Cr Sue Miller sought and was granted leave of the meeting to reorder the items in the agenda to consider Item 8.5 *South Coast Growth Strategy – Consultation Feedback & Next Steps* at this time.

The meeting moved to Item 8.5.

8.5. South Coast Growth Strategy - Consultation Feedback & Next Steps

C24575

Moved Cr Lou Nicholson seconded Cr Milli Livingston

1. **That Council receives the submissions lodged and outcomes from the Community Engagement for the draft South Coast Growth Strategy.**

2. **That Council request a Council Information Session to be held in December 2024 and a subsequent report will be presented to Council in early 2025, seeking endorsement of a final South Coast Growth Strategy.**

CARRIED

The meeting returned to Item 8.4.

8.5. South Coast Growth Strategy - Consultation Feedback & Next Steps

Item 8.5 *South Coast Growth Strategy – Consultation Feedback & Next Steps* was considered earlier in this meeting.

8.6. Port Elliot / Middleton / Milang Master Plan - Consultation Feedback

C24578

Moved Cr Craig Maidment seconded Cr Bill Coomans

1. **That Council receive the outcomes from the feedback for the Middleton Master Plan (Attachment 4 - Middleton Master Plan Engagement Report contained in this meeting agenda) and;**

a. **endorses the Middleton Master Plan (attachment 1 contained in this meeting agenda) as the basis for prioritising future projects for the Middleton township.**

b. **Note that future projects will require funding, tailored investigation and engagement.**

2. **That Council receive the outcomes from the feedback for the Milang Master Plan (Attachment 5 - Milang Master Plan Engagement Report contained in this meeting agenda) and;**

    a. **endorses the Milang Master Plan (attachment 2 contained in this meeting agenda) as the basis for prioritising future projects for the Milang township.**

    b. **Note that future projects will require funding, tailored investigation and engagement.**

3. **That Council receive the outcomes from the feedback for the Port Elliot Master Plan (Attachment 6 - Port Elliot Master Plan Engagement Report contained in this meeting agenda) and;**

    a. **endorses the Port Elliot Master Plan (attachment 3 contained in this meeting agenda) as the basis for prioritising future projects for the Port Elliot township.**

    b. **Note that future projects will require funding, tailored investigation and engagement.**

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

8.5. South Coast Growth Strategy - Consultation Feedback & Next Steps

Responsible Officer: Stacey Bateson (General Manager Community)

Report Author: Kylie Weymouth (Manager Strategic Development)

Recommendation

Recommendation 1:

That Council receives the submissions lodged and outcomes from the Community Engagement for the draft South Coast Growth Strategy

Recommendation 2:

That Council request a Council Information Session to be held in December 2024 and a subsequent report will be presented to Council in early 2025, seeking endorsement of a final South Coast Growth Strategy.

Prior Resolutions

Meeting Date	Agenda Item Number	Report Title	Resolution Number
5 August 2024	4.1	South Coast Growth Strategy	C24392
22 January 2024	8.1	Goolwa North Code Amendment Submission	C24007
18 December 2023	4.2	Petition Opposing the Goolwa North Code Amendment	C23498
19 June 2023	8.1	Goolwa North Growth Area	C23212

Community Strategic Plan Impact

LIVEABLE	**Distinctive townships, places, spaces, and transport networks that support active lifestyles vibrant cultures and productive enterprise**
GREEN	Climate-ready, a place where nature is valued, and resources are managed sustainably and creatively to support a new economy
CONNECTED	Created for, with and by the community. We are safe, healthy and all enjoy accessible infrastructure and services
ENABLED	Proactive pursuit of innovative practices, ethical resource management and transparent leadership to foster community engagement, trust, and accountability, thus ensuring an inclusive and empowered Council

Report Objective

That Council receive and consider the feedback provided by the community during the community engagement of the draft South Coast Growth Strategy.

Executive Summary

In response to considerable community opposition to a private landowner's proposal to rezone around 270 hectares for mostly residential use at Goolwa North, the Council, upon the request of the Planning and Land Use team from the (now) Department for Housing and Urban Development, resolved to seek community input on alternative growth areas in the south coast region of the Alexandrina Council area.

