



General Meeting 1 December 2022

Minutes

First Nations acknowledgement

General Meeting

Apologies: Paul Acfield, Sandy Ball, Mara Blazic, Paul Caica, Deb Cashel, Greg Cashel, Marg Easson, Bruce Foster, Shelley Harrington, Paul Laris, Sandy Schultheis, Geoff Short, Kate Smith, Richard Smith, Anne Wheaton

Attendees: Kate Barrett, Bert Brown, Marty Cielens, Bernadette Cranwell, Jim Douglas, Lionel Edwards, Theo Ellenbroek, Lara Lamnek, Becky Llewellyn, Rae Marnham, Steve Medhurst, Mark Pierson, Andrea Rankin, Lisa Redman, Chris Newby, Cory Stewart, Julie Whitehead, Geoff Wood

Moved Julie Whitehead

Seconded Theo Ellenbroek

Carried

Attendees:

Welcome to Kate Barrett (ex WACRA)

Acceptance of GM minutes 1 September

See website for minutes: <http://wacra.org.au/news-events/meetings/>

Moved Becky Llewellyn

Seconded Julie Whitehead

Carried

Financial Report and acceptance

See website for Treasurer's report: <http://wacra.org.au/news-events/meetings/>

All expenses paid.

Financial Report and acceptance

Moved Mark Pierson

Seconded Julie Whitehead

Carried

Adelaide Beach Management Review

See report by Geoff Short at end of these minutes

Chris Newby attending

This government promised a comprehensive, science-based review of options for long-term management of our coasts. That review is scheduled to report by June 2023 but there has been no substantive progress on appointing the expert panel. The clock is ticking on that June deadline.

Briefings on this issue by representatives from the Department for Environment and Water have not reported any substantive progress to date. If the June 2023 deadline stays in place, it is unlikely that a proper analysis of the options can take place.

WACRA continues to lobby for a commitment from federal, state and local governments for a whole of metropolitan coast scientific strategic plan for the long-term management of our local beaches.

A lot of evidence has been gathered and shared on this topic by coastal community groups and this data should be considered by the review. It is essential that the community have its voice heard on this very important issue.

Bert Brown reporting

We have been waiting to see what the government is going to do. The aim is to find sustainable solutions to coastal erosion, particularly at West Beach.

The government has decided on panel members:

<https://www.environment.sa.gov.au/topics/coasts/managing-adelaides-beaches/adelaide-beach-management-review#review>

The review will still be a 12-month process commencing Jan/Feb 2023, meeting every 2 months. The media release states that the panel will be receiving and reviewing submissions from community groups. We are concerned that there will be a consultation process – we hope this includes real community engagement from the beginning of the process.

Beach management review

Paul Sutton (CEO Charles Sturt Council) has acknowledged the fact that our coastline needs replenishing. The sand is moving northwards rapidly. Council fears it will take too long for the experts to address the problem. Council knows it needs to allocate budgets to address this.

More details: <https://www.environment.sa.gov.au/topics/coasts/managing-adelaides-beaches/adelaide-beach-management-review#review>

Chris Newby reporting

The independent advisory panel is a de facto Coast Protection Board (to avoid conflict of interest). There is a mix of representation (Karna person, university experts etc).

The department will go out to independent consultants for the expert panel (ie tender submissions to undertake analysis). This group will prepare a report for the panel. The panel will report to the Attorney General (AG) and then to Cabinet. The timeframe is still 12 months. This timeframe allows for community consultation. An independent firm will assist with the consultation process – how to engage. Community consultation will commence in January. The scientific review is a desktop review looking at the past and what is happening overseas. These two aspects will be combined to advise up.

Through that process the scientific panel will come up with a solution. Then there will be return to the community to see what their reaction is. The outcome will go back through the advisory panel and up. It's not predetermined re the outcome. There are a number of options heard about through stakeholder groups. Strong community interest indicates that the government and panels need to take that on board.

Questions to Chris Newby from the floor:

Q: Can you tell us more about the scientific review?

