

Analysis of Public Submissions

Adelaide International Bird Sanctuary National Park - Winaityinaityi Pangkara Draft Management Plan

The Adelaide International Bird Sanctuary National Park - Winaityinaityi Pangkara Draft Management Plan was released for public consultation from 16 January 2018 to 16 April 2018. There were 37 submissions on the draft management plan. These are summarised in Table 1. A summary of all feedback received and any changes arising is provided in Table 2.

All submissions on draft park management plans 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 management;
2. Feedback suggested an alternative approach that was considered more appropriate than that proposed in the draft plan;
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 plan;
5. Feedback was already addressed in the plan;
6. Feedback addressed issues beyond the scope of the plan, 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 plan 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.

Table 1 – Summary of submissions

Number	Name
1	John Gitsham, President Birds SA
2	James Miller, Chief Executive Officer Adelaide Plains Council
3	Alan Watchman
4	Chris Daniels, Presiding member AMLR Natural Resources Management Board
5	Alvin and Sylvia Jenkin
6	City of Port Adelaide Enfield Council
7	Friends of the Adelaide International Bird Sanctuary
8	Duncan Mackenzie, President of Friends of Parks Inc, Chairman, BirdLife Australia Gluepot Reserve
9	David Donaldson
10	David Robertson
11	Deirdre Wood
12	Anna Woods
13	Mineral Resources Group, Department of Premier and Cabinet
14	Friends of Gulf St Vincent Inc.
15	Glen Linke, President South Australian Blokart Club
16	Jean Turner
17	Joan Gibbs, Lecturer in Ecology, School of Natural and Built Environments, University of South Australia
18	Joseph Dafoe
19	Dr John Hatch
20	Krantidev Ghosh
21	Kate Buckley
22	Lynda Tout-Smith
23	Mary-Ann van Trigt
24	Matthias Tomczak
25	Maureen Christie, Secretary Friends of Shorebirds SE
26	Julia Peacock, Nature Conservation Society of SA
27	North Coast and Plains Advisory Committee

Number	Name
28	Olga Gostin
29	Victorian Wader Study Group
30	Robert Wilson
31	Peter Cornish
32	Sue Coad
33	Michelle Gardner
34	Brooke Liebelt, Manager Yorke Peninsula Tourism
35	Birdlife Australia
36	Craig Wilkins, Chief Executive Conservation Council of SA
37	Sean Sloan, Primary Industries and resources SA
38	Confidential

Table 2 – Summary of feedback

Comment No.	Comment	Sub No	Plan altered	Response	Criteria
General					
1	Supported the plan's collaborative approach, the vision, management themes and objectives.	1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 9, 12, 14, 16, 17, 18, 19, 22, 23, 25, 26, 27, 29, 32, 34, 35, 36, 37	No	Feedback supports the plan.	4
2	Recommended stronger commitment from Government including a new Act of Parliament to allocate funding and ensure protection of the area. Recommended the plan include more information about resourcing for the park and a commitment on funding for park rangers.	7, 8, 17, 18, 23, 35	No	No change. Outside the scope of this plan. These matters are addressed through business planning, rather than through a strategic plan of this type.	6
3	Recommended releasing the Collective Plan for public consultation. Requested clarity on how the collective impact approach will be integrated in to the community, the park management and the broader sanctuary area.	8, 16, 17, 21	No	No Change. Outside the scope of this plan. However a separate document has been prepared to address this. The role of the collective will be determined by the community. While this approach is supported by Government is not appropriate for the plan to determine what role the collective may take.	6
4	Recommended that the plan should provide direction on key issues rather than defaulting to subordinate planning processes.	1, 17	Yes	The plan has been revised to give a clearer articulation of outcomes. However it is not practical to address all issues in detail in a strategic plan of this type. Several subordinate plans will be required.	6
5	Provided comments or suggestions about the park's name.	3, 16	No	No change. Outside the scope of this plan.	7
6	Expressed the view that the messages within the plan were not clearly communicated. Recommended that clearer connections between each theme are required to express a cohesive explanation of management.	17, 21	Yes	The plan has been revised to establish better linkages between each theme. Changes have been made throughout the plan to ensure that it communicates messages in a clear and concise way.	3