The consultation period closed on 2 October 2024 after an extensive and varied community engagement process.

The feedback received has now been collated and is provided for the consideration and noting of Council, ahead of a Council Information Session to be held in early December and subsequent Council Report that will seek endorsement of a final South Coast Growth Strategy.

The key takeaways are:

- confirmation that significant infrastructure is required across the range of services (hard and soft) *ahead* of *any* additional growth (in some cases is already needed) in *any* location proposed;
- additional development is not supported on Hindmarsh Island due to limited access, a lack of infrastructure and the sensitivity of the environment (Ramsar wetland);
- significant strong opposition (78%) to the development of Middleton Area Q due to the impact of development on this area of high biodiversity and habitat value, on the cultural significance of the area to Ngarrindjeri, and on the rural township character and township separation;
- a high level of support (67%) for Area L at Goolwa; and
- support for Area M in Goolwa for urban development (mixed views whether for employment or residential).

Context

The Alexandrina Council area is currently experiencing significant growth pressure via private landowner driven Code Amendments based on the growth areas within the current *30 Year Plan for Greater Adelaide*, and further pressure through the additional land identified for future growth in the draft *Greater Adelaide Regional Plan* (GARP), which is proposed to replace the *30 Year Plan for Greater Adelaide*. It is necessary for Council to identify an appropriate growth plan in order to be able to direct this growth to areas that are suitable and appropriate.

A number of preliminary engagement activities were undertaken regarding proposed growth areas during the Village Conversations at Goolwa, Middleton and Port Elliot in late 2023. Workshops were subsequently held with Council members, Administration and Council's consultant, Holmes Dyer to consider this preliminary feedback and the opportunities and constraints identified for the proposed areas. On 5 August 2024, Council resolved to seek community feedback on a number of areas in the south coast region of Alexandrina for the two staged 30-year growth strategy that is intended to be used to inform future strategic planning decisions, including Council's submission regarding the GARP.

General Analysis

Community Engagement

Council's Administration undertook an extensive and varied engagement process to seek input from the community on the areas chosen by Council at the 5 August 2024 Council meeting, for the draft *South Coast Growth Strategy* (SCGS).

Community engagement commenced on 29 August 2024 and closed on 2 October 2024.

Engagement activities included:

- Information (draft South Coast Growth Strategy and Frequently Asked Questions document provided on the Alexandrina **MySay** website (1,740 unique visits).
- A **survey** provided on the MySay website (365 responses - refer Attachment 1)
- A **video recording** of the content of the draft SCGS (we received very positive feedback for this by Councillors at Victor Harbor who have now requested that this be a future feature of their community engagement activities) that was viewed 286 times
- A **sandwich board** with information about the SCGS and how to be involved, located outside of the Middleton IGA throughout the consultation period (free of charge).
- A **display** of information, including how to get involved, located outside of the entrance to Woolworths at the Goolwa Shopping Centre for a week (cost for space hire).
- Three **drop-in information sessions** facilitated by Council's Administration:
    - Two half day sessions held outside of the **Middleton** IGA on Friday 6 September 2024 and Saturday 28 September 2024 (attended by approximately 57 people)
    - One full day session held in the **Goolwa** Shopping Centre Mall on Thursday 19 September 2024 (attended by approximately 148 people)
- **Public notices** in the *Southern Argus* and the *Fleurieu Sun*. (Articles also appeared in the *Victor Harbor Times,* the *Southern Argus* and the *Fleurieu Sun).*
- **Social Media Posts** (Facebook and Instagram)
- **Presentations** and **discussion** with the Goolwa Cittaslow Committee, Middleton Town and Foreshore Association and the Port Elliot Town and Foreshore Improvement Association.
- **Information** specifically sent to the Ngarrindjeri Aboriginal Corporation (together with an invitation to discuss) and to the Ratalang Basham Beach and Horseshoe Bay Advisory Committee.

The figures listed above suggest that the engagement activities, particularly the new initiatives undertaken, were successful in reaching a broad section of the community. In respect to the online survey, 204 Alexandrina residents, 216 Alexandrina ratepayers, 18 Alexandrina Business owners, 31 visitors and 13 'others' made up the respondents.

