

Analysis of Public Submissions

Park Management Plan Draft Amendments

The Park Management Plan Draft Amendment document was released for public consultation on 22 March 2021 and closed on 24 June 2021. Draft amendments for Newland Head and Deep Creek Conservation Parks were released together. Twenty one submissions were received during this time. The submissions have been summarised in the tables below.

All submissions on the park management plan draft amendments are carefully reviewed against the following criteria:

Feedback meeting criteria 1-3 below, result in alterations:

1. Feedback provided additional information of direct relevance to the draft amendments;
2. Feedback suggested an alternative approach that was considered more appropriate than that proposed in the draft amendments;
3. Feedback highlighted omissions, inaccuracies or a lack of clarity.

Feedback meeting criteria 4-9 below **do not** result in alterations:

4. Feedback clearly supported the draft amendments;

5. Feedback was already addressed in the plan;
6. Feedback addressed issues beyond the scope of the draft amendments, or recommended the inclusion of detailed or prescriptive information that is not appropriate for a strategic plan of this type;
7. Feedback proposed an alternative approach but the recommendation of the draft amendment was still considered the most appropriate option;
8. Feedback was based on incorrect information;
9. Feedback offered an open statement, or no change was sought.

Newland Head Conservation Park and Deep Creek & Talisker Conservation Parks Management Plan Draft Amendment 2021

Twenty one submissions were received and are listed in Table 1. A summary of all feedback received and the response to this feedback is provided in Table 2.

Additional to this feedback has been the ongoing dialogue with stakeholders to deliver the Wild South Coast Way more generally, which in many cases included discussions regarding the campsites that were subject to this amendment process.

Table 1: Summary of submissions

Submission number	Name	Respondent
1	Alonge Samuel	Individual
2	Angeleen Ayod	Individual
3	Dean Richardson	Individual
4	Michael Cornish	Individual
5	Adeoluwa Akinyeke	Individual
6	Marilyn Henderson	Individual
7	James Nkhata	Individual
8	Dani Austin	Individual
9	Lillian Camphausen	Individual
10	Caitlin Breyer	Individual
11	Craig Williams	Individual
12	Nadine Welke	Individual
13	Helen Dyer	State Planning Commission
14	C Harvey	Individual
15	Liz Ole	Individual
16	Jim McLean	Walking SA
17	Darren Harvey	Individual
18	Ann Wheaton	Individual
19	Robyn Quinn	Individual
20	Winston Syson	Friends of Newland Head CP
21	Louisa Halliday	Green Adelaide

Table 2 – Summary of feedback

Comment number	Comment	Submission number	Amendment altered	Proposed response	Criteria
1	Expressed general support for the draft amendments	1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 10, 14, 20	No	No change necessary.	4
2	Expressed general support for the draft amendments, and made specific recommendations towards the design of the campsites	3, 8, 9, 11, 12, 15,16, 17, 18, 19	No	No change necessary, as the inclusion of specific design specifications for campsites is not considered appropriate for a strategic plan of this type.	4,6
3	Expressed general support, and provided commentary generally about the content of management plans and their relation to the state planning code.	13	No	No change necessary, as comments were generally supportive and provided only additional open commentary on the application of the planning code in management plans.	9
4	Raised concerns about the potential impact to native woodland bird species from campsite development and increased use of the Heysen trail.	21	No	The existing management plans require operational programs targeting important species. Consultation with the region has confirmed these programs are in place and creating outcomes. Specific changes targeting the mentioned species is not considered appropriate for a strategic plan of this type.	6