A: There was a tender process shortlisted to 5 suppliers. We have received their submissions. The advisory panel will recommend to the AG who to appoint. These are people with experience in coastal matters – engineers, scientists etc.

Q: Is it the same people as last time?

A: No.

Q: What is happening in the interim? Sand is disappearing fast and infrastructure is being damaged. We need sand and we need it now.

A: The government as part of the review will deliver 100,000 cubic mtrs of sand to West Beach. We will see how this impacts on Henley Beach over time. We have experienced 20 high water events this year so the beach has not had time to recover. We are looking from a structural perspective at how to

improve this situation. It doesn't involve delivering sand to Henley Beach. It is a wait and watch situation.

Q: Wait and see is not appealing to Henley residents. The problem is the sea walls. Ideally there would be dunes. Sand is coming through to Henley and manifesting in a bar all the way along, almost to Grange. It needs immediate attention. What is the department going to do?

A: This question does not relate directly to the review. For example, Joe's Kiosk – it is built in a not ideal location and not an ideal design re a sea wall. Options are available and the department is looking at this and communicating with Charles Sturt Council. The message from Council is more sand.

Q: I'm concerned about what will come first. Is the community being put at the forefront over the environment? Also the sand coming in – it seems it won't come in as there is not enough sand at West Beach (should be more like 500,000 cubic mtrs). What do you think?

A: Re the sequencing of events, I think it's important to take the community on the journey. It is premised on the science but the community needs to be included. It will be based on scientific principles.

Q: Being part of an alternative advisory panel, we meet once a month and discuss this subject. The advisory panel meeting once per two months seems underwhelming. Comment?

Re taking sand from the Torrens Outlet and passing it through to Henley Beach, what happened to that idea?

A: Taking it from the Torrens Outlet – not an ideal time of year now. The beach heights at the ideal time were not as confronting as they are now. The coast is reactive and a challenging environment to work with. We don't rush into these things. I can hear the frustration from the group but that is what the review is for.

Re the panel meeting frequency, the foundational work will be done by an independent scientific firm (analysis). That work is reported to the panel who will meet every 2 months or as required. It is enough but if it is not, there is opportunity to increase the frequency.

Q: Can groups report to the independent scientific review?

A: The community consultation process provides a process to make submissions via the panel to the scientific review.

Q: Clarifying the pipeline proposal – is it scientific or engineering?

A: Engineering has its basis in science and is based in theories. I think that science and engineering are intertwined in their approach. The pipeline approach was based in science with an engineering approach.

Q: Is the coastal group at DEW likely to employ a scientist?

A: There is a coastal scientist employed on this.

Q: Will all the submissions be apparent as they are passed up the line? Would it be possible for submissions to be available and visible?

A: It comes up in the Planning and Design Code section below. It's not difficult for the department to put these online and make them available to the public.

Q: Is there a TOR for the committee?

A: Yes, it is published on the DEW website.

A: It's in the 'Our Coast' section (hard to find). Adelaide Beach Management Review page :

<https://www.environment.sa.gov.au/topics/coasts/managing-adelaides-beaches/adelaide-beach-management-review#review>

Q: Will you be announcing the results of the tender?

A: Yes, it will be publicly known, but the submissions will not be made public as they contain commercial information. There will be a summary document as well. We are committed to transparency.

WACRA thanks Chris Newby for attending and answering these questions.

Bert Brown summarising:

It seems the major concern is an interim resolution of the sand degradation.

Proposal that we call for the urgent interim plan for external sand replenishment, in particular at Henley South and West Beach, from an appropriate source, up until the review has outcomes. Minimum 150,000 cubic mtrs. It needs to be addressed now.

Moved Lisa Redman

Seconded Mark Pierson

Carried

Action: WACRA will put together this proposal and put it to the department

Climate Matters Report

An update on the innovative work being undertaken by the WACRA Climate Matters Group through the My Tree Project with local schools as well as advocacy for improving tree canopy and emissions reduction. Members will be briefed on project plans for 2023 and beyond.

