

Analysis of Public Submissions

Park Management Plan Draft Amendments

The Park Management Plan Draft Amendments document was released for public consultation on 2 December 2019 and closed on 28 February 2020. Two hundred and forty three submissions were received. The submissions have been summarised for each of the four Park Management Plan Draft Amendments 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.

Coorong National Park Management Plan Draft Amendment

Ninety nine submissions were received and are summarised in Table 1. A summary of all feedback received and the response to this feedback is provided in Table 2.

Table 1: Summary of submissions

Submission number	Name	Respondent
1	David Rawnsley	Shack lessee
2	Capt. Bouc Jones	Individual
3	Sarah Macdonald	Individual
4	Brad Nancarrow	Individual
5	Denys Smith	Individual
6	Daryl Matthews	Individual
7	Mary Raymond	Individual
8	Nicholas Martin West	Representative of a lessee
9	<i>Name anonymous</i>	Individual
10	Ryan van Kaathoven	Individual
11	<i>Name anonymous</i>	Representative of a lessee
12	Jack Pappin	Representative of a lessee
13	Patrik Seibert	Representative of a lessee
14	<i>Name anonymous</i>	Representative of a lessee
15	James Daniel Maunder	Individual
16	Freya Higgins-Desbiolles	Individual
17	Maureen Christie	Individual
18	Nikki Rawnsley	Individual
19	<i>Name anonymous</i>	Individual
20	Mark (<i>surname not provided</i>)	Traditional Owner
21	Jess Moeller	Individual
22	Luke Mann	Representative of a lessee and a shack owners' association
23	Ben Arthur	Representative of Traditional Owner
24	Paul O'Dea	Lessee
25	<i>Name anonymous</i>	Individual
26	Hayley Bedson	Individual
27	Paul Lynne Nykiel	Representative of a lessee
28	Catherine Bell	Lessee
29	Jan van Kaathoven	Representative of a lessee
30	Daryl Matthews	Individual
31	<i>Name anonymous</i>	Individual
32	Colin Johnson	Individual
33	Ian Harper	Lessee
34	<i>Name anonymous</i>	Representative of a shack owners' association

35	Dayna Willis	Lessee
36	<i>Name anonymous</i>	Individual
37	Desmond Stanley	Representative of a lessee
38	Barry Sweetman	Lessee
39	<i>Name anonymous</i>	Representative of a lessee
40	John Oborn	Lessee
41	Allan Tonkin	Lessee
42	Clarissa Martin	Representative of a lessee
43	<i>Name anonymous</i>	Representative of a lessee
44	<i>Name anonymous</i>	Lessee
45	<i>Name anonymous</i>	Representative of a lessee and a 'Friends of Parks' group
46	<i>Name anonymous</i>	Lessee
47	<i>Name anonymous</i>	Individual
48	Mike O'Reilly	Individual
49	Tony Hoff	Individual
50	<i>Name anonymous</i>	Individual
51	Michael Veenstra	Commercial Tour Operator
52	Judy (<i>surname not provided</i>)	Individual
53	Natalie Howson	Representative of a lessee
54	Joal McCutcheon	Representative of a lessee
55	<i>Name anonymous</i>	Representative of a lessee
56	David Campaign	Lessee
57	Lejla Mehmedagic	Individual
58	Samuel Muirhead	Individual
59	Kevin Brincat-Cotton	Individual
60	<i>Name anonymous</i>	Individual
61	<i>Name anonymous</i>	Representative of a Friends of Parks group
62	<i>Name anonymous</i>	Lessee
63	<i>Name anonymous</i>	Individual
64	Roslyn Gorman	Lessee
65	Gail Gorman	Lessee
66	Lynette Pridham	Lessee
67	<i>Name anonymous</i>	Representative of a lessee
68	Nigel M Atkin	Representative of a lessee
69	Gabor Karl	Individual
70	Tania Sweetman	Lessee
71	Janet Gorman	Lessee
72	Chris Salmon	Representative of a lessee
73	Jillian Daly	Representative of a lessee
74	Jason Varacalli	Representative of a lessee
75	Frances Coombe	Individual
76	<i>Name anonymous</i>	Representative of a Friends of Parks group