Council also received 28 emailed submissions **(Attachment 2)**, three (3) hard copy submissions **(Attachment 2)** and two (2) petitions.

Submissions were received from the Conservation Council of SA **(Attachment 3)**, the Coast Unit of the Department for Environment and Water **(Attachment 4**), the Hills and Fleurieu Landscape Board **(Attachment 5)**, and a resolution from Council's Climate Emergency and Environment Committee (CEEC) (refer separate Item 9.2 in this Agenda).

WHAT DID WE HEAR?

In addition to questions regarding the details of respondents, the survey asked a number of key questions including seeking general feedback on the services and facilities that are considered necessary to accommodate growth over the next 30 years. Questions regarding whether the community support, do not support or are neutral in respect to specific potential growth areas were also asked.

A full MySay Report is provided at **Attachment 1** and a summary of the responses to the survey questions is provided as follows.

Q 5 What services and facilities do you think will be needed to accommodate growth over the next 30 years?

General answers included the following.

- Medical facilities including:
    - expanded hospital

    - increase to GP numbers
    - allied health services - physio, radiology, dentistry
- Sport and recreation facilities - including open space and green areas, recreation centres, playgrounds, skate parks, showers on beachfront
- Environment - areas containing natural drainage and ecosystems, wildlife corridors, significant and remnant flora and fauna and habitat to be avoided and protected
- Transport options - pedestrian & cycle trails, uber, taxi, rail link from Mt Barker to South coast to Seaford
- Child and aged care facilities
- Road infrastructure including:
    - upgrades (particularly Randell Road, Hindmarsh Island, Goolwa Road, Goolwa to Strathalbyn Road, Goolwa to Victor)
    - adequate road widths in new developments to allow car parking & emergency vehicle access
    - Bypass routes (around Middleton, Brookman Rd, Goolwa, change the traffic management between Cadell Street / Goolwa Terrace / Brooking Street / Randell Road)
    - bridge from Hindmarsh Island to Clayton Bay
- Traffic management and car parking improvements
- Employment - incl. new business hubs, industries, production facilities
- Power & internet
- Retail - food & other shops, restaurants
- Adequate emergency services - ambulance, fire and police
- Sewer
- Water - pressure & availability
- Stormwater infrastructure
- Tourism facilities
- Education - including more teachers, early to tertiary education opportunities
- Professional services - vets, accountancy, surveying, conveyancing, banks etc
- Community facilities
- Rubbish collection frequency
- More Council staff to cater for increased population & infrastructure demands

The community were asked whether they support, do not support, or are neutral in respect to the areas identified for potential growth. They were also asked to provide reasons for their level of support. The outcomes of these questions are summarised as follows:

Hindmarsh Island -proposed Infill/Existing Area A (Phase One) and proposed Rural Living Intensification Areas D & E (Phase Two)

There were two (2) potential opportunities for growth identified in Phase One for Hindmarsh Island. With the exception of the isolated rectangular area of land to the east of Coorong Quays (which is affected by the Environment and Food Production Area or EFPA), **Area A** (Infill/Existing Capacity) recognised that there is scope within the existing planning policy framework to deliver additional dwellings that can form part of the south coast of Alexandrina's contribution to meeting the State's dwelling targets. As it is an 'infill' opportunity resulting from existing planning policy Area A it is in Phase One.

In respect to **Area A**, 44.9% of the survey respondents supported the option, 30.1% did not support and 25.0% were neutral. The key reasons provided for not supporting related to the lack of infrastructure (particularly in relation to Hindmarsh Island), the sensitivity and importance of the environment (again particularly for Hindmarsh Island) and the effect on the rural character. The key reasons provided for supporting this outcome are that there is ability to connect to the existing services and infrastructure (however this was particularly recorded in respect to the Goolwa part of **Area A**).