Comment No.	Comment	Sub No	Plan altered	Response	Criteria
7	Recommended that a trust be established to manage donations.	8	No	No change. Outside the scope of this plan.	6
8	Requested the inclusion of species names and photo credit for the photographs within the plan.	20	Yes	This has been included in the plan.	2
9	Recommended consideration of a project to develop charcoal from mangroves.	30	No	Outside the scope of this plan.	6
10	Requested the Sheoak trees around Buckland Lake are protected and further rehabilitation of these are undertaken.	30	No	Noted. However this level of detail is not appropriate in a strategic plan of this type.	6
11	Requested stronger penalties for compliance breaches	26	No	Outside the scope of this plan.	6
Directions for management					
12	Sought clarity regarding the geographical scope of the plan. Recommended that geographical descriptions of the park, the sanctuary and/or flyway, and various sites and zones be clarified. References to the Gawler River, Buckland Lake and Local Government boundaries were also sought.	1, 2, 7, 8, 18, 22, 25, 27, 30	Yes	The maps and geographical descriptions of sites and the overall scope of the final plan have been revised for clarity. A new section has been included to introduce the flyway concept and its relationship with the sanctuary, the park and other areas of high ecological value.	3
13	Recommended that the salt fields, strategies for their management, and ongoing cooperation with the managers of this site, are included in the plan.	6, 8, 18, 19, 23, 26, 30	No	No change. This matter is outside the scope of this plan because this site is not within the park. However the site has been marked on Figure 1 and its' strategic importance has been recognised.	6
14	Recommended aligning the park management plan with the Migratory Shorebird Conservation Action Plan. Recommended that the international, commonwealth and state layers of protection for shorebirds is more clearly explained. Highlighted that this has resulted in confusion and inconsistencies in the presentation of data.	8, 25, 26, 30, 35, 36	Yes	These mechanisms have been explained in Theme 1. Data relating to bird records has been revised accordingly.	1

Comment No.	Comment	Sub No	Plan altered	Response	Criteria
15	Expressed objection to the prospect of mining in the park and suggested that strategies to mitigate disturbance to shorebirds associated with this activity should be included in the plan.	1,7, 12, 26, 37	No	Proclamation occurred prior to the development of this plan and is outside the scope of this planning process. There are no current resource development proposals. Therefore this matter is not considered in detail. Should any proposals progress in the future, detailed assessments would be undertaken as part of the process.	8
16	Requested clarity of the difference between park, sanctuary and flyway. Recommended that the sanctuary concept, and its implications for property owners is clarified.	25, 27, 30	Yes	The plan has been revised extensively to create a clear distinction between the national park and flyway site. For clarity the flyway site is highlighted as an area that supports multi tenure conservation. The role of the flyway and the flyway site has been defined in a new section of the plan.	3
17	Recommended the plan align with the Metropolitan Adelaide and Northern Conservation Action Plan, and that a Community Action Plan is developed to guide on ground actions.	8, 35	No	No change. However this suggestion is noted and will be considered during the detailed action planning that will follow the adoption of this plan.	6
18	Suggested that the plan should outline a framework for community engagement in park management.	8, 16	Yes	The plan has been revised to highlight the opportunities for community involvement in park management.	2
19	Recommended sanctuary boundary is extended to include a broader landscape focus for shorebird protection and include key areas and partners extending up in to the gulf and on the northern side. Requested explanation of ecosystem dynamics beyond park boundary.	8, 25	No	Further addition of land to the park is outside the scope of this plan. The plan has been revised to outline the complementary role of key habitats in the gulf.	6
20	Requested that State Government continues to advocate for national and international conservation efforts as part of the East Asian-Australasian Flyway.	6	No	Feedback supports the plan.	4
21	Expressed support for research into carbon offset and sequestration potential.	6	No	Noted. Outside the scope of this plan.	6