77	Barry Brown	Individual
78	Russell Cook	Individual
79	Nathan Ley	Individual
80	Brian Perry	Individual
81	Lynette Trevilyan	Lessee
82	<i>Name anonymous</i>	Individual
83	Bruce Gallasch	Representative of a lessee
84	Bob Jeffery	Lessee
85	David Ben Rawnsley	Lessee
86	Peter (<i>surname not provided</i>)	Lessee
87	Nicole Evans	Individual
88	<i>Name anonymous</i>	Representative of a lessee
89	<i>Name anonymous</i>	Representative of a lessee
90	<i>Name anonymous</i>	Lessee
91	<i>Name anonymous</i>	Representative of a regulatory authority
92	Geoff Gallasch	Representative of a lessee, shack owners' association and a Friends of Parks group
93	<i>Name anonymous</i>	Representative of a lessee
94	Samuel Harris Financial Capability Worker	Centacare Catholic Country SA
95	Geoff Wells	Individual
96	Allan Holmes	Individual
97	Allan Holmes Presiding Member	Coast Protection Board
98	Cath Bell	Individual
99	Anita Allen Director Planning Reform	Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure

Table 2 – Summary of feedback

Comment number	Comment	Submission number	Amendment altered	Proposed response	Criteria
1	Expressed general support for the draft amendments.	1, 4, 8, 10, 11, 14, 15, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 24, 26, 29, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 48, 51, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 62, 63, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 72, 73, 74, 78, 80, 81, 84, 85, 86, 88, 89, 90, 92, 93.	No	No change necessary.	4

2	Expressed general opposition to the draft amendments.	7, 9, 16, 25, 28, 30, 47, 52, 75, 76, 82.	No	Justification for opposition was not provided. No change.	7
3	Expressed the view that access to shacks facilitate a love for the environment.	2.	No	No change necessary.	4
4	Expressed the view that shack lessees help protect the park.	53, 64, 71, 83.	No	No change necessary.	4
5	Expressed opposition to the draft amendments on the grounds that only a privileged few have the opportunity to lease shacks.	3, 13, 98.	No	This position is noted however it is not consistent with Government's policy position on the future management of shack leases.	7
6	Expressed opposition to the draft amendments on the grounds that enabling shack leases may lead to commercialism in parks.	3, 97.	No	This concern is noted and will be addressed during the development of future lease conditions.	7
7	Expressed opposition to the draft amendments on the grounds that there is other accommodation available nearby as an alternative to shack accommodation.	5, 6.	No	This position is noted however it is not consistent with Government's policy position on the future management of shack leases.	7
8	To maximise benefit to the state, future shack leases could be put out to public tender.	6.	No	This suggestion is noted however it is not consistent with Government's policy position on the future management of shack leases.	7
9	Expressed the view that removal of shacks would enable better hiking trails, more camping spots and better access for the public.	6.	No	No change necessary. Visitors to the park have access to camping and a network of trails within the park. This will not be affected by the draft amendments.	7
10	Contended that draft amendments contradict the Coorong District Council Development Plan and will not meet the requirements of the <i>River Murray Act 2003</i> and Building Code of Australia.	6.	No	No change required. The amendment does not contradict the Planning and Design Code, building codes or the <i>River Murray Act 2003</i> . However this legislation and codes will be a key consideration during the development of	7

