

Summary of responses to WACRA paper 'Coast Park criteria'

1. Introduction

The content of the WACRA proposal received severe criticism from most of the local resident/property owner and dune carer groups, and conditional support from bicycle users' groups, some local residents/property owners and the WACRA committee/membership. The process (of producing and circulating comments intended to extend, rather than ignore, the work and report of the Coast Park Community Reference Group [CPCRG]) was positively acknowledged in most of the responses; two responses included unproductive and inaccurate comment on the intent and attitude of the WACRA proposal.

Although not explicitly noted in the WACRA paper, it's proposal was, in part, in response to the results of the Council survey about people's preferences for the CPCRG Option 1 (Coastal plus Seaview/Military)(3.19/5) and Option 2 (Coastal)(3.04/5). This insignificant difference was ignored by those who disagreed with the proposal.

All respondents clearly provided comment that was the result of actively engaging in the process; this suggests that continuing public discussion about the Coast Park will be of interest to many people, although their interests will differ significantly.

As indicated in the proposal, it and this summary will be made available to relevant officers in state and local government. If the intended Coast Park is to be a positive an asset to the human and other communities living in and near the coastal ecosystems it is to traverse, or circumvent, and to others who wish to visit it, both sectors of government have a considerable responsibility to promote continuing attempts to arrive at a balanced account of these interests.

1. Information was sent to those shown on the table at the end of the paper:

WACRA executive committee and membership	Sandpiper and WEDGE groups – Heather Sawyer, Geoffrey Read
Tennyson Dunes group – Val Wales, Nick Crouch	Charles Sturt Bicycle Users' Group - Paul Anderson
CEPG - Judy Packer, Chris Naylor	Port Adelaide Bicycle Users' Group – Tony Bazeley
Tennyson South Dunes Group – Chrissy Paterson	Chairperson CPCRG – Don Howie

Responses received were as follows:

1.1 Representing groups working for the Tennyson Dunes/coastal ecosystems

- Don Howie & Judy Packer - Coastal Ecology Protection Group
- Val Wales & Nick Crouch - Tennyson Dunes Group

1.2 Representing groups of local residents/property owners

- Chrissy Paterson - Henley South Residents' Group
- Heather Sawyer - Sandpiper Place Dune Carers' Group
- Geoffrey Reed - Wild Endangered Dunes Group

1.3 Individual local residents/property owners

- Peter & Victoria Helman - Henley Beach area
- Alan Simpson - Tennyson area

1.4 representatives of bicycle users' groups

- Paul Anderson - Charles Sturt BUG
- Tony Bazeley - Port Adelaide BUG

1.5 WACRA executive committee and membership

2. In general

2.1 The proposition that the Coast park be 'internally consistent in occupying a coastal position throughout its length, including the Tennyson Dunes area; deviation on to Seaview and/or Military Rds is unnecessary and outside the spirit/intention of a Coast Park' was:

- Strongly rejected by the responses under 1.1 and 1.2 above
- Strongly supported by one of the responses under 1.3 above, and strongly rejected by the other
- Supported by the responses under 1.4 above

- Supported by WACRA executive and general members, with the exception of two members who were strongly opposed to the proposal

2.2 Responses under 1.1 & 1.2, and one of the responses under 1.3, strongly supported, explicitly or implicitly, the CPCRG Option1 - coastal path from Terminus St to Moredun St and Dune Crt to Third Ave, PLUS Seaview Rd and/or Military Rd from Fort St to Third Ave.

The WACRA proposal, which the CPCRG was not permitted to consider, that the pathway follow the coastal position discussed as Option 2 by the CPCRG, and shown as Option 1 A and 1B in the report to Council on 23/02/15, PLUS pass through the Tennyson Dunes, was supported by one of the responses under 1.3, and those under 1.4.

2.3 Responses supporting the WACRA proposal questioned/made **alternative** suggestions about matters including:

- 1) path material and width (e.g. that Tennyson Dunes paths not exceed 1.8m in general, but enlarge to 2.0m at points where vegetation would not be damaged to allow for passing traffic and interpretation sections)
- 2) most effective means of cyclist and pedestrian behaviour management, including promoting and designing for 'walking pace environment' on any of the Tennyson Dunes pathways and 'negotiated passage' along some sections, often noting the frequent ineffectuality of local government by-laws in similar situations, and the insufficient funding that leads to inadequate policing and lack of sanctions/fines that are sufficiently publicised and legally enforced
- 3) the requirement that cyclists walk on paths through the Tennyson Dunes, indicating that this would not be acceptable to cyclists either because they wished to use the shared path as a thoroughfare, rather than an 'excursion' through the dune ecosystem, or because the wearing of cleated shoes to assist cycling makes walking uncomfortable
- 4) the need for a more rapid, less prescriptive construction schedule.