Comment No.	Comment	Sub No	Plan altered	Response	Criteria
22	Requested stronger recognition of the need for consistent land and seascape management.	8	Yes	The plan has been revised to address this comment.	2
23	Requested that new NRM Boards, once established, should undertake shorebird conservation as a priority.	23	No	No change. Outside the scope of this plan. However, shorebird conservation is already identified as a priority in existing plans that will continue to help set priorities for NRM programs.	6
Park significance and purpose					
24	Requested the inclusion of significant wetlands including Clinton Wetland of National Importance.	26, 27, 34, 35	Yes	This has been included in this section	3
25	Recommended that types of recreation and tourism be listed.	25, 30	No	This level of detail is not appropriate in a strategic management plan of this type.	6
26	Recommended that the EPBC threatened ecological community Subtropical and Temporal Saltmarsh, and other species of significance are included in the 'Park significance and purpose' section	26, 37	Yes	This has been included in this section.	3
Challenges and opportunities					
27	Recommended adding the challenge of changing public perceptions to salt marsh as a key land management issue.	2, 8, 16, 18	No	This issue is acknowledged and addressed indirectly through strategies to promote minimal impact on salt march communities.	6
28	Recommended that the role of park in climate change adaptation and sequestration potential be maximised through land use change and opportunities such as infrastructure impacting the shoreline.	6, 16, 26, 37	Yes	The section called 'Challenges and Opportunities' and Theme 1 have been expanded to include this recommendation.	2
29	Outlined the challenge of balancing use, enjoyment, tourism and conservation across the park.	19, 26, 37	No	This was already covered by the plan.	5

Comment No.	Comment	Sub No	Plan altered	Response	Criteria
30	Recommended reordering challenges to elevate the importance of shorebird protection.	25, 27, 30	No	The challenges and opportunities are not in order of priority. In recognition of the traditional owners, the Challenges and opportunities associated with Kurna people are listed first.	7
31	Recommended that sharing beaches be included in the challenges.	25, 30	Yes	This has been added in the 'challenges and opportunities' section.	2
32	Suggested the inclusion of managing pest plants and animals in the 'challenges and opportunities' section.	26	Yes	This issue has been described in further detail in Theme 1.	3
Theme 1: Conserving migratory shorebirds and their habitat					
33	Recommended a stronger emphasis on conservation imperatives, greater protection measures and greater clarity about strategies for shorebird conservation and compliance including restrictions on beach access, tourism development, 4WD use and dogs.	1, 7, 10, 12, 16, 17, 19, 21, 23, 24, 25, 26, 29, 30, 31, 35, 36, 37	Yes	The plan has been revised for greater clarity. The draft plan takes a pragmatic approach to land management and has been informed by extensive community engagement. The final plan adequately addresses shorebird protection while enabling recreational activities on beaches to continue.	3
34	Recommended that the plan includes specific detail about goals and methodologies for monitoring of shorebirds, their habitats and human impacts. Recommended that this is integrated with shorebird monitoring at adjacent sites and throughout the flyway. Recommended ongoing support for monitoring and on-ground works including rehabilitation and conservation projects including the Samphire Coast Icon Project. Submissions also sought clarification about how monitoring would link to areas outside the park. Submissions also recommended inclusion of Friends of Shorebirds South East and Victorian Wader Study Group in the plan as long term collaborators and important contributors to data. Recommended referencing the long term data sets compiled by these groups.	1, 7, 8, 10, 12, 16, 18, 23, 25, 26, 29, 30, 35, 36, 37	Yes	The plan has been revised to better articulate strategies for monitoring of shorebirds and human impacts including the relationship between park specific monitoring and the 'Shorebirds 2020' project. However, it is not necessary for a strategic plan of this type to identify specific quantified targets. This will be included in a more detailed research and monitoring program.	3

Comment No.	Comment	Sub No	Plan altered	Response	Criteria
35	Expressed support for specific additions to the park.	1, 8, 14, 19, 25, 27, 29, 36, 37	No	No change required. Beyond the scope of this plan. The information prepared has been passed onto relevant DEW staff and will be considered should the opportunity arise to add further land to the park.	6
36	Recommended that the plan focuses on migratory shorebird species and each of their required habitat types as well as all other biodiversity values applicable to the park.	1, 8, 16, 35, 36	Yes	The plan has been revised to acknowledge the presence and management needs of endemic species and other habitat types. However its primary focus will continue to be on migratory shorebirds.	1
37	Requested that references are incorporated to support scientific content.	16, 35, 36	Yes	As necessary, additional references have been included.	1
38	Supported education for local and international students as a resource to help conserve shorebirds	21, 25, 26	No	Education is already a focus for the plan, however it is not necessary to be this detailed in a strategic plan of this type.	6
39	Recommended the establishment of effective boundary fencing.	23, 33	Yes	The plan has been revised to give direction on priorities for fencing and revegetation.	2
40	Recommended development of investment plan and work plans with key stakeholders to ensure long-term stewardship of the park. Recommended developing specific coastal management actions alongside the four local councils.	2, 8	No	Noted. Further detail has been added regarding cooperation with local Government. This suggestion is noted and will be considered during the detailed action planning that will follow the adoption of this plan.	6
41	Suggested that awareness-raising strategies are focused on local residents as well as visitors.	25, 30	Yes	The final plan has been revised so that raising awareness among local residents will also be a focus.	2
42	Recommended the development of a fire management plan.	8	Yes	The plan has been revised to include direction on fire management.	3
43	Recommend the development of a policy that mitigates the use of plastic at events and promotions in the park.	14	No	Noted. However this level of detail is not appropriate in a strategic plan of this type.	6
44	Recognised the potential future impacts of housing developments on the park and conserving shorebirds.	14	No	The plan has been expanded to highlight the importance of adjoining land and minimising impacts associated with adjacent developments.	6