The other areas of land on Hindmarsh Island are proposed for Phase Two and are identified for intensification, meaning for a reduction in the minimum allotment size allowed. Of these 'Rural Living Intensification' areas identified for Hindmarsh Island (**Areas D & E**), 41% do not support this, 26.4% are supportive and 32.6% are neutral. The reasons provided for not supporting this option relate to:

- lack of infrastructure
- constraints of a single access on and off the island (safety)
- sensitive and important natural environment (Ramsar wetland of international importance) and the affects additional development would have on this
- existing larger minimum allotment sizes should remain limiting future development.
- effect on the character of the island

There were limited reasons provided for supporting the option with some being from landowners supporting the ability to subdivide their own land and one suggesting that the proposal ' maintains the semi-rural nature of the area'.

Concerns about the likely effect of development on the natural environment and surrounding wetland (internationally significant Ramsar Wetland) were also raised in submissions from The Hills and Fleurieu Landscape Board **(Attachment 5)**.

Goolwa Phase One: proposed Area A (between Fenchurch Street, Washington Street, Bricknell Road and Banfield Road/Byrnes Road), Area C (Lakeside), Area K (Seachange), Area L (School)

Proposed **Area A** "Infill/Existing' - note grouped with Area A on Hindmarsh Island) was identified to recognise that there is some capacity for this area to deliver additional housing to contribute to the State's targets with the existing planning policy with no changes proposed. 44.9% of respondents support this, 30.1% do not support and 25.0% are neutral. The key reasons provided for not supporting are the lack of infrastructure, services and traffic management, the sensitivity of the surrounding environment, effect on rural character. Reasons for support included proximity to infrastructure and services.

Proposed **Area C** 'Rural Living Intensification' (Lakeside- part area affected by Private landowner Code Amendment) was identified with the view to consider more efficient use of this land as opposed to expanding into currently undeveloped areas. 46.2% of respondents support this, 30.6% do not support and 23.1% are neutral. The key reasons provided for supporting include needing more options for people entering retirement, logical expansion of developed areas, and ability to be serviced by infrastructure.

The reasons provided for not supporting are:

- impact on rural character & lifestyles
- infrastructure and services in the region cannot support more people in the over 70 age brackets (in respect to the Residential Park Code Amendment)
- inadequate infrastructure already
- traffic congestion
- protection of food production areas required
- negative impact on natural habitat

In addition to the survey responses, a petition was received in relation to the Lakeside Code Amendment affected component of this option which states that '*The local community objects to any expansion of Lakeside because it will change the country 'feel' of Goolwa North*....' The petition is signed by 62 people and was tabled at the 21 October 2024 Council Meeting and provided to the planning consultant undertaking the engagement for the Code Amendment. Council has already resolved and provided its response to the Lakeside private land-owner Code Amendment (C24498). This submission will be considered by the planning consultant appointed by the landowner to prepare the Code Amendment, along with the other submissions that were received. Ultimately, once these submissions and the outcomes of the consultant's investigations have been considered, the decision regarding whether or not to approve the Code Amendment in its current, or a revised form, sits with the Minister for Planning.

Area K (Seachange) Deferred Urban Zoned land was included in the draft Strategy in recognition of the area's ability to deliver dwelling units to contribute to the State's targets. As has been pointed out in a number of survey responses, part of this area already has an approval, the remainder is the subject to a private land-owner Code Amendment to expand the adjacent caravan park. 66% of respondents support the option, 12.2% do not support and 21.4% are neutral.

Area L (Goolwa School) is Deferred Urban zoned land surrounding the Goolwa High School and is identified for additional housing and potential shared use recreation facilities. Area L received significant support from the community (67.4%) with 13.5% of respondents not supporting and 19.1% being neutral.

The key reasons provided in support include:

- the need for greater schooling facilities
- the availability of infrastructure
- logical expansion
- ideal location for affordable housing, recreation and community facilities
- developer contribution to infrastructure
- ability to include green zones

Reasons provided for not supporting include:

- 'too many more houses'
- 'not enough infrastructure currently' (wastewater, medical, allied health, supermarkets etc)
- 'ruin rural township feel and character'.