				detailed policies and any future lease negotiations.	
11	Suggested more detail is provided with regard to the lease conditions.	12, 49, 77, 87, 91.	Yes	Additional text has been added to clarify leases will ensure minimal impact on the environment and requirements for shacks to conform to relevant building standards.	3
12	Expressed opposition to the draft amendments on the grounds that longer term shack leases will enable private rights on public land.	17, 87, 95, 96, 97.	No	This position is noted however it is not consistent with Government's policy position on the future management of shack leases.	7
13	Suggested that the park should be returned to Traditional Owners for management.	23.	No	No change. Aboriginal ownership of the park is a matter that is beyond the scope of these draft amendments.	6
14	Suggested the park management plan is old and should be reviewed to place environmental considerations first.	17.	No	Noted. However, this recommendation is beyond the scope of this proposed amendment.	7
15	Suggests existing shacks should be maintained and managed by the government and made available for public hire.	79.	No	No change. This recommendation is not consistent with Government's policy position on the future management of shack leases.	7
16	Unsure of amendments (no reason provided).	27, 50, 61.	No	Feedback not provided, no change.	9
17	Suggested lessees should be supported with a small payment to acknowledge their contribution to protecting the park.	94.	No	This suggestion is noted however it is not consistent with Government's policy position on the future management of shack leases.	7
18	Expressed opposition to the draft amendments on the grounds that longer term shack leases conflict with the Objectives of the National Parks and Wildlife Act 1972.	96, 97.	No	This position is noted. Ensuring alignment with the Act will be a key consideration in the development of future conditions of leases.	7
19	Expressed opposition to the draft	97.	No	This concern is noted. Local environmental	7

	amendments on the grounds that there was no supporting information on the assessment and risk mitigation measures of coastal hazards.			and coastal hazards will be considered during the development of future lease conditions.	
20	Any development on shack sites will need to comply with the Planning and Design Code (Phase Two). Residential development in parks with a conservation zoning and policy framework does not support residential development.	99.	No	No change. Legislation and codes will be a key consideration during the development of detailed policies and any future lease negotiations.	9
21	Expressed opposition to the draft amendments on the grounds that shack leases can lead to constraints for public access and enjoyment of the coast.	97.	No	This position is noted. Ensuring public benefit and enjoyment of parks will be a key consideration in the development of future conditions of leases.	7

Innes National Park Management Plan Draft Amendments

One hundred and eight submissions were received and are summarised in Table 3. A summary of all feedback received and the response to this feedback is provided in Table 4.

Table 3: Summary of submissions

Submission number	Name	Respondent
1	Y Aston	Shack lessee
2	James Powell	Shack lessee
3	Robert Koch	Shack lessee
4	Michael Elliot	Individual
5	Lee Morgan	Individual
6	Chanae Matthews	Individual
7	Margaret Coles	Shack lessee
8	Brenton Chivell	Shack lessee
9	Paul Flavel	Shack lessee
10	Julie Dawson	Shack lessee
11	Arron Smith	Individual
12	Tricia Piwanski	Individual
13	Dean Smith	Individual
14	Leanne Nelson	Individual
15	Buddy Dawson	Individual
16	Daniel Zesers	Individual
17	Julie Powell	Shack lessee
18	Vynita Strauss	Shack lessee
19	Jess Strauss	Individual
20	Jacqueline Strauss	Individual
21	Mark Menzel	Shack lessee
22	Evelyn Chapman	Individual
23	Andrew Menzel	Shack lessee
24	Jaden Hedges	Individual
25	Karen Dutschke	Individual
26	Beryl Arandelovic	Individual
27	Darrell Strauss	Individual
28	Emily Strauss	Individual
29	Matilda Strauss	Individual
30	Jed Paul	Individual
31	Des Mead	Shack lessee
32	Rex Dangerfield	Shack lessee
33	Richard Provis	Shack lessee
34	Kent Lesiuk	Individual
35	Shinobu Kodaka	Individual