Comment No.	Comment	Sub No	Plan altered	Response	Criteria
45	Requested that other important species such as the White-bellied Sea-eagle are covered by temporary closures when required (i.e. nesting).	16	Yes	The plan has been revised to highlight that additional protection measures may be introduced as required for the protection of specific values.	2
46	Recommended that over-abundant kangaroos be monitored and managed separately to other pests and feral animals.	16	Yes	A specific reference to the management of over-abundant kangaroos has been included in the plan.	2
47	Recommended conducting research in to alternative sites for shorebirds, in particular Bolivar Treatment Works.	1	No	No change. These ponds are not within the park. Therefore, research of this type is outside the scope of a park management plan.	6
48	Suggestion that the PIRSA Fisheries and Aquaculture Fish Care Volunteer Program could be involved in any future education and awareness raising programs.	37	No	Noted.	9
49	Noted the encroachment of mangroves in the Port Gawler Beach area impacting shorebird habitat.	30	No	Noted.	9
50	Provided editorial comments about bird classifications.	25	Yes	Appendix 1 has been corrected.	1
51	Requested a reference to Bead Samphire and the recovery plan for this species.	26	Yes	This has been included in an additional strategy within Theme 1 relating to the recovery of rare or threatened plants and ecological communities.	3
52	Requested the inclusion of work undertaken by Birds SA and Bird Life Australia.	17	Yes	References to the work of Birds SA and Bird Life Australia been included as appropriate.	3
Theme 2: Advancing Kaurna relationships with Country					
53	Expressed support for the opportunities for Kaurna people, including employment as park rangers, involvement in land management activities, undertaking monitoring and tourism ventures, and protecting cultural heritage.	1, 2, 6, 7, 14, 16, 17, 18, 23, 25, 36, 37	No	No change. Feedback supports the plan.	4

Comment No.	Comment	Sub No	Plan altered	Response	Criteria
54	Recommended more detail was needed on how to encourage visitors and users to respect Kaurna Culture and significant sites.	1, 17	No	It is not appropriate to include strategies for cultural site protection in a strategic management plan of this type. This will be considered during the development of detailed operational plans.	6
55	Recommended that Kaurna significant sites that are prohibited or restricted should be outlined clearly in the plan.	1	Yes	Further detail about site protection has been included in Theme 2.	3
56	Recommended that the area between Middle Beach and Port Gawler become a Kaurna cultural site.	8	No	Noted. However further discussions with Kaurna are needed before a commitment is made for this purpose.	7
57	Supported the development of a Kaurna Traditional Use Zone.	37	No	Noted. Already included in the plan.	4
58	Suggested that cultural significance was too detailed in the plan.	21	No	This level of detail is important to convey the cultural significance of the area and the custodial role of the traditional owners – the Kaurna people.	9
59	Requested that the plan commit to the development of a Kaurna Place of belonging, Kaurna Cultural Centre or Kaurna Interpretative Centre.	28	No	The details about this concept are yet to be resolved. However a strategy has been included to scope this opportunity in conjunction with Kaurna.	7
Theme 3: Maintaining access and creating opportunities for nature-based tourism					
60	Expressed support for tourism development and other economic development opportunities. Recommended capitalising on the cruise ship and the United Kingdom bird watching market.	2, 6, 14, 15, 18, 23, 25, 34, 35, 37	Yes	The plan has been revised to express the broader economic and employment opportunities.	3
61	Recommended that tourism should be environmentally sustainable as well as environmentally sensitive. Requested that the term 'Eco-tourism' is included in the plan.	16, 17, 26	Yes	This has been addressed in the plan.	2
62	Raised concerns about tourism development and recommended the development of certification for tourism operators.	14, 26	No	DEW already supports this approach throughout the State. However the management of tourism developments has been further expanded in the plan.	5