Goolwa Phase Two: proposed Area M (Employment), Area P (Goolwa Northeast)

Area M is located between Skewes Road to the west, north of Port Elliot Road, and south of Kessel Road in Goolwa and is currently zoned Deferred Urban. It is recommended for Employment land due to its proximity to the existing Strategic Employment zoned land and proximity to other higher impacting land uses such as Council's waste-water treatment facility. This also reflects the findings of Council's Productive Economy paper that considered the current and future employment land needs of our five largest townships.

52% of respondents support this proposal, 20.3% do not support and 27.7% of respondents are neutral. Many submissions expressed interest in understanding what type of employment is proposed and suggested that employment land should be located further out of town near the airport land. The reasons provided in support include:

- the need for areas for employment creation particularly with expected population increase
- proximity to other employment land and waste-water treatment facilities
- availability of infrastructure
- should be included in Phase One

Reasons provided by those not in support include:

- growth not reflective of rural town character
- traffic issues
- further loss of separation of townships

A number of responses indicated a preference for the area to be developed for residential.

A petition relating to proposed Area M, signed by 46 people was received and tabled at the 21 October 2024 Council Meeting (C 24497). The petition states: '*We the undersigned request the following to the South Coast Growth Strategy: 1. We do not support Area M for Industry/Employment 2. We support changing Area M to Neighbourhood Zone in Phase 1. 3. We support using all Deferred Urban Land into Phase 1 before Rural Living land intensification.'*

Area P (Goolwa Northeast) refers to an undeveloped ('greenfield') area of land bound by North Road and Byrnes Road to the south, and (extension of) Banfield Road to the north in Goolwa and is a small part of the land that is currently the subject of the Goolwa North Private land- owner Code Amendment.

45.9% of respondents support this area for future growth, 29.2% do not support it and 24.9% are neutral. The key reasons provided in support of the proposal include:

- infrastructure availability
- proximity to services
- consolidated location & ownership
- logical expansion
- not on coastal land
- not affecting land with high conservation value nor in the EFPA
- should be included in the first Phase

The key reasons provided for not supporting the proposal include:

- already insufficient infrastructure
- ruin the quiet and character of Goolwa
- traffic impacts
- should be larger allotments
- encroaching on farmland
- road infrastructure would need improvement (incl. for commuters from Adelaide)

Many responses indicated support for larger allotments, the need to protect the areas of remnant vegetation and the need to provide visual buffers of vegetation.

Some responses questioned why the previous community opposition to growth at Goolwa North has been ignored, whilst others questioned why Goolwa North areas have been taken off the table.

Middleton Phase One: Area B (Middleton West), Area Q (Middleton East)

Area B Middleton West refers to the land recently rezoned via a private land-owner Code Amendment from Deferred Urban to Master Planned Township zoned land and is the triangular piece of land between Basham Beach Road, the rail line, Mindacowie Terrace and Port Elliot Road. This area of land was included in the draft Strategy in recognition of its ability to deliver dwellings to contribute to the State's housing targets as an 'Infill/Existing' area. Despite the existing ability for this land to be developed, 41.2% of respondents do not support it, 40.9% do support it and 17.9% are neutral. Many submissions pointed out that the land is already available for development but wished to see the larger allotments proposed during the consultation of the Code Amendment.

Area Q (Middleton East) refers to the area of land bound by Offshore Road/Boettcher Road/north of Newell Avenue in the south, Port Elliot Road to the north and west of the Council depot at Middleton. The land is currently zoned Rural and is affected by the EFPA. Significant opposition was expressed by respondents with 78.2% that do not support, 14.5% support and 7.3% who remain neutral.

There are limited reasons provided in support of Area Q with the following individual responses being recorded:

- provides additional housing (including for young people)
- poor agricultural land
- a rational extension to Goolwa & has been supported by Council previously

A strong sense of opposition to this option is voiced in the responses with the key reasons relating to the area being of high conservation value containing rare and endangered flora species and habitat for significant wildlife. These concerns are echoed in formal written submissions received from the Conservation Council of SA **(Attachment 3)**, the Hills and Fleurieu Landscape Board **(Attachment 5)**, Second Nature Conservancy and by Council's Section 41 Climate Emergency and Environment Committee (refer Item 9.2 in this Agenda). Other reasons provided for not supporting this option are:

- encroaches into the 'green belt' between townships that help retain their identity and are consistently reported to be valued in community forums
- lack of infrastructure
- area is a natural wetland and subject to flooding
- stormwater impacts
- not suitable to provide for affordable housing to assist with housing crisis due to higher land value, larger blocks being required
- culturally significant land for Ngarrindjeri
- existing traffic congestion
- detrimental impact on the character of the town
- detrimental effect on the town's broader role as a holiday destination for South Australians as a whole.