Julie Whitehead reporting:

We have done three deputations to council re the budget and increasing canopy.

The My Tree Project – workshops propagating plants and then planting on Schools Tree Day (29 July).

Art workshops culminated in a SALA exhibition. There was high student participation.

See resources for the My Tree Project: <http://wacra.org.au/my-tree-project-multimedia-resources/>

It was a fantastic team. The Climate Leaders Award (Community category) was won by Deirdre Knight, a member of the My Tree Project team.

In 2023 we aim to look at sustainable education, a bottom-up approach.

We also had a stall at the Nature Festival (Woodville Town Hall) which was a wonderful event.

We have also put in an application for Community Event of the Year.

Children's Art Space at Festival Theatre – they might take over doing the art workshops in 2024.

Planning System Implementation Review [open discussion]

See report by Marty Cielens at end of these minutes

The Expert Panel for the Planning System Implementation is undertaking a review of reforms to the planning system implementation.

WACRA is preparing a submission to that review which is due by 16 December. We would like to hear from members about on how the current system has affected them or their community.

Areas being examined by the review include tree planting/remediation, urban infill, car parking and local heritage issues.

The Expert Panel is particularly interested in concrete examples of how people have been affected by planning decisions and actions.

Your feedback will help WACRA prepare its submission.

Summary discussion papers prepared by the Expert Panel:

https://plan.sa.gov.au/planning_review/have_your_say

Marty Cielens reporting:

We want to thank Becky Llewellyn for her submission and work on this. We also want to acknowledge Theo Ellenbroek for his input.

We need feedback from members as to how the Planning and Design Code is affecting you, for the review. We also want to know how people are coping with the portal.

Once the full submission is completed, we will put it on the WACRA website. The submission is due 16 December.

The summary (*see Reports at the end of these minutes*) is in draft form and is open for comment. We invite your input by **6 December**.

From the floor: Sounds like a really good summary of the issues at stake.

We have also made contact with council on this issue. They have been taken from the equation. We wrote to council and got a response from Paul Sutton. They have been part of mayors' forums on this issue. Issues were raised that were beyond the scope of the expert review panel. For example, the abject failure of SA to have an adequate public transport system. Car-centricity means more space is required for on-street parking. We will send a copy of our submission to Council. We are also a member of Community Alliance SA and will send our submission to them. They will consolidate all submissions and make a substantial submission themselves. They will also be making a verbal submission. All submissions will be on their website: <https://communityalliancesa.org.au/>.

Action: Please give your feedback on the form provided or by emailing Becky Llewellyn.

Questions and issues for council

Members of the WACRA Executive meet regularly with elected councillors and council staff to lobby on behalf of its members on matters regarding the health and well-being of coastal communities.

This is an opportunity to share your ideas on issues and topics that WACRA can take up with newly elected City of Charles Sturt Councillors.

Our group Council Connect meets with council on issues.

Issues for 2023 – planning and the review, public transport, traffic management, urban infill and restrictions on traffic movement, and the danger in that. Tree canopy once again as there is not more money in the budget for this. Linear Park between Third Street and the northern end of Tennyson Reserve. Recommendations for structure of the Coastal Protection Board (Tammy Franks has raised this issue but it has not been addressed). We will raise these issues with council and, where relevant, with State Government.

Seagrass meadow seed gathering

Update on the potential to gather seeds along our beaches in December. The seeds will be planted out to enhance the seagrass meadows that help protect our coastline.

More information about this exciting project: [Ozfish Seeds for Snapper webpage](#)

Action: Please spread the word about this project

General business

You are invited to join us for supper and Christmas cheer

Covid - please check with the State Health conditions.

You are encouraged to wear a mask.

Friends of Gulf St Vincent

AGM – the committee is holding a special general meeting 8 December. Mark Pierson is stepping down and is seeking nomination. Mark increased the membership from 15 to 80 during his time as president. Mark is seeking an invitation to join the Coastal Management Group. We will take that on notice.

Meeting closed at 9pm.



