# Horseshoe Bay - Feedback form

## About you

01. Full name Required

02. Email address Required

03. What is your connection to Horseshoe Bay? Please select all that apply. Required

| Select all that apply |
| --- |
| ☐ I live within walking distance |
| ☐ I live within a short drive (less than 15 minutes) |
| ☐ I live within a moderate drive (15–30 minutes) |
| ☐ I live more than 30 minutes away |
| ☐ I work nearby but don't live nearby |
| ☐ I don't live or work nearby, but I visit for other reasons |
| ☐ Other |

04. How often do you visit Horseshoe Bay? Required

| Select one answer only |
| --- |
| ◯ Daily |
| ◯ Several times a week |
| ◯ Once a week |
| ◯ A few times a month |
| ◯ A few times a year |
| ◯ Only during the warmer months |
| ◯ Only during the cooler months |

| |
|---|
| ◯ Once a year |
| ◯ Less than once a year |
| ◯ I have never visited Horseshoe Bay |

05. Suburb Required

| |
|---|
| |

06. Are you a resident and/or ratepayer of the Alexandrina Council? Required

| Select one answer only |
|---|
| ◯ Resident |
| ◯ Ratepayer |
| ◯ Resident and ratepayer |
| ◯ Neither |

## Feedback on the options

## Option 1 – Raise breakwater height and length

This option intends to protect a greater extent of the Bay from high wave energy by increasing the height and length of the existing breakwater.

Consultants advise that this option is effective in the short term but not effective in the long term.

**Capital cost:** $17.9M
**30-year operating cost:** $0.6M

**Pros**

- Effective at reducing recession due to storm erosion in short term
- Limits disruption to the beach.

**Cons**

- Does not improve recession due to sea level rise in the longer term.
- Does not improve recession on the eastern extent.
- Expensive ($18.5M) and challenging to construct
- Impact to sea grass and heritage breakwater.




07. Please share your overall level of support for Option 1: Required

| Select one answer only |
| --- |
| ◯ Strongly support |
| ◯ Support |
| ◯ Neither support nor oppose |
| ◯ Oppose |
| ◯ Strongly oppose |

08. What do you like about Option 1? 👍

09. What do you dislike about Option 1? 👎

## Option 2 – Offshore breakwater in the nearshore

This option seeks to reduce exposure to wave energy and increasing beach widths in the central extent of the Bay by constructing an offshore, submerged breakwater.

Consultant advises that this option is not effective in the short term or longer term.

**Capital cost:** $9.3M
**30-year operating cost:** $0.3M

**Pros**

- Nature-based recreation opportunities
- Limits disruption to the beach.

**Cons**

- **Does not reduce recession due to storm surge or sea level rise in the longer term**
- Challenging design and construction
- Increase erosion risk east and west of the structure.



10. Please share your overall level of support for Option 2: Required

| Select one answer only |
| --- |
| ◯ Strongly support |
| ◯ Support |
| ◯ Neither support nor oppose |
| ◯ Oppose |
| ◯ Strongly oppose |

11. What do you like about Option 2?

12. What do you dislike about Option 2?

## Option 3a – Sand nourishment (bay sand)

This option intends to increase the volume of sand in the central part of the Bay by borrowing sand from the eastern part of the Bay (beach, not dunes, in the short term) to increase capacity for erosion during storms.

In this case the beach profile on the eastern side of the bay would retreat by 10m to provide the source of sand.

Consultant advises that this option is effective in the short term and moderately effective in the longer term.

**Capital cost:** $0M
**Operating cost:** $0.36M-$1.5M ongoing every 1-5 years, depending on seasonal weather impacts.

**Pros**

- Effective at reducing recession in the short term
- Moderate reduction in recession due to sea level rise in the longer term
- Lower comparable longer-term costs
- Flexible (for example, Council can pursue this option now and decide to do something else later)
- Increase beach width in high-use area
- Retains beach amenity
- Promotes environmental value of the foreshore and dunes.

**Cons**

- Disruption to beach during sand operations
- In the long-term the eastern part of Bay will retreat due to sourcing sand and eventually impact the dunes
- Council requires State Government authority approval for each campaign (every 1-5 years).



13. Please share your overall level of support for Option 3a: Required

| Select one answer only |
| --- |
| ◯ Strongly support |
| ◯ Support |
| ◯ Neither support nor oppose |
| ◯ Oppose |
| ◯ Strongly oppose |

14. What do you like about Option 3a?

15. What do you dislike about Option 3a?

## Option 3b – Sand nourishment (quarry sand)

This option intends to increase the volume of sand in the central part of the Bay by sourcing sand from outside of the system.