Among these and the responses summarised under 2.4 below the rejection of the use of wide, concrete/asphalt pathways was common, as was acceptance of the suggestion that the Coast Park here, and along its entire length, should be designated a state/regional asset and, therefore, an ongoing, equitably and sufficiently funded joint responsibility of state and local governments. Although not discussed in the WACRA proposal or responses, it seems appropriate to suggest that the Coast Park be designated a linear park following the model of the River Torrens Linear Park, funded and managed in ways that responsibly reflect that designation.

2.4 Responses which disagreed with the WACRA proposal made comment/suggestions about matters including:

- 1) the fact that other sections of the Coast Park deviate from a coastal position
- 2) the need to retain Seaview and Military Rd pathways to provide for different users (i.e. pedestrian/recreational/natural area appreciation vs cycling/commuting) of the paths and inclement weather conditions
- 3) their difficulty, on the basis of prior experience of projects and the often limited government financing of them, in believing that existing pathways through the Tennyson Dunes could be suitably modified and maintained without unacceptable damage to the dunes - and consequent rejection of the Coast Park proceeding through this area
- 4) the need for adequate and ongoing funding to provide comprehensive biodiversity management training for local government officers and volunteers able to see to the biodiversity-related aspects of coats path maintenance
- 5) the need for permeable-surface pathways through Tennyson dunes to reduce run-off and consequent damage to the dune ecosystem
- 6) rejection of the use of boardwalks
- 7) the desirability of centralising interpretation in and near the Tennyson Dunes southern car park, especially in a water-sensitive design centre accompanied by an Aboriginal food garden
- 8) the primary need for ecologically sensitive design, construction and maintenance, particularly for the upgrading of paths through the Tennyson Dunes, but ideally for all of this section of the Coast Park – and the designation of the Tennyson Dunes pathways as 'walking trails'.
- 9) the construction of a safe connection from Seaview Rd to Military Rd on the southern side of Tennyson Dunes since a biodiversity-respecting pathway into and through the Dunes from Bournemouth St has not yet been proposed
- 10) some acceptability of a coastal position for the Coast Park pathways providing that was in physically lower sections of the dunes (swales) to protect resident safety, privacy and security
- 11) the desirability of upgrading and maintaining the grassed area/public reserve in front of the properties between Dune Crt and Third Ave
- 12) the need for a wide-ranging approaches to the management of pedestrian and cyclist behaviour
- 13) the need to retain the 5-section approach of the CPCRG (i.e. rejection of the 3-section approach advocated by WACRA), treating the Tennyson Dunes section (section 3) as uniquely different from sections 1,2 4 and 5, and dealing with each of these sections individually in close consultation with associated residents/property owners
- 14) the desirability of retaining the 'less managed' and 'less constructed' environment of this section of Adelaide's coastal dunes (some respondents have used the term 'wild' which has connotations of areas largely unaffected by humans and so is not used here because it is completely inconsistent with this area) because it provides a more open ambience.

3. Concluding comments

3.1 The WACRA proposal provided a vehicle for several individuals and groups to make public (to each other, at least) comment. Many of the factors that are germane to the positions taken by individuals and groups have been presented.

3.2 WACRA will continue to review its position in the light of the responses received .We remain open-minded to the possibility of changing circumstances as the project progresses through government, council and community management .

3.3 WACRA will inform Minister Mullighan and Mayor Keneally of the outcome of the results of our endeavors to find common ground and compromise between the coastal residents' groups and other special interests groups we contacted.

3.4 WACRA will continue to lobby for what is sees as desirable and equitable approaches to the paths to be taken by a Coast Park in this section, as will all other interested parties.

3.5 The active and genuine participation in commenting on the WACRA proposal is respected, and acknowledged with thanks.

Marg Easson, Jim Douglas, David Schofield & Richard Smith 14/04/15