



Analysis of Public Submissions

Parks of the Glenthorne National Park-Ityamaitpinna Yarta Precinct Draft Management Plan 2021

The Parks of the Glenthorne National Park-Ityamaitpinna Yarta Precinct Draft Management Plan was released for public consultation from 24 September 2021 until 24 December 2021.

During that time, the public had the option to provide feedback on the draft plan by providing a written submission or completing a survey on the YourSAy website.

Thirty-three submissions were received, including five written responses and 28 surveys. Table 1 outlines the submissions received and Table 2 summarises the feedback received and how it was considered in finalisation of the plan. Table 3 contains a copy of the YourSAy survey questions.

All submissions on the draft park management plan have been 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 plan;
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 draft plan;
6. Feedback addressed issues beyond the scope of the draft 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: Submissions received

Submission #	Name	Respondent
1	Friends of Hallett Cove Conservation Park	Volunteer group
2	Heath Hunter	Individual
3	Hurley family	Adjoining landholders
4	Nathan Rhodes	PIRSA
5	John Hoult	Individual
6	Lauren Scarman	Park visitor
7	Jann Manda	Local community member
8	Jason (surname not provided)	Park visitor
9	Jads (surname not provided)	Local community member
10	Kate Merritt	Park visitor
11	SCMB	Park visitor
12	Warwick Conway	Park visitor
13	Ali P	Individual
14	Gary Goland	Individual
15	Birgitta Selberg	Park visitor
16	Angela (surname not provided)	Park visitor
17	Rosy Centrella	Local community member
18	Mick Boers	Local community member
19	Chris (surname not provided)	Park visitor
20	Chris Nettle	Park visitor
21	Fran Hoop	Environmental volunteer
22	Holdfast Model Aero Club	Lessee
23	Di Hakof	Local community member
24	Dean Podger	Individual
25	Brendan Todd	Environmental volunteer
26	Peter Mayer	Individual
27	Name anonymous	Park visitor
28	Austin (surname not supplied)	Park visitor
29	Adam Nicholls	Local community member
30	Name anonymous	Park neighbour
31	Daniel Mabarrack	Individual
32	Veronica Parle	Individual
33	Name anonymous	Local community member



Table 2: Analysis of feedback

Comment Number	Comment	Submission Number	Plan Altered	Response	Criteria
General					
1	Supported the direction of the plan with no specific feedback provided.	8, 12, 13, 23, 24, 26, 27, 28, 29, 32	No	Submissions supported the plan.	4
2	Expressed the opinion that inclusion and emphasis of Kaurna culture and heritage is important, particularly themes 3 and 4.	11, 16, 17, 33	No	Feedback is consistent with the direction in the plan.	5
3	Suggested lease holders have a representative voice should an increase in park usage affect the established operations of lease holder activities.	22	No	This will be monitored and managed at an operational level. Detail of this nature is not necessary to include in the plan.	6
Theme 1: Protecting natural values					
4	Suggested that highlighting the winter spider orchid (<i>Caladenia brumalis</i>) is not appropriate and that the local climate may limit successful reintroduction.	1	No	The identification of the nationally threatened winter spider orchid and the program to reintroduce it is an important example of the biodiversity within the precinct and the effort underway to restore the local environment.	7
5	Expressed the view that encouraging programs for regeneration & protection of native fauna species should be included.	1	No	No change. The plan includes scope for revegetation, restoration, and pest control programs to take into account desirable outcomes for native fauna.	5
6	Suggested improvements to fencing at Hallett Cove Conservation Park to control the intrusion of foxes, particularly along the eastern boundary where foxes are attracted to wildlife at Lucretia Dam.	1	No	The design and construction of a fox proof fence is not being considered for Hallett Cove Conservation Park during the life of this plan. Pest species will be managed at the landscape level in partnership with stakeholders.	7
7	Expressed the view that restoring Waterfall Creek to prevent erosion is a strategy that has been tried and has proved inadequate, and will do little to protect aquatic habitat of the creek.	1	No	Noted. However, further targeted restoration works along Waterfall Creek is a strategy that may be adopted in the future as part of an integrated solution to limit stormwater impacts in the park.	9



