



***Liz Penfold*** MP

MEMBER FOR FLINDERS

Suite 16, 60 Tasman Terrace

PO Box 1798

PORT LINCOLN 5606

[flinders.portlincoln@parliament.sa.gov.au](mailto:flinders.portlincoln@parliament.sa.gov.au)

[www.lizpenfold.com](http://www.lizpenfold.com)

Phone:(08) 8683 0722

Fax: (08) 8682 5912

Ref: COT1G1:JL09

Date: 28<sup>th</sup> April 2009

Mr. Ned Roberts  
District Council of Tumby Bay  
PO Box 61  
TUMBY BAY SA 5605

Dear Ned

**District Council of Tumby Bay - Draft General Development Plan Amendment**

I am very concerned about the large tracts of coastal land being annexed by the government for 'environmental' purposes.

Under the State Government's Perpetual Lease Accelerated Freehold (PLAF) program the traditional 20 metre set back from the high tide mark or cliff top was increased to 50 then to 100 metres and beyond. Now rigorous coastal planning controls included in the Development Plan Amendment, as part of the State Government driven Coastal Management Strategy, will result in an even larger area of Eyre Peninsula coastal land being effectively annexed. For example, I am aware of land between 2.5 to 8 kilometres inland from the coast included in the Land Not Within A Council Area (Eyre) Coastal Conservation Zone.

The PLAF exercise allowed the Government to claim significant tracts of coastal land from leasehold property owners with no compensation in the name of conservation and sustainability. During the process I was contacted by many land owners angry and dismayed by the amount of coastal land the Government was acquisitioning and the lack of genuine consultation. Besides receiving no compensation for the land taken owners were required to pay substantial surveying and fencing costs. I believe lessees were placed in a no win situation because future freeholding costs were going to be substantially higher and their property could not be sold or transferred until it was freeholded. Hence the Government had them over a barrel.

The Tumby Bay District Council's Development Plan Amendment, which I understand is similar to other Eyre Peninsula councils, reveals that significant tracts of freehold coastal land are proposed to be included in the Coastal Conservation Zone. The prescriptive planning controls within the Coastal Conservation Zone may negate any possible alternate use of the coastal land. They will certainly limit future retirement funding or farming options and will result in this freehold land becoming a defacto conservation zone with the expectation that pest plant and animals control will be managed and paid for by private individuals with no recompense. It is so inequitable many of the coastal property owners were also caught in the costly freeholding program and are expected to accept the same scenario without protest.

Councils supportive of controlled and planned development could not have possibly foreseen the extensive area of coastal land that will be shut off from any form of development. The wording of the nine strategies in the draft Coastal Management Strategy took a broad view with a plethora of 'motherhood' statements. I suggested at the time in my submission that documents worded in this way are subject to differing interpretations and can result in quite draconian regulations being introduced, if not immediately, at some time in the future.

I was also extremely concerned that the Strategy appeared to be delivering a strong message of increased regulation and control which overruled any provision for economic development and growth.

I am still extremely concerned. The Principles of Development Control of the Coastal Conservation Zone state that the only form of development envisaged in the zone are conservation works, interpretive signage and facilities and nature based/eco tourist accommodation. Therefore any future subdivision, change of land use and future development access to the coast is going to be very difficult. Eyre Peninsula has not reached its full potential and such restrictive planning regulations do not encourage or foster growth and development which is essential to ensure coastal communities retain their essential services. I am sure Councils do not want to shut the door on future port infrastructure, land based aquaculture enterprises, boat ramps, desalination plants, alternative crops such as olives and oil mallee or any other future employment opportunities.

The harsh planning controls are supposedly for the benefit of many, however no compensation or consideration has been given to individuals or the farming families who, while they live in a beautiful area are struggling with drought, long distances, fewer services and choices. The majority of them have owned the land for generations and have been good custodians. Ironically those who have been the best custodians are being penalised the greatest as their land is now the most desirable. They are feeling disenfranchised. Why should they pay for the people residing in the rest of the State to feel good?

When the draft Coastal Development Strategy was released for public comment I questioned the premise that 'remote' areas are more fragile and therefore need more protection and made more inaccessible. I still question why 'remote' areas are more fragile than other areas and can not be sustainably developed. I believe this is just a way of ensuring that this region in particular stays undeveloped.

Visitors who want to visit this region do not contribute towards the cost of keeping “a wild and pristine coastline” and they also expect a certain amount of development to allow them to visit. Why should ‘remote’ communities be further disadvantaged? These communities are custodians of their region – they love where they live and they don’t want another “Glenelg” but closing all avenues for coastal development is neither fair nor responsible.

Who is going to manage these vast tracks of land? Fire will be and is already an increasing risk and feral plants and animals will thrive. Previously property owners were responsible and they would also have kept an eye on irresponsible behaviour however this will no longer happen. Already damage by feral animals, plants and visitors in our national and conservation parks and water reserves is noticeably increasing.

I am concerned that small coastal townships, such as Tumby Bay and Port Neill and the other small settlements in the area, will not be able to take advantage of any mining spin offs as it appears that regional development and growth is going to be stifled. We do not want ‘fly in fly out’ workers travelling between major cities and regional mines as this provides little local economic benefit to the region’s small businesses. It is preferable families are accommodated as close by as possible. Towns need to be able to sustain vital infrastructure and social fabric that is integral to their community’s survival. The retention of essential services such as schools, acute care hospitals, banks, etc is vital to their continuing prosperity and growth. Limiting and restricting development will have a negative effect and will result in higher property and development costs, less volunteers and funding to look after the environment, which is a counter productive result for everyone.

This ‘land grab’ as part of the Coastal Development Strategy, a pilot project to be rolled out across the State, is at the expense of individual land owners and small rural communities. I am concerned the extent of the Coastal Conservation Zone and accompanying restrictions will be detrimental to regional people and the long term prosperity of all South Australians, not just Eyre Peninsula. I ask that a limit of a “100 metre only” Coastal Conservation Zone be introduced to guarantee the zone does not claw back into farmer’s paddocks. In fact, it may be necessary for titles to extend to the high water mark, in the case of major infrastructure projects supported by the State and/or Federal Government.

I therefore urge Council and Planning SA to reconsider the extent of the boundaries of the Coastal Conservation Zone and ensure future coastal development with appropriate controls is permissible wherever it is most appropriate.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Liz Penfold". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

**Mrs. Liz Penfold MP**  
*Member for Flinders*