

GOOLWA STATE HERITAGE AREA HERITAGE STANDARD

YourSAy Engagement Report (July 2025)



BACKGROUND

South Australia's current planning and development system became fully operational in March 2021 with all operations under the *Development Act 1993* being replaced by the *Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016*. The Planning and Design Code (the Code), which has replaced Development Plans across the state, is a single 'rule' book of planning policy for assessing development applications.

The 2021 planning reforms have strengthened the protections for State Heritage Areas (SHAs) by:

- Introducing a SHA Overlay that protects and manages the heritage values of SHAs by ensuring development within SHAs is managed in a way that maintains the heritage values. The SHA Overlay policies take precedence over any applicable Zone and general policies in the Code, and demolition control is maintained.
- The SHA overlay also:
 - formalises the role of Statements of Significance for SHAs and 'other relevant documents' (e.g. Heritage Standards) in the development assessment process.
 - provides the triggers for developments that must be referred to the Minister responsible for the administration of the *Heritage Places Act 1993* (the Minister).
- Empowering the Minister to direct decisions on referred development applications, i.e. the Minister may direct the planning authority to refuse the development application or impose conditions in the event the planning authority approves it (previously the Minister was only empowered to provide advice for the planning authority's regard).

INTRODUCTION

Goolwa was considered an important centre for trade between South Australia and the eastern states and was one of Australia's principal river ports between 1850 and 1880. The current townscape of Goolwa is an outstanding representation of this era and was declared a SHA in 1987.

The existing Guidelines for Development for the Goolwa SHA were reviewed and updated by the Department for Environment and Water (DEW) to ensure they:

- were fit for purpose;
- consistent with terminology in the Code; and
- reflect the Goolwa SHA's Statement of Heritage Significance.

The key changes in the Goolwa Heritage Standard included:

- updating the structure and terminology of the Heritage Standard, to mirror the structure of the SHA Overlay of the Code;
- strengthening language within the Heritage Standard to reflect its statutory status under the Code;
- clarifying the purpose of the Heritage Standard, as an assessment tool for DEW's heritage architects/officers, as delegates of the Minister;
- including a detailed description of the heritage features of the Goolwa SHA, as a context for providing advice;
- describing the 'heritage values' of the Goolwa SHA, to highlight what is of heritage significance; and
- revising guidance policy relating to materials, fencing and services (such as solar panels) to reflect current practices.

SUMMARY OF ENGAGEMENT

The draft Heritage Standard for the Goolwa SHA was released for public consultation on the YourSAy website from 14 October 2024 to 22 November 2024.

Key stakeholders were also engaged directly prior to the consultation period.

ENGAGEMENT METHODS

Meetings were held with the Alexandrina Council and emails were sent to the Alexandrina Council, the South Australian Heritage Council (SAHC), key community groups and government authorities summarising proposed changes, and inviting people to comment via a YourSAy engagement survey or written submissions directly to DEW.

The public consultation was also promoted via the Alexandrina Council, Plan SA and DEW websites, newsletters and social media.

To support property owners, residents and the general public in understanding the draft Goolwa Heritage Standard and to support them making a submission, if they desired, DEW offered the opportunity for them to talk face-to-face with DEW officers about the draft Heritage Standard.

ENGAGEMENT OUTCOMES

FORM OF FEEDBACK	NO. OF RESPONSES
YourSAy on-line survey	3 respondents
Responses to Question 12 in the YourSAy on-line survey: <i>What is the most important aspect of Goolwa's heritage for you?</i>	3 responses
Responses to Question 13 in the YourSAy on-line survey: <i>Do you have any other comments on the Heritage Standard for the Goolwa State Heritage Area?</i>	3 responses
Emailed submissions (sent directly to Heritage South Australia, DEW)	3 submissions, including from the following organisations: <ul style="list-style-type: none">Alexandrina CouncilNational Trust, Goolwa BranchIndependent Heritage Consultants
Face-to-face sessions	1 face-to-face session, attended by 1 person.

WHAT WE HEARD AND HOW WE RESPONDED

GENERAL COMMENTS

Respondents made several general comments not directly related to the Heritage Standard, but rather addressing the Goolwa SHA more broadly. These general comments have been summarised by theme and are presented below.

