

## Feedback

Matt Slater <[REDACTED]>

Mon 14/12/2020 1:39 PM

To: DIT:Planning Reform Submissions <DIT.PlanningReformSubmissions@sa.gov.au>; Daniel McKenna <[REDACTED]>

Hi

I own some acreage next door to the Adelaide Bird Sanctuary at Dublin.

The land is zoned coastal conservation.

The current zoning allows for some tourism activities on the block but no tourism accommodation which I believe is ridiculous, a half way house that discourages investment in tourism infrastructure.

It is common sense that tourism accommodation will enable tourists to stay longer in the area and for there to be more tourism visitations of tourism facilities which will encourage further development of those facilities which will encourage more tourists to visit, and so on as you virtuous expanding cycle.

The new zoning from my planners comments, I have engaged masterplanners to submit a development proposal for the caravan park, envisages that tourism of all types should be encouraged in coastal conservation zone subject only to protection of any unique ecological values of the land.

This is an extremely welcome change in stance from the old system where any development of tourism accommodation is non complying and as a result there is inadequate trade-off between ecological preservation and development which brings jobs and improves amenities of the area.

My local council, Adelaide Plains, has dismissed my caravan park proposal and have said they would refuse to consider it without even checking what ecological value my land holds and what land management could be instituted to allow the development to go ahead.

The majority of the population live near a beach and we like to play there.

The current zoning encourages Councils like the one above to take the attitude that coastal conservation land is locked up and the key thrown away for any type of commercial development unless there will be no ecological damage whatsoever.

This is ridiculously high bar and flies in the face of common sense.

The land I own is virtually useless for agricultural production because of the low rainfall and degraded but the local Council has no answer for the question of what I am to do with the land then. Just let the land be invaded by noxious weeds and plants because I cannot justify spending the money on something which will not give me a decent return.

But the Council then calls in a tourism consultant because they don't understand why there has not been any tourism development happening after the arrival of the Adelaide Bird Sanctuary. I know because I have spoken to that tourism consultant.

I am sure the council planners would prefer any such development to be tucked away on some dirt road which will immediately make it a subsistent type operation without the turnover to develop the necessary facilities just as long as the local NIMBYS dont get upset on having to drive past it. Yes the NIMBYS believe they have a right to come into an area and build what they want but oh no after that they object to any further changes in the area.

I am sure the council planners have in mind some glamping operation which will be unprofitable or marginal because it doesn't have the necessary economies of scale.

I do still have issues with the new planning system though and what is allowed in the coastal conservation zone.

Why does it support camp grounds and not restrict caravan and tourist parks. Once again we are half pregnant. Why does it support one and not the other? These appear to be value judgment, let the market decide the mix. In my opinion the new rules should state that the development of all tourism facilities including accommodation is supported. Why try and restrict the investment in tourism accommodation? what sort of signal does that send to would be developers, oh yes come and invest along the coast but not too much and we just want to keep it low key barely profitable type operations which will probably become eyesores with the lack of funds to properly maintain them.

The new rules should also acknowledge that there has to be a trade off between development and ecological protection, both can't be unfettered goals in themselves. What is the point of trying to keep something in its pristine state if the population cannot access it to enjoy it, it is often taxpayers funds that have been expended and access for taxpayers should to the greatest degree possible be enabled?

My mind keeps going back to the Gold Coast and the high rise towers there and what would have happened if the Adelaide Plains planners had been in charge.

In the same vein because the new rules are overly prescriptive of what type of tourism accommodation it envisages that there are silly anomalies such as it is not clear that caretaker residents are even allowed.

This makes the new rules look unprofessional and half baked and half hearted and such logical inconsistencies will have developers looking elsewhere to Kangaroo Island and in other states

Regards

Matt Slater  
[REDACTED]