Comment No.	Comment	Sub No	Plan altered	Response	Criteria
63	Suggested that the opportunities for tourism is overstated.	8, 18	Yes	Plan has been revised to express a realistic approach to tourism development based on demand.	2
64	Requested to develop a series of maps for visitors.	8	No	While not specifically mentioned in the plan, some maps have already been developed. Others will be developed to support the application of detailed sign and interpretive plans.	6
65	Recommended the use of innovative technology to expand the visitor experience.	24	Yes	This approach has been included in a relevant strategy in the plan.	2
66	Requested a reference to Nature-Based Tourism Plan.	34	No	The plan adopts the principles outlined in this strategy. It is not necessary to reference the strategy.	7
67	Requested the inclusion of Yorke Peninsula region in the plan for future partnership opportunities.	34	No	Noted. However this level of detail is not required in the plan.	6
68	Requested that the plan expresses clearer strategies for the authorisation and management of recreational activities.	7, 8, 18, 23, 25, 26, 27, 30, 35	Yes	Theme 3 and theme 4 have been consolidated to clearly explain access arrangements. Theme 1 has been expanded to explain how threats to shorebirds associated with visitor access will be managed. These themes include clearer strategies to manage recreational activities and illegal activities.	3
69	Supported the restriction for motorbikes and 4WD's on beaches and the consolidation of tracks.	15, 23, 24, 26, 27 31, 36	No	No change necessary. However the plan has been revised to give clearer direction about track management.	4
70	Requested improved management of recreational crabbing/cockling. Options proposed included greater compliance effort, monitoring and the banning of crabbing rakes.	17, 21, 23, 26, 36, 37	No	No change. Outside the scope of this plan.	6

Comment No.	Comment	Sub No	Plan altered	Response	Criteria
71	Recommended that a master plan for visitor access is required. Requested a number of detailed strategies/ operational plans be developed for recreational use, signage, vehicle use, sustainable recreational opportunities and ecotourism including funding commitments.	1, 2, 8, 17	Yes	A strategy to facilitate the development of a master plan for visitor access was in the draft plan. Further detail has been included to explain what this will entail.	3
72	Expressed support for the development of camping facilities. Recommended further detail is provided about strategies for camping, that camping be limited and subject to management.	1, 7, 21, 25	Yes	The future consideration of camping options has been addressed in Theme 3.	3
73	Requested that 4WD access not be allowed in the designated Shorebird Conservation Zone at any time of the year, not just the pre-migration period.	1, 24, 26	No	No change. The final plan adequately addresses shorebird protection while enabling recreational practices on beaches to continue. The plan has been revised to enable periodic closure to be reviewed or extended if necessary.	5
74	Supports the development of a collaborative strategy with the Port Gawler Off-Road Vehicle Park to address illegal off road driving in the national park, adjacent to the off-road vehicle park.	2, 8, 23	No	Feedback supports the plan.	4
75	Suggested that professional horse riding should not be allowed or should be undertaken under a permit.	16, 25, 30	No	The establishment of separate strategies for 'professional' and 'recreational' horse riding would not be feasible. Under regulations, horse riding activities must be undertaken under a permit if conducted for 'fee or reward'.	8
76	Requested that any activity disturbing shorebirds should not be permitted i.e. hang-gliding, flying model aircraft and land yachting. Suggested that drones and hovercraft are not suitable in the park.	21, 25, 30	No	Given that these activities have occurred at low levels it is not necessary to prohibit them. However, the plan has been revised to give guidance for the management of these activities in the future.	7
77	Recommended that Shorebird Conservation Zone activity and exclusion be made clear. It was also highlighted that this contradicts the idea of the park which is an area for shorebird conservation.	25, 27, 30	Yes	The management regime applying to these areas has been clarified. These areas have been renamed as areas that are periodically closed to vehicles.	3