What We Heard

- The Heritage Standard is considered comprehensive, well written and is valued by the community.
- The significance of 17 Admiral Terrace, built in 1854 by William Younghusband, should be recognised.
- The Heritage Standard should reference the management of archaeological resources as they are relevant to SHAs.

How We Responded

- DEW acknowledges and appreciates the positive feedback received about the Heritage Standard.
- The Heritage Standard has been updated to include 17 Admiral Terrace in the history and significance section, recognising its role as an early landmark of the town.
- DEW is in the process of developing a reference to archaeological resources to add to the [Goolwa SHA webpage](#) to support better management of these values across SHAs.

YOURSAY QUESTION 12: *What is the most important aspect of Goolwa's heritage for you?*

What We Heard

- Some respondents believe Goolwa's tourism would benefit from increased development and change.
- Others expressed strong appreciation for the unique heritage values of the Goolwa SHA, particularly as one of the few places globally where a steam train meets a steamboat.

How We Responded

- The feedback regarding potential for tourism related development is noted; however, these suggestions sit outside the scope of the Heritage Standard.
- DEW has ensured the Statement of Significance in the Heritage Standard reflects the unique historic qualities of Goolwa and supports appropriate future development within the SHA that respects those values.
- The comments regarding the lack of change in Goolwa are noted, however they are not directly related to the Heritage Standard.
- The Heritage Standard will provide guidance for appropriate future development within the SHA. The Statement of Significance summarises heritage values in relation to the appreciation of the historic uniqueness of Goolwa.

YOURSAY QUESTION 13: *Do you have any other comments on the Heritage Standard for the Goolwa State Heritage Area?*

What We Heard

- A respondent noted that the new wharf currently lacks shops and that more commercial activity could help attract tourists and encourage longer visits.
- Another respondent suggested that the Heritage Standard should be included in the Form 1 (vendor's statement) provided to buyers of properties within the SHA.
- There was also a suggestion that the Heritage Standard should form part of the prescribed searches conducted by local councils.

How We Responded

- The community's interest in increased activation of the wharf area is noted and consideration of adaptive reuse of heritage places to support this is encouraged. Broader development and tourism strategies, however, fall outside the scope of the Heritage Standard.

- Properties within the SHA are currently identified in the Form 1 under the *Land and Business (Sale and Conveyancing) Act 1994*. Including the Heritage Standard in this documentation would require legislative change. However, the suggestion is noted for further consideration.
- The suggestion to include the Heritage Standard in local government search processes is also noted. As this would involve coordination with local authorities, DEW will scope interest with these authorities in future regular meetings.

SPECIFIC COMMENTS

The following comments are specific and technical in nature:

1. Background

No comments were made on the background section of the Heritage Standard.

2. Heritage Value

Section 2.1 –Statement of Significance (Goolwa State Heritage Area)

No comments were provided.

Section 2.2 – What is of heritage significance?

What We Heard

- *'On page 18 it could be worth noting that the Goolwa Hotel is registered under the Historic Shipwrecks Act because of the Mozambique items listed there.'*

How We Responded

A footnote has been added to page 18 of the Heritage Standard about the Goolwa Hotel being registered under the *Historic Shipwrecks Act 1981*.

3. Heritage Standards for Development

Section 3.1 – Purpose of Heritage Standards for Development

What We Heard

- *'The text relating to referrals may be rather confusing for the general public as it refers to two separate entities, the Relevant Authority/Council, and the SHA Overlay. Further explanation could avoid confusion and misunderstanding.'*
- *'Ideally these vistas should be mapped, either by way of photographs or an annotated aerial photograph. This can be a difficult concept for the non-professional to understand.'*

How We Responded

The comments regarding the clarity of planning commentary have been noted and the feedback is appreciated, however the text included in section 3.1 of the Heritage Standard that discusses referrals is consistent in all Heritage Standards and was developed in collaboration with planners.

DEW are in the process of developing a simplified version of the explanation of the referral process for the DEW website to assist with understanding. Similarly, property owners will likely have some understanding of the planning system that will help them with this content, as they are most likely considering development options if they need to read the Heritage Standard.

The description in section 2.2 and 3.1 of the Heritage Standard has been updated to provide greater clarity regarding the vista.

Section 3.2 – Land use

No comments were provided.