36	Robert Arandeovic	Individual
37	Louise Lesiuk	Individual
38	Jason Dawson	Individual
39	Jordan Lesiuk	Individual
40	Dylan Lesiuk	Individual
41	Ruby Strauss	Individual
42	David Thackrah	Individual
43	Ian Janzow	Individual
44	Chris McNeil	Individual
45	Lisa Strauss	Individual
46	Masaki Kodaka	Individual
47	Andrew Nielsen	Individual
48	Dr Grainne Maguire, Coastal Birds Program Leader	Birdlife Australia
49	Helen Miller	Individual
50	Mary Raymond	Individual
51	Peter Pfennig	Individual
52	Sidney Boucher	Individual
53	Harvey A Foster	Individual
54	K Williams	Individual
55	Steven Hansen	Individual
56	Steve Jarrett	Individual
57	Paul (<i>surname not provided</i>)	Individual
58	Jack Pappin	Individual
59	Patrik Seibert	Individual
60	Maureen Christie	Individual
61	<i>Name anonymous</i>	Individual
62	Dennis Ferrett	Individual
63	<i>Name anonymous</i>	Individual
64	Erik Geiss	Individual
65	<i>Name anonymous</i>	Individual
66	Kym Warner	Individual
67	Dylan Lesiuk	Individual
68	Catherine Bell	Individual
69	Rex Dangerfield	Lessee
70	Des Mead	Lessee
71	Beryl Arandelovic	Individual
72	Jessie Strauss	Individual
73	<i>Name anonymous</i>	Individual
74	John & Marilyn Grovermann	Lessee
75	Vynita Strauss	Lessee
76	Yvonne Paull	Individual
77	Amy Kennedy	Individual

78	<i>Name anonymous</i>	Individual
79	<i>Name anonymous</i>	Individual
80	Sarah Macdonald	Individual
81	<i>Name anonymous</i>	Traditional Owner
82	Ken Jones	Lessee
83	Margaret Coles	Lessee
84	<i>Name anonymous</i>	Individual
85	<i>Name anonymous</i>	Lessee
86	Joanna Rowe	Representative of a lessee
87	<i>Name anonymous</i>	Representative of a lessee
88	<i>Name anonymous</i>	Individual
89	<i>Name anonymous</i>	Individual
90	<i>Name anonymous</i>	Individual
91	Dave (<i>surname not provided</i>)	Individual
92	Barbary (<i>surname not provided</i>)	Individual
93	<i>Name anonymous</i>	Individual
94	<i>Name anonymous</i>	Individual
95	Tony Turner	Individual
96	Terry Furness	Individual
97	<i>Name anonymous</i>	Individual
98	<i>Name anonymous</i>	Individual
99	Richard Dawson	Representative of a lessee
100	Julie Dawson	Lessee, Representative of a shack owners' association and a Friends of Parks group
101	<i>Name anonymous</i>	Individual
102	<i>Name anonymous</i>	Lessee
103	Samuel Harris Financial Capability Worker	Centacare Catholic Country SA
104	Geoff Wells	Individual
105	Allan Holmes	Individual
106	Allan Holmes Presiding Member	Coast Protection Board
107	Cath Bell	Individual
108	Anita Allen Director Planning Reform	Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure

Table 4 – Summary of feedback

Comment number	Comment	Submission number	Amendment altered	Proposed response	Criteria
1	Expressed general support for the draft amendments.	3, 11, 12, 16, 19, 21, 24, 25, 26, 28, 29, 30, 32, 33, 35, 36, 38, 39, 41, 43, 46, 49, 54, 57, 62, 69, 70, 71, 72, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79,	No	No change necessary.	4

		82, 83, 84, 85, 88, 93, 95, 96, 97, 99, 100.			
2	Expressed general opposition to the draft amendments.	42, 50, 51, 52, 56, 63, 64, 65, 66, 68, 81, 90, 91, 98.	No	Justification for opposition was not provided. No change.	7
3	Expressed the view that access to shacks facilitate a love for the environment.	6, 20.	No	No change necessary.	4
4	Expressed the view that shack lessees help protect the park.	1, 2, 7, 8, 9, 10, 14, 15, 17, 18, 22, 23, 27, 31, 34, 37, 40, 44, 45, 47, 55.	No	No change necessary.	4
5	Expressed opposition to the draft amendments on the grounds that only a privileged few have the opportunity to lease shacks.	80, 107.	No	This position is noted however it is not consistent with Government's policy position on the future management of shack leases.	7
6	Suggested more detail is provided with regard to the lease conditions.	5, 58, 86, 92, 101.	Yes	Additional text has been added to clarify leases will ensure minimal impact on the environment and requirements for shacks to conform to relevant building standards.	3
7	Expressed opposition to the draft amendments on the grounds that longer term shack leases will enable private rights on public land.	60, 101, 104, 105, 106.	No	This position is noted however it is not consistent with Government's policy position on the future management of shack leases.	7
8	Suggested that parks are for conservation and shacks are inappropriate.	4, 59, 60.	No	No change. Lease conditions will ensure minimal impact on the environment and that shacks conform to relevant building standards.	7
9	Suggested that if existing shacks remain they should be accessible to all park visitors.	101.	No	No change. This recommendation is not consistent with Government's policy position on the future management of shack leases.	7
10	Commercial fishers use shacks at the Fisherman's Village at Pondalowie Bay for seasonal accommodation.	1, 8, 13.	No	No change necessary.	4