Middleton Phase Two: Area N (Middleton West)

Area N refers to land currently zoned Deferred Urban that is bound by Port Elliot Road to the south, Ocean Road to the East and north of the Basham Beach intersection with Port Elliot Road to the west. 43.9% of respondents are not in support of this option, 33.3% do support and 22.7% are neutral.

The key reasons provided in support of this option are:

- a logical expansion
- would better balance the township
- better option than Area Q
- can be supported by infrastructure

The reasons provided in opposition to the option include:

- already insufficient infrastructure (including power waste water, NBN, pedestrian)
- traffic congestion already exists (needs a bypass route)
- too many houses
- needs a waste water system
- detrimental impact on the character of the township

- concerns about township separation
- needs larger allotments

As well as the survey responses, there were 30 written submissions received **(refer Attachment 2)**. These included the following.

- Twelve additional submissions opposing Area Q -additional concerns raised including: questions why previous community feedback has not been listened to in respect to this, effect on tourism as holiday character diminished
- A letter from (URPS) Craven Group & Oakford Homes requesting collaboration with Council to overcome the challenges posed by growth
- Letter from (URPS) Allworth Pty Ltd supporting the designation of Area Q in Phase One of the Strategy. Recognises the need for protection any areas of cultural or environmental significance. Suggests that larger allotments located here will attract lifestyle seeking families and early retirees and allow for tree canopy and buffers.
- Letter from (URPS) Craven Securities Pty Ltd regarding Area L - supports the inclusion in Phase One and requests the ongoing support be confirmed through other strategic planning initiatives.
- Letter from Aspen Group in support of the inclusion of their land at 130 Monument Road Hindmarsh Island in the SCGS.
- Submission from ratepayer and future resident of Goolwa Beach raising concern about the lack of notification to residents and/or ratepayers.
- Submission from the Department for Environment and Water Coast Unit providing the following advice: any urban growth must minimise stormwater discharge to the coast via water sensitive urban design to protect seagrass beds.
    - the impact on marine benthnic ecosystems from nutrient and sediment inputs from stormwater infrastructure is a real concern that causes changes in coastal system behaviours resulting in impacts including the increased threat of erosion
    - In respect to 'infill areas: **Area B** - will presumably direct stormwater into the stormwater drain that flows directly into the Encounter Marine Park Whale Sanctuary Area and so must be appropriately managed using sufficient open space. Concern that the recently upgraded stormwater drain may already be at capacity being associated with existing developed area.
    - In respect to **Area Q** adjacent Tokuremoar Reserve - this area is already under threat from stormwater runoff from adjoining developed land and further development may increase stormwater runoff into the wetland impacting its geological and ecological integrity. Concern about increase in weeds from stormwater. Concern about the potential impacts on Aboriginal Heritage sites
    - Northern part of Area A western end Hindmarsh Island - contains a significant area of native vegetation associated with the Ramsar wetland status of the island and surrounding waters. Urbanisation would need to include measures to protect this vegetation, including through the incorporation of appropriate buffers from development, to avoid impacts. The southern portion of **Area A** on the western end of Hindmarsh Island, adjacent to the current extent of the Coorong Quays development, should identify an environmental buffer between the river and any future development.
- Email from concerned resident who does not support Area B