Jim Douglas (Acting Chairperson)

REPORTS

Beach Management Review (Geoff Short)

- There should be an announcement by the Government about the Independent Advisory Panel and its Terms of Reference “soon”.
- Then will follow an announcement on the scientific expert panel and its TOR, and on the proposed community engagement process.
- The review will still be a 12-month process – ie DEW has foregone its original June 2023 deadline.
- Interim sand management of hotspots is challenging given the bad weather conditions and the fact that the plover nesting season is now under way.
- It appears that DEW is following its previous approach of announcing decisions, not engaging with the community in decision-making. This is not what WACRA considers “community engagement”.
- WACRA has reiterated its request for regular briefings to all affected community groups. Other groups have apparently suggested a symposium to present the science, one-on-one briefings to individual groups, a survey of residents, discussion of the economic value of the beaches. It is not known whether any of those suggestions will be taken up by DEW.
- The DEW Beach Management Review team has a new Community Engagement Coordinator - Ms Cory Stewart – and we look forward to open and frank discussions with her.

Submission to the Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act and the Planning and Design Code (Marty Cielens)

We need feedback from WACRA members on how the Planning Act and Design Code are affecting you so that we can finalise our submission to that review.

Important areas that affect WACRA members include policies on **trees, urban infill, car parking, and character and heritage**.

The review also wants to find out how people are going with the single PlanSA portal: <https://plan.sa.gov.au/>.

We want the review to put in place planning systems that encourage a more liveable, competitive, affordable, and sustainable long-term growth strategy for our region.

Once completes, our full submission will be on the WACRA website : <http://wacra.org.au/>.

The final date for submissions to the review is **16 December**.

Data shows Adelaide's population increasing:

	People in Adelaide	Private dwellings	% separate house	% semi-detached and townhouses	% flat or apartments
2011	1,225,236	533,512	76.0	12.6	11.1
2021	1,387,290	596,876	72.8	17.0	8.9

WACRA wants the government to ensure that development occurs with a balance between community and private developer interests

KEY HEADINGS IN THE REVIEW AND WACRA'S POSITION ON THEM

Access to the planning processes – disadvantage of the current centralised e-Planning System

- Processes are needed to assist people who struggle with complex paperwork and technological barriers
- Not everyone is computer savvy, and many struggle with literacy
- Many people in the community are visually impaired
- The system should not be a barrier to these people

Reliance on digital access and high literacy levels means there need to be supports easily available to help people navigate the system.

- WACRA believes much more can be done to make this system more accessible
- The review needs to consult with people who are not digitally adept, as well as representatives from low-vision and low-literacy organisations.

On the topic of urban infill developments – there should be more effective public notification and appeal rights.

- WACRA wants to see notices of demolition and any plans in excess of zoning guidelines for height and mass should include a 28-day consultation process.
- Residents within a 200m radius should be informed of the proposed demolition and their input considered by the planning Assessment Manager or Council Assessment Panel.
- Act needs much more rigorous definitions of both 'substantial impacts' and 'significant variation' of existing norms.

There should be a standardised development approvals process that ensures only properly qualified people can approve developments.

- We recommend that local councils become the authorising body for issuing planning permits - not private certifiers.
- This would standardise the approaches in zones and neighbourhoods that the current system by-passes.

Greater transparency is needed for major developments.

- We want the Review Panel to place major developments in a whole-of-government framework to avoid decision-making where not all the information and evidence for and against a major project is on the table.
- Where major developments do have consultations on the State YourSAy portal, all submissions should be published for the sake of transparency in decision-making.

Developers need to take greater responsibility for establishment of infrastructure associated with new developments.

- They need to be responsible for associated infrastructure such as roads, parking and green space within and near their developments
- Otherwise we get cost shifting to Local Councils and others who do not benefit directly from the redevelopment.
- Existing infill developments of a large scale also need higher targets for green space and canopy so that profits for the developer are not at the expense of the wider community and environment.

Currently, developers take the profits and leave the wider community to carry cost of providing infrastructure for the new development.