11	Enabling shacks to remain adjacent to key shorebird breeding sites will create disturbance at all times, rather than just visitation peaks.	48.	No	This concern is noted. Local environmental priorities will be considered during the development of lease conditions to ensure minimal impact on the environment.	6
12	Amendment does not offer guarantee of tenure for lessees.	53, 61, 67, 87.	No	Feedback noted. The amendments enable the government to provide a greater range of tenure options to lessees.	6
13	Suggests shacks should be exempt from a lease with conditions because shacks pre-date park proclamation.	89.	No	This suggestion is noted. However this recommendation is not consistent with Government's policy position on the future management of shack leases.	7
14	Unsure of amendments (no reason provided).	73, 94, 102.	No	Feedback not provided, no change.	9
15	Suggested lessees should be supported with a small payment to acknowledge their contribution to protecting the park.	103.	No	This suggestion is noted however it is not consistent with Government's policy position on the future management of shack leases.	7
16	Expressed opposition to the draft amendments on the grounds that longer term shack leases conflict with the Objectives of the National Parks and Wildlife Act 1972.	105, 106.	No	This position is noted. Ensuring alignment with the Act will be a key consideration in the development of future conditions of leases.	7
17	Expressed opposition to the draft amendments on the grounds that there was no supporting information on the assessment and risk mitigation measures of coastal hazards.	106.	No	This concern is noted. Local environmental and coastal hazards will be considered during the development of future lease conditions.	7
18	Any development on shack sites will need to comply with the Planning and Design Code (Phase Two). Residential development in parks	108.	No	No change. Legislation and codes will be a key consideration during the development of detailed policies and any future lease negotiations.	9

	with a conservation zoning and policy framework does not support residential development.				
19	Expressed opposition to the draft amendments on the grounds that shack leases can lead to constraints for public access and enjoyment of the coast.	106.	No	This position is noted. Ensuring public benefit and enjoyment of parks will be a key consideration in the development of future conditions of leases.	7
20	Expressed opposition to the draft amendments on the grounds that enabling transferable shack leases may lead to commercialism in parks.	106.	No	This concern is noted and will be addressed during the development of future lease conditions.	7

Little Dip Conservation Park Management Plan Draft Amendments

Twenty eight submissions were received and are summarised in Table 5. A summary of all feedback received and the response to this feedback is provided in Table 6.

Table 5: Summary of submissions

Submission number	Name	Respondent
1	Osker Linde Deputy Principal Legal Officer	SA Native Title Services
2	Tom Davidson	Friends of Little Dip Conservation Park
3	William Peden	Individual
4	Bruce Greenhalgh	Individual
5	Drew Laslett	Individual
6	Rick Moore	Individual
7	Susan Adey	Individual
8	Jeff Campbell, Chairman	Friends of Shorebirds SE
9	John Davidson	Individual
10	Mary Raymond	Individual
11	<i>Name anonymous</i>	Individual
12	Patrik Seibert	Individual
13	Maureen Christie	Individual
14	<i>Name anonymous</i>	Individual
15	Suzie Riley	Lessee
16	Catherine Bell	Individual
17	David Evans	Member of a Friends of Parks group
18	Lockie Riley	Representative of a lessee
19	Sarah Macdonald	Individual
20	Jeff Campbell	Representative of a Friends of Parks group
21	<i>Name anonymous</i>	Lessee
22	<i>Name anonymous</i>	Individual
23	Samuel Harris Financial Capability Worker	Centacare Catholic Country SA
24	Geoff Wells	Individual
25	Allan Holmes	Individual
26	Allan Holmes Presiding Member	Coast Protection Board
27	Cath Bell	Individual
28	Anita Allen Director Planning Reform	Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure

Table 6 – Summary of feedback

Comment number	Comment	Submission number	Amendment altered	Proposed response	Criteria
1	Expressed general support for the draft amendments.	15, 18.	No	No change necessary.	4
2	Expressed general opposition to the draft amendments.	5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 16, 17, 22.	No	Justification for opposition was not provided. No change.	7
3	Expressed the view that shack lessees help protect the park.	3.	No	No change necessary.	4
4	Expressed opposition to the draft amendments on the grounds that only a privileged few have the opportunity to lease shacks.	8, 20, 27.	No	This position is noted however it is not consistent with Government's policy position on the future management of shack leases.	7
5	Expressed opposition to the draft amendments on the grounds that enabling shack leases may lead to commercialism in parks.	2, 26.	No	This concern is noted and will be addressed during the development of future lease conditions.	7
6	Suggested more detail is provided with regard to the lease conditions.	1.	Yes	Additional text has been added to clarify leases will ensure minimal impact on the environment and requirements for shacks to conform to relevant building standards.	3
7	Expressed opposition to the draft amendments on the grounds that longer term shack leases will enable private rights on public land.	2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 13, 24, 25, 26.	No	This position is noted however it is not consistent with Government's policy position on the future management of shack leases.	7
8	Suggested that parks are for conservation and shacks are inappropriate.	13.	No	No change. Lease conditions will ensure minimal impact on the environment and that shacks conform to relevant building standards.	7
9	Suggested that if existing shacks are to remain they should be accessible to all park visitors.	19.	No	No change. This recommendation is not consistent with Government's policy position on the future management of shack leases.	7
10	Unsure of amendments (no reason provided).	14, 21.	No	Feedback not provided, no change.	9
11	Suggested Traditional Owners need more	1.	No	No change. Determining the level of Traditional	6

	involvement in all aspects of park management.			Owner involvement in aspects of park management is outside the scope of the draft amendments.	
12	Expressed opposition to the draft amendments on the grounds that there is other accommodation available nearby as an alternative to shack accommodation.	7.	No	This position is noted however it is not consistent with Government's policy position on the future management of shack leases.	7
13	Suggested a freehold option would provide greater tenure security for lessees.	15.	No	This suggestion is noted. However, a freehold option would require excising land from the park which is not consistent with Government's policy position on the future management of shacks in parks.	7
14	Suggested lessees should be supported with a small payment to acknowledge their contribution to protecting the park.	23.	No	This suggestion is noted however it is not consistent with Government's policy position on the future management of shack leases.	7
15	Expressed opposition to the draft amendments on the grounds that longer term shack leases conflict with the Objectives of the National Parks and Wildlife Act 1972.	25, 26.	No	This position is noted. Ensuring alignment with the Act will be a key consideration in the development of future conditions of leases.	7
16	Expressed opposition to the draft amendments on the grounds that there was no supporting information on the assessment and risk mitigation measures of coastal hazards.	26.	No	This concern is noted. Local environmental and coastal hazards will be considered during the development of future lease conditions.	7
17	Any development on shack sites will need to comply with the Planning and Design Code (Phase Two). Residential development in parks with a conservation zoning and policy framework does not support residential development.	28.	No	No change. Legislation and codes will be a key consideration during the development of detailed policies and any future lease negotiations.	9
18	Expressed opposition to the draft amendments on the grounds that shack	26.	No	This position is noted. Ensuring public benefit and enjoyment of parks	7

	leases can lead to constraints for public access and enjoyment of the coast.			will be a key consideration in the development of future conditions of leases.	
--	--	--	--	--	--

Parks of the Coffin Bay Area Management Plan Draft Amendments

Twenty six submissions were received and are summarised in Table 7. A summary of all feedback received and the response to this feedback is provided in Table 8.