- Submission from ratepayer and resident Area B supported if developed in accordance with the concept plan used in the consultation. Area N is not supported for similar reasons to those identified for Area Q with the addition that it is considered prime agricultural land and should not proceed prior to a bypass road. Growth should be consolidated in Goolwa and Victor Harbor as per the State Governments plans and most efficient way to deliver infrastructure. Concern about the nature of the decision making around the development of the Strategy.
- Submission from the Middleton Town & Foreshore Association **(refer Attachment 6)** - do not support growth options identified for Middleton (infrastructure, significant environmental impacts, climate change risk elements, existing long running consultations, disproportionate growth, flooding, township separation encroachment, traffic, emergency services constraints, character). Area B only supported in the form presented during Code Amendment consultation & concern that this is not what will happen. Area N not supported as prime agricultural land, impact on township separation. Area Q rejected in its entirety (due to all the constraints listed in the SCGS itself). Growth should happen at Victor Harbor and Goolwa as per State's plans, not fragmented across the coast. Breach of faith with the community in respect to the way in which Area Q came to being.
- Email and attached submission Area B - disappointment that will be developed by Oakford and not in a way characteristic of Middleton nor delivering sustainable homes as promised.
- Email and attachments raising concern that planning needs to be sustainable and not ad hoc, that good governance is required, that 'the letters patent and native title' should be adhered to, that good planning should start from the ground up so geomorphology is studied, ground and surface water and rise in sea level should be taken into account, Ngarrindjeri heritage should be considered.
- Email and attached submission from the Hills and Fleurieu Landscape Board. Concern about how the considerations have informed the identification of the proposed growth areas and what planning requirements will be put in place to manage the risks posed by development. Most impacts can be avoided or managed with the provision of appropriate buffers with the exception of proposed Area Q. Climate change impacts need to be explicitly identified for each proposed growth area. Effect of further development including jetties and pontoons on Hindmarsh Island (erosion and removal of native vegetation within a Ramsar wetland of international importance). Area B Middletown West - stormwater runoff concerns relating to affect on the Encounter Marine Park Sanctuary & Southern Right Whale nursery habitat and short distance of development to this sanctuary. Area Q - adjacent to the Tokuremoar Reserve which has the 3rd highest conservation value across the Fleurieu (Southern Fleurieu Coastal Action Plan is cited,)
- Submission from CLR - CL Rowe and Associates supports Area A for higher density including the area on the western end of Hindmarsh Island as within reasonable proximity to shops and services at Goolwa. Area B - already zoned and support additional allotments subject to suitable wastewater disposal. Area C - opposes use of rural living land as it provides different living options and further development would detrimentally impact the existing amenity and character of the immediate locality, is too far from services and shops (2 - 4 km away), limited access to water, CWMS infrastructure and electricity infrastructure, need road upgrades, provide a buffer to agricultural and township activities - move to Phase 2. Area K & Area L - support Deferred Urban land should take precedence over any other options available. Area Q - part landowners are clients - states the history of the zoning of the land being Rural Fringe from 1980 to 2014, considers a logical expansion of Goolwa & close to the township (2.6km away), is not suitable for farming, access to infrastructure is readily available, consistent with pattern of development in locality, valid sand mining leases exist over the land. Questions the opposition information of the Middleton Town and Foreshore submission, raises concern about Councils planning staff advising members of the public that the planning department does not support the future development of Area Q. Areas D & E - considers that errors that were in the original documentation (which were immediately corrected) in relation to the potential yield mean submissions should be disregarded. Area M - comments seem to confuse and refer to other areas of land, the land should be developed for residential as development for industrial

purposes is 'irrational' and 'ill-conceived', traffic, visual appeal concerns, alternative area for industrial land suggested consistent with the GARP. Area N - Deferred Urban so should be prioritised for development. Area P concur with inclusion in Phase Two, noting objections of the community in relation to the Goolwa North Code Amendment.