Local heritage protection

- Adelaide has a unique heritage in its built environment, so WACRA wants to see heritage provisions strengthened and calls for more creative solutions that allow building alteration within clear guidelines.
- This will help preserve what is left

This needs much greater accountability and supervision.

- WACRA wants the Expert Panel to put in place systems that ensure what is approved in planning is what is built.
- We also ask the Commission to provide stricter requirements for heritage and character area developments.

The National Trust is proposing that there be a separate act to cover heritage matters. This is because the existing Act is not able to adequately address the complex needs of heritage protection.

WACRA supports the National Trust's proposal.

Tree policy

Michael Keelan, *The Advertiser's* gardening expert, described why trees fall in storms. He wrote:

'We are constantly removing trees with every new residential development...Trees growing in the front line protect the others growing in their wake, and as trees grow, they develop, in addition to their normal root growth, stronger growth to strengthen themselves to the prevailing wind...'

'Protection of trees is offered from other trees in the immediate area. As we remove more trees, the natural strength of others is compromised.'

'The removal of just one mature tree, or even the erection of a substantial new development or house can alter the normal wind direction. It will also increase the velocity and wind turbulence that will hit other trees kilometres away.'

- WACRA wants to see tightened protection of existing trees, including the introduction of a height protection threshold, crown spread protection and species-based tree protections.
- We would also recommend the adoption of targets such as those proposed for Unley, where a minimum 15% of land on new developments has tree cover.

Self-regulation in this area does not work. There needs to be proper repercussions for people thumbing their nose at trees by not complying with requirements.

Trees matter!

Car parking policy

The existing code uses the assumption that new developments have only one car per household. It assumes we will all use public transport and only buy small cars

So The current code provides for one garaged car per dwelling in a new build. But in reality:

Vehicles per dwelling	No. of registered motor vehicles 2011	No. of registered motor vehicles 2021	Change in no. of vehicles	% Change in 10 years
2 motor vehicles	168,502	195,642	27,140	13.9%
3 motor vehicles	71,075	97,042	25,967	26.8%
Total vehicles (excluded none & not stated)	417,633	489,333	71,700	16.7%

- The number of 2 and 3 car homes has increased by over 40% since 2011
- More than 55 per cent of residences now have two or more cars
- Large SUVs now dominate new car sales.

Everyone who lives in areas with urban infill is noticing reduced amenity, such as streets full of parked cars and narrowed roads.

This impacts on community access to amenities where that infill is near beaches, parks and community facilities.

It also impacts on pedestrian amenity and safety, especially around schools.

And as for cyclists, cluttered roads are making cycling more and more dangerous.

The Act needs to take a tougher line on parking provisions which have quickly changed Adelaide's streetscapes for the worse since its introduction.

It also needs to consider the impact of much larger cars on garage specifications. If it wont fit in - it goes on the street.

This review is a chance to show environmental leadership.

Ventilation

- WACRA urges the Review to include new ventilation specifications and guidelines in a revamped Code to improve new building environments with the latest scientific advice on ventilation.
- Whatever new standards are put in place, there needs to be attention to operating noise from large air-conditioner and filtration units near neighbours.

Deconstruction of older homes and recycling of building materials

- WACRA encourages courageous thinking about introducing deconstruction as a sustainable alternative to demolition for older buildings
- We need to preserve building materials for reuse, reduce landfill dumping, and introduce a new skilled employment stream for people in a sustainable, closed-loop building industry.

Dark roofing materials

- While it is unlikely that regulating roofing colour choice in private dwellings would be popular, the Code needs to provide incentives for more people to choose lighter coloured roofs
- This would improve Adelaide's response to heat intensification as climate change increasingly challenges liveability.

IN SUMMARY

- WACRA hopes that in the spirit of transparency and accountability, that all of the submissions will be made public so everyone can see who has participated and how they have expressed their views.
- We look forward to seeing environmental sustainability higher in the values behind the Building Act and Code.

Without a functioning environment, all the building in the world will not provide for quality of life.