Table 7: Summary of submissions

Submission number	Name	Respondent
1	Darren Richardson	Individual
2	Leith Blacker Manager Development & Environmental Services	District Council of Lower Eyre Peninsula
3	Mary Raymond	Individual
4	Brad (<i>surname not provided</i>)	Individual
5	Maureen Christie	Individual
6	Patrik Seibert	Individual
7	Leisa Moore	Individual
8	Helen Loller	Lessee
9	Catherine Bell	Individual
10	Brian Eylward	Lessee
11	Greg Turbill	Individual
12	Sarah Macdonald	Individual
13	Peter Herraman	Individual
14	Craig Gerschwitz	Individual
15	Russell Cook	Individual
16	<i>Name anonymous</i>	Individual
17	Ross Allen	Individual
18	<i>Name anonymous</i>	Individual
19	Nurbek (<i>surname not provided</i>)	Representative of a Friends of Parks group
20	<i>Name anonymous</i>	Individual
21	Samuel Harris Financial Capability Worker	Centacare Catholic Country SA
22	Geoff Wells	Individual
23	Allan Holmes	Individual
24	Allan Holmes Presiding Member	Coast Protection Board
25	Cath Bell	Individual
26	Anita Allen Director Planning Reform	Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure

Table 8 – Summary of feedback

Comment number	Comment	Sub #	Amendment altered	Proposed response	Criteria
1	Expressed general support for the draft amendments.	1, 2, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 18.	No	No change necessary.	4
2	Expressed general opposition to the draft amendments.	3, 5, 6, 9, 12, 16, 17.	No	Justification for opposition was not provided. No change.	7
3	Suggested more detail is provided with regard to the lease conditions.	5.	Yes	Additional text has been added to clarify leases will ensure minimal impact on the environment and requirements for shacks to conform to relevant building standards.	3
4	Unsure of amendments (no reason provided).	4, 7, 8, 20.	No	Feedback not provided, no change.	9
5	Suggests existing shacks should be maintained and managed by the government and available for public hire.	12.	No	No change. This recommendation is not consistent with Government's policy position on the future management of shack leases.	7
6	Suggested lessees should be supported with a small payment to acknowledge their contribution to protecting the park.	21.	No	This suggestion is noted however it is not consistent with Government's policy position on the future management of shack leases.	7
7	Expressed opposition to the draft amendments on the grounds that longer term shack leases conflict with the Objectives of the National Parks and Wildlife Act 1972.	23, 24.	No	This position is noted. Ensuring alignment with the Act will be a key consideration in the development of future conditions of leases.	7
8	Expressed opposition to the draft amendments on the grounds that there was no supporting information on the assessment and risk mitigation measures of coastal hazards.	24.	No	This concern is noted. Local environmental and coastal hazards will be considered during the development of future lease conditions.	7
9	Expressed opposition to the draft amendments on the grounds that only a privileged few have the opportunity to lease shacks.	25.	No	This position is noted however it is not consistent with Government's policy position on the future management of shack leases.	7

10	Any development on shack sites will need to comply with the Planning and Design Code (Phase Two). Residential development in parks with a conservation zoning and policy framework does not support residential development.	26.	No	No change. Legislation and codes will be a key consideration during the development of detailed policies and any future lease negotiations.	9
11	Expressed opposition to the draft amendments on the grounds that shack leases can lead to constraints for public access and enjoyment of the coast.	24.	No	This position is noted. Ensuring public benefit and enjoyment of parks will be a key consideration in the development of future conditions of leases.	7
12	Expressed opposition to the draft amendments on the grounds that enabling transferable shack leases may lead to commercialism in parks.	24.	No	This concern is noted and will be addressed during the development of future lease conditions.	7
13	Expressed opposition to the draft amendments on the grounds that longer term shack leases will enable private rights on public land.	22, 23, 24.	No	This position is noted however it is not consistent with Government's policy position on the future management of shack leases.	7