



**Coastal Conservation Zone
13 May 2009**

The District Council of Tumby Bay's draft General Development Plan Amendment, which I understand is similar to other Eyre Peninsula councils, incorporates the State Government driven Eyre Peninsula Coastal Management Strategy that includes an extensive and very prescriptive Coastal Conservation Zone.

In 2005, Planning SA approached the Eyre Peninsula Local Government Association and its member councils to develop a Coastal Development Strategy. It was to be a pilot project and Councils participated in the belief that a consistent framework across the region, and beyond, would help guide future development and provide consistency around South Australian coastlines.

I am very concerned about the large tracts of coastal land being annexed by the government for supposedly 'environmental' purposes through this plan. 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, the proposed rigorous coastal planning controls included in the Development Plan Amendment 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.

As a result of the Tumby Bay proposed planning changes I have been contacted by several very concerned land holders, including the Oswald family, who have owned and farmed Section 428, a War Service Settlement block, for sixty years and maintained the land adjacent to the coast during this period. In 1996 they paid substantial fees to freehold their land. Bill Oswald wrote in his submission on behalf of his family.

"The economic cost must be counted when taking into account the proposed amendments. By discounting all development along the coastal zone it greatly devalues the existing land which includes farming land and existing subdivisions. Particularly for farm land along the coast by stopping development it greatly lowers the value of the land and if this were to occur banking institutions would not look favourably on the lack of equity.

"From an ecological viewpoint the coastal zone has been preserved by the existing landholders. An excellent example of this is recently Fisheries SA and SAPOL, in collaboration with local landholders, apprehended abalone poachers who were moving along the coast. This together with continuing measures to control introduced plants and animals along the coast, prove that landholders have a desire and an obligation to help each other to conserve the ecology along the coastal 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 de facto 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 now expected to accept the same scenario without protest.

I quote from Craig and Deb Williams submission.

“While I have sympathy for the policy of provision of a coastal zone, the current blanket application of this policy with no consideration for local situations is likely to have the opposite effect to that which the policy envisions.

I would like to see an outcome where the zone boundary is changed to be in line with our 2008 survey crown boundary 50 km inland from the high water mark. This will enable a continuous wildlife corridor without detriment to our regional economic future, and with minimal land degradation.

With the current zone boundary we will be unable to farm about 300 hectares of land of our 790 hectares, equivalent to 38% of our farm. Last year we received no remunerations or compensation for giving up 20 m of coastal land.

Our sections have been farmed for so many decades - native wildlife cannot live in the ploughed paddocks. We have no wetlands, dunes or coral reefs that need protection. Therefore there will be no loss of coastal habitat or biodiversity.

We have spent a lot of time and significant funds planting native tress, removing boxthorns and controlling rabbits and introduced pest species on the land in question. It is inevitable that feral plant and animal pest will take over when the land is unmanaged on such a large area, to the detriment of native species. I believe the proposition that volunteers will be found to manage the land to be optimistic, and naïve. I don't understand where you will find the volunteers or funds as we have to support all grants with 50% of our own funds.”

Time Expired

“The implementation of these top down Government policies have put our family under considerable financial duress. We have already paid \$20,000 last year for the joy of changing our boundaries officially with surveyors and the Department of Environment for our perpetual lease into free hold land.”

“Who will take on the financial responsibility to managed South Australia's 25,330 hectares of 5067 km of coastline if farmers are no longer involved?”

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, and so should every freehold landowner in this state, be very concerned that 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. The extent of the Coastal Conservation Zone should be urgently reviewed.