Consultants advise this option would be effective in the short term and moderately effective in the long term.

**Capital cost:** $0M
**Operating cost:** $1.25M-$5.4M (every 1-5 years depending on seasonal weather impacts)

**Pros**

- No impact to the eastern section of the bay as using external sand instead
- Effective at reducing recession in the short term
- Moderate reduction in recession due to sea level rise in the longer term

- Lower comparable longer-term costs
- Flexible (for example, Council can pursue this option now and decide to do something else later)
- Increase beach width in high-use area
- Retains beach amenity
- Promotes the environmental value of the foreshore and dunes.

**Cons**

- Disruption to beach during sand operations.
- Need authority approval for each campaign (every 1-5 years).




16. Please share your overall level of support for Option 3b: Required

| Select one answer only |
|---|
| ◯ Strongly support |
| ◯ Support |
| ◯ Neither support nor oppose |
| ◯ Oppose |
| ◯ Strongly oppose |

17. What do you like about Option 3b?

18. What do you dislike about Option 3b?

## Option 4a – Buried seawall & existing seawall replacement

This option seeks to 'hold the line' against beach erosion by extending the vertical seawall.

This will remove the risk to infrastructure. However, the beach in front of the wall will continue to erode/deepen and reduce the amount of usable beach over time.

Consultant advises that this option is effective in the short term and longer term.

**Capital cost:** $3.6M
**30-year operating cost:** $0.2M

**Pros**

- 'Holds the line' - limits recession past the wall in the short and longer term
- Straightforward approvals, design and construction.

**Cons**

- Loss of useable beach over time (as sand erodes in front of the wall)
- Impact on beach amenity (subjective)
- Impact on the beach environment
- Significant rebuild costs after 30 years
- Disruption during construction
- Significant loss of useable sand beach (impact tourism and use).




19. Please share your overall level of support for Option 4a: Required

| Select one answer only |
| --- |
| ◯ Strongly support |
| ◯ Support |
| ◯ Neither support nor oppose |
| ◯ Oppose |
| ◯ Strongly oppose |

20. What do you like about Option 4a? 👍

21. What do you dislike about Option 4a?

## Option 4b – Buried seawall & existing seawall replacement with nourishment

This option intends to 'hold the line' against beach erosion by extending the vertical seawall but also bringing in approximately 9000m3 of external sand to better maintain a useable sandy beach.

Consultant advises this option is effective in the short term and the longer term.

**Capital cost: $3.6M**
**30-year operating cost:** $1M-$4M

**Pros**

- 'Holds the line' - limits recession past the wall in the short and longer term
- Straightforward approvals, design and construction
- Maintains useable sandy beach
- Lower comparable rebuild cost due to maintenance of sand in front of wall.

**Cons**

- Impact of sea wall on beach amenity (subjective)
- Impact on the beach environment
- Disruption during construction and sand campaigns.




22. Please share your overall level of support for Option 4b: Required

| Select one answer only |
| --- |
| ◯ Strongly support |
| ◯ Support |
| ◯ Neither support nor oppose |
| ◯ Oppose |
| ◯ Strongly oppose |

23. What do you like about Option 4b? 👍

24. What do you dislike about Option 4b?

## Option 5 – Managed relocations of assets

This option seeks to progressively move buildings and assets out of the areas where the shoreline recession is anticipated. This would need to be done collaboratively with asset users. Due to complexities of this option, it was not costed or assessed in detail by the consultant.

The consultant has advised that this option would be effective in the short term and the longer term.

**Pros**

- Removes assets and infrastructure from the recession areas (mitigates the hazard)
- Allows natural bay processes to occur
- Does not interfere with habitat.

**Cons**

- Community may not wish for assets to be moved
- Challenging to implement
- Sea level rise beyond 2100 may still require protection.




25. Please share your overall level of support for Option 5: Required

| Select one answer only |
| --- |
| ◯ Strongly support |
| ◯ Support |
| ◯ Neither support nor oppose |
| ◯ Oppose |
| ◯ Strongly oppose |

What do you like about Option 5?

26. What do you dislike about Option 5?

Submit feedback before 5 pm, Thursday 30 October 2025

Surveys can be emailed to alex@alexandrina.sa.gov.au, posted to Att: CEO, Alexandrina Council, PO Box 21, Goolwa SA 5214 or dropped off at the Strathalbyn or Goolwa office during opening hours.