Section 3.3 – New buildings

- *'Is it worth mentioning that verandahs over the footpath are characteristic in the Cadell Street precinct?'*
- *'Suggest page break before "design additions."*
- *'Bottom right graphic is misplaced (p.32)'*

How We Responded

Text has been added to section 2.2 of the Heritage Standard (Architectural Features) to reference that verandahs over the footpath are characteristic in the Cadell Street Precinct and the Heritage Standard has been corrected to reflect the above suggestions.

The Heritage Standard has been updated to reflect the formatting suggestions.

Section 3.4 – Alterations and additions

What We Heard

- *Suggest page break before "design additions."*
- *Bottom right graphic is misplaced (p.32)*
- *"Materials, Finishes and Colours" – can this text be better linked to its content which follows on the next page?*
- *'It could be worth noting that there are two distinct types of bricks to be found in buildings in Goolwa, one is smaller than the other. I call them Middleton brick because I think they came from Baston's Brickworks. I had a cottage in Middleton many years ago and I found that the bricks used in it were smaller than the usual bricks. Some years later I was talking to the stonemason doing some repairs to the Holy evangelist Church in Goolwa and he commented that the brick he had were too big for the repairs. I still had a small supply of the bricks from my Middleton cottage so I gave them to him and they fitted the job he was doing.'*
- *'Roofing and rainwater goods (new): what does DEW consider to be "corrugated profile"? This may be easily misinterpreted – inclusion of a graphic?'*

How We Responded

The Heritage Standard has been updated to include the above corrections.

The comment around the two distinct types of brick found in the buildings in Goolwa is noted and the insight is appreciated. The reference to Port Elliot bricks in the Heritage Standard has been removed and it is now acknowledged in the Heritage Standard that brick may have been local or from Adelaide, or as ballast from Britain.

Corrugated is a common definition for 'custom orb' or 's-curve' roof sheeting. The comment is noted and 'Traditional corrugated' has been added to the description in the Heritage Standard for clarity.

Section 3.5 – Ancillary development

What We Heard

- *'Should the last word in the introductory paragraph be 'structures' rather than "services"?''*
- *'Cannot support temporary shipping containers. They are such an eyesore and ensuring their removal can become a compliance nightmare! Alternatively, these must be clad with suitable cladding that ensures compatibility with the local historic character.'*
- *'Goolwa Little Scotland – Solid fence (side or rear): corrugated profile metal sheeting – should this include reference to "galvanised" to avoid use of zincalume?'*
- *'Section starting "Boundary A shown below" – ideally this text should be on the same page as the image that it refers to.'*
- *'Question the compatibility of the zone provisions – is this correct?'*
- *'Note that there are some inconsistencies between these standards and zone provisions relating to advertisements e.g. Infrastructure (Ferry and Marina Facilities) and Township Main Street zones. However, the Overlay prevails, although this may result in some confusion for applicants. Perhaps a note somewhere explaining that Overlays take precedence over Zone and sub-zone policies.'*
- *'Rainwater tanks – include reference to "galvanised iron" to avoid zincalume?'*

How We Responded

The Heritage Standard is referring to other services, such as plant and equipment. No change has been made.

The comment regarding shipping containers is noted, however they are often requested during construction and are therefore included in the Heritage Standard.

Comment regarding zincalume has been noted and 'galvanised' has been added to the fencing note in the Heritage Standard. Galvanised steel has also been added to the description in the Heritage Standard.

Comments regarding zoning have been noted and text stating that, '*Overlay provisions take precedence of the Zone/Sub zone provisions*' has been added to the Heritage Standard.

Comments regarding formatting have been noted and the Heritage Standard has been updated.

Section 3.7 – Landscape context and streetscape amenity

What We Heard

- '*Refer to boundary re-alignments instead of re-adjustments. This maintains consistency with the wording that is used in the Code.*'

How We Responded

'Realignments' has been added to the text in the Heritage Standard.

Section 3.8 – Demolition

No comments were provided.

Section 3.9 – Conservation works

What We Heard

- '*Demolition a) – reference in first paragraph to "after 1930" – this is puzzling as all other references are to the importance of pre-1930.*'
- '*If the building is also 'uninhabitable' then this should be added to the paragraph which refers to the risk of private public safety. There is case law on this issue.*'

How We Responded

- The comment regarding the date has been noted and corrected in the Heritage Standard to refer to pre-1930.
- Comment noted regarding adding uninhabitable to the paragraph in the Heritage Standard, however wording is direct from the SHA Overlay and because of this remains the same.