Comment No.	Comment	Sub No	Plan altered	Response	Criteria
78	Requested a commitment to the rehabilitation and clean-up of illegal rubbish dumped and stronger enforcement for rubbish dumping.	7, 34	Yes	Theme 3 has been expanded to address this request.	1
79	Requested that horse riders using the park are required to pick up manure.	16, 27	No	No change. Leaving manure in the park is not allowed under regulations.	6
80	Recommended that strategies for visitor facility management are expanded to include facility development.	18, 21	Yes	A more detailed explanation of visitor facility development processes has been included in the plan. The plan has been revised to highlight the environmental considerations that will be required for visitor infrastructure planning.	2
81	Recommended walking, riding and driving only occur below high tide.	25, 30	Yes	This has been included in the final plan and will be incorporated into a minimal impact code.	1,2
82	Recommended that types of vehicles should be described when referring to use across the park.	25, 30	Yes	The different regulations applicable to different types of vehicles have been included in the final plan.	2
83	Requested that guidelines for beach driving and horse riding should be developed.	25, 30	Yes	This will be addressed through the development of a minimal impact code.	2
84	Requested that dogs are not permitted on tracks and trails, just the beach areas.	25, 30	No	The continuation of dog walking is important to local people that use these areas. People visiting with dogs are required to pick up after their dog and will be encouraged to adopt minimal impact behaviours.	7
85	Recommended that infrastructure development within the park should be restricted to tracks, trails and bird hides etc.	25, 30	Yes	Further commentary has been included to describe the safeguards that will be applied in developing any future infrastructure.	2
86	Supported the development of trails in the park.	7, 33	Yes	The plan has been revised to include further planning for trail development.	1

Comment No.	Comment	Sub No	Plan altered	Response	Criteria
87	Requested that the plan include a more explicit strategy regarding education and awareness raising. Involvement in any future changes to access was requested.	32, 37	Yes	The plan has been revised to include awareness raising as a strategy. The request for further involvement has been passed on to relevant DEW staff.	2
88	Expressed support for horse riding. Recommended that horse-riding is only permitted in areas where horse float parking is easily accessed. Recommends uptake of an area previously scoped for horse float parking.	5, 11	Yes	Beaches that are regularly used for horse riding will continue to be available for horse riders. A strategy has been added to theme 3 to address float parking.	1
89	Highlighted that Adelaide Plains Council have a number of action plans that aim to consolidate vehicle use along tracks and trails.	2	Yes	Theme 3 has been expanded to acknowledge the prior work of Council towards the rationalisation and rehabilitation of tracks.	1
90	Recommended that 4WD access between Webb Beach and Bakers Creek and north of Parham Creek, is improved and that signage is established advising that driving on mudflats is a hazard.	5	Yes	Prohibit access.	7
91	Recommended that DEW work with Motorcycles SA to identify alternative areas for motor bike riders.	8	Yes	A strategy about the Port Gawler off-road vehicle park has been expanded to include this suggestion.	2
92	Recommended the development of a risk strategy.	8	Yes	The plan has been revised to include a greater emphasis on the safety of visitors and the management of risks.	3
93	Requested that fat-tyre bicycle riding is added to the list of possible recreational activities.	16	No	The inclusion of this as a threat is not warranted because there has not been a significant amount of this type of activity.	7
94	Recommended that beach driving should not be allowed in the park.	24	No	The plan seeks to maintain current activities as well as address conservation needs. This approach is considered adequate and reflects community expectations.	7
95	Requested local councils establish complimentary bylaws to support the 'dogs on leads policy' that will apply in the park.	35	No	No Change. Councils will be encouraged to adopt complimentary by laws for areas adjacent to the park however this is outside the scope of this plan.	6

Comment No.	Comment	Sub No	Plan altered	Response	Criteria
96	Expressed opposition to horse riding in the park.	35	No	Horse riding will be confined to a small portion of the park. This approach will minimise the scale of impacts while allowing for a continuation of this activity within the area.	7
97	Supported continued recreational access including crabbing and fishing.	37	No	Noted. Already included in the plan.	5
98	Highlighted that the draft plan contained strategies about access that are outside the scope of a park planning process. For example access to council managed foreshore areas.	27	Yes	Figure 1 has been revised to ensure that access routes outside of the park have not been included unless they are public roads. The plan has been revised to provide an explanation of the roles of local government in foreshore areas adjacent to the park.	3
99	Recommended several strategies to address potential impacts and safety concerns associated with beach driving.	30	No	The plan has been revised to clearly to express a raft of strategies that ensure that beach driving is safe and has a minimal impact.	5