- Letter from landowner 179 Randell Rd Hindmarsh Island - should be included for growth in Phase 1 as it is unencumbered, is not in the EFPA, close to shops and amenities of Goolwa, orderly transition to larger rural allotments, provides options for future development at different allotment size minimums.
- Letter from land-owners of 1303 Pt Elliot Road, Goolwa (Area M) - considers there is little need for additional industrial land as existing industrial land is not fully utilised and is taken up with development that offers little employment, visual aspect of industry, some land affected by bushfire requirements due to Native vegetation heritage agreements in proximity, more appropriate for rural living.
- Email and attachment from Second Nature Conservancy - significant concerns about Area Q - containing species critically endangered on the Fleurieu Peninsula and Nationally - development of housing in close proximity to the site would add further pressures from likely predation and disturbance of wildlife by domestic pets like cats and dogs, particularly relevant for the wetland birds which expend large amounts of energy when disturbed which is known to detract from breeding and migratory success. Noise and higher levels of foot traffic into the area and adjoining reserves would also be of concern for wildlife at the site, flooding concerns, viewscape. Area A Hindmarsh Island - contains areas of considerable environmental value including likely habitat for the EPBC listed endangered Orange Bellied Parrot and a range of other birds, native fish, amphibians and reptiles - other areas on Hindmarsh Island should have sensitive habitat identified and adequately retained. Area L adjacent large patches of remnant vegetation that development could have significant impact on.
- Email from resident suggesting Area M should be developed for residential rather than Employment lands and moved to Phase One.
- Email from resident opposing Area Q and N and B unless developed as promised - breach of trust as never identified before (Q), lack of town planning considerations - character, infrastructure, environment)
- Receipt of three handwritten surveys (Area A: 3 support, Area B: 1 support, 1 does not support, Area C: 1 support, 1 neutral, Area K: 2 support, 1 neutral, Area L: 3 support, Area Q 1 support, 2 do not support, Areas D & E: 1 support, 1 neutral, Area M: 2 do not support (1 supports residential), 2 neutral, Area N: 2 support, 1 neutral, Area P: 1 supports, 1 does not support, 1 neutral.
- Written submission from Gemlife - recommends reconsideration of eastern portion of Area O at Port Elliot (currently Deferred Urban) as is not affected by the EFPA, is contiguous, infrastructure availability, consolidated ownership, more efficient use of land.

Comparative Analysis

The only comparison relates to the alternative growth strategy that is part of the draft Greater Adelaide Regional Plan that was released for consultation part way through the SCGS engagement period. The affect that this has on the draft SCGS and how we should respond is discussed in a separate Council report.

Financial and Economic Implications

The recommendation of this report is to note the feedback received and therefore, in accordance with the Alexandrina Council's Adopted Budget / Long Term Financial Plan, the financial implications of adopting this recommendation are considered low.

Risk Management

In accordance with Alexandrina Council's Risk Assessment Matrix, the risk of adopting this recommendation is considered low.

Conclusion

The engagement activities undertaken during the community consultation of the draft South Coast Growth Strategy are considered to be relatively successful. Whilst criticism is still aimed at the lack of informing all residents, it is considered that the varied engagement initiatives such as the video recording, advertising and advice regarding the draft SCGS and how to get involved being provided in public places and the drop-in sessions staffed by Councils Administration in public places were successful, particularly in helping spread the message and attracting people who may not otherwise be engaged through the more traditional engagement channels.

Feedback on the whole is a resounding concern from the community for the lack of infrastructure and inappropriateness of the south coast for significant residential growth due to its traditional role as a holiday, quiet semi-rural destination. That if growth is to occur, that it must occur *after* the appropriate infrastructure is in place.

There is a real concern about the impacts of growth in many of the proposed areas and particularly Area Q at Middleton and areas on Hindmarsh Island on the sensitive remaining natural environment and a desire to protect this.

There is concern about the effects that any significant level of growth will have on the rural character and feel of all of the townships on the South Coast.

These concerns and a recommendation as to how Council should respond, together with consideration of the draft Greater Adelaide Regional Plan, are intended to be discussed at a Council Information Session in December 2024 and a subsequent final SCGS plan brought back to Council for formal endorsement in early 2025

Attachments ***(all attachments provided under separate cover)***

Attachment 1 - MySay Report

Attachment 2 - redacted compilation of additional Submissions received

Attachment 3 - Conservation Council of SA Submission

Attachment 4 - Department for Environment and Water Coast Unit Submission

Attachment 5 - Hills and Fleurieu Landscape Board Submission

Attachment 6 - Middleton Town and Foreshore Association Submission