8	Expressed the view that sections of Waterfall Creek where the periods of deposition which created the Hallett Cove landscape are visible must be preserved and never revegetated.	1	Yes	Further detail has been added to clarify that any further revegetation won't cover sections of the bank where the periods of deposition are visible.	3
9	Suggested greater emphasis on protecting the public from the risk of undercut banks along Waterfall Creek collapsing, and the risk of further erosion threatening adjacent walking trails.	1	Yes	The plan has been revised to reflect these comments. The risk to the public from undercut banks and threat to the walking trail has been highlighted.	1
10	Suggested replacing 'late Paleozoic glaciation' with 'Permian glaciation'.	1	Yes	This change has been made as suggested to simplify the language in the plan.	2
11	Expressed the view that the infrastructure at the Black Cliff geological monument in Hallett Cove Conservation Park needs a specific action plan to address interpretation and public safety provisions appropriate to protect the unique significance and use of the site.	1	No	The plan already outlines that infrastructure will be monitored and maintained in good condition to protect and interpret the geological values in the park and adjacent Sandison Reserve. This includes the Black Cliff site.	6
12	Suggested that the noisy miner (<i>Manorina melanocephala</i>) and European honeybee (<i>Apis mellifera</i>) should be specifically listed as a priority species for management due to the impacts they can have on biodiversity values.	2	No	Adverse impacts to biodiversity from these species and the public risk from European honeybees will be monitored and managed at the park operations level. Listing these as priority species for management is not necessary in this plan.	6
13	Supports the commitment to control priority weeds and vertebrate pests by participating in landscape scale control programs.	4, 16	No	No change required. Feedback supports the direction in the plan.	4
14	All species present in the parks, including insects, should be recorded and used in evaluation of ecological recovery.	14	No	Identification and recording species is undertaken at an operational level as part of ongoing monitoring programs.	6
15	Expressed the opinion that restoration of Glenthorne National Park-Ityamaitpinna Yarta should leave some areas open, without broad scale planting of trees and shrubs.	15	No	A vegetation management plan will be developed to guide the restoration works on the property. The implementation of this will include leaving areas of open space.	6
16	Suggested constructing feral proof areas and reintroducing native fauna.	21	No	Feral proof areas are not considered as a viable option for the strategic direction of these parks. However, the reintroduction of native wildlife will be considered at an operational level.	7



17	Expressed the view that habitat connectivity should be a focus with provision of roadside signage to remind motorists of animals in the area.	26	No	No change. Feedback supports the direction in the plan. Roadside signage will be discussed with Department for Infrastructure and Transport.	4
18	Expressed the view that restoration works should aim to replicate pre-European settlement conditions.	31	No	The aim of restoration will be to contribute to landscape-scale priorities for nature conservation. Trying to restore pre-European vegetation in these parks is not the desired outcome or achievable within the resources available.	7
19	Suggested adopting a holistic approach to long term management of impact causing native wildlife rather than culling.	33	No	No change. Feedback is consistent with the direction in the plan. Non-lethal options will be considered first. Culling is an option that will be considered if it remains the only practicable option.	5
Theme 2: Providing recreation opportunities					
20	Suggested the second paragraph should be explicit that cycling and horse riding are only permitted on trails in Glenthorne National Park-Ityamaitpinna Yarta.	1	Yes	The paragraph has been revised to specify that cycling and horse riding are only permitted on certain trails in Glenthorne National Park-Ityamaitpinna Yarta.	3
21	The Coastal Park Path in Hallett Cove Conservation Park should be referred to as Coastal Walking Trail.	1	No	No change. The trail is known as, and labelled, the Coast Park Path on the park walking trail map.	7
22	Expressed the view that flying model gliders in Hallett Cove should not be promoted due to the fragile nature of the area where the activity usually occurs.	1	No	The reference to flying remote controlled model gliders remains to articulate it as a permitted activity. However, the paragraph has been revised and the statement regarding south westerly winds creating great conditions has been removed.	7
23	Expressed the view that the plan should acknowledge private sector tourism and service potential of private land adjacent Glenthorne National Park-Ityamaitpinna Yarta.	3	Yes	The plan has been updated to acknowledge the support for tourism and economic benefit that private sector development on land adjacent the park may provide.	1
24	Suggested that development or using land within Glenthorne National park-Ityamaitpinna Yarta for activities that are incompatible with development potential of adjacent private land should not occur.	3	No	Outside the scope of this plan. The assessment of development, leasing, and land use within parks is undertaken in accordance with legislation, policies, and set criteria.	6
25	The proposal to locate the RSPCA headquarters and animal care campus in Glenthorne National Park-Ityamaitpinna Yarta should be specifically described in the plan.	5	Yes	The plan has been updated to specifically highlight the RSPCA proposal for their headquarters and animal care campus to be	3



				located within the Lease Zone in Glenthorne National Park-Ityamaiitpinna Yarta.	
26	The veloway on the eastern side of the expressway is identified as a walking trail and the cycling/walking track on the western side of the expressway is not shown as connecting to Majors Road and continuing past the boundaries of the park.	5	Yes	Figures 1 and 2 have been updated to label the Patrick Jonker Veloway and show management tracks in each of the parks.	3
27	Suggested more detail on the play space planned for Glenthorne National Park-Ityamaiitpinna Yarta.	6	No	Feedback suggests including prescriptive information that is of an operational nature. Detail on the design and development of the play space can be found on the department's website.	6
28	Suggested more access points to parks, including access to Glenthorne National Park-Ityamaiitpinna Yarta from Matthew Street Reserve.	7, 20	No	No change. Access points to parks are planned at an operational level and are positioned to provide appropriate and manageable access for park visitors, National Parks and Wildlife Service staff, and other services.	6
29	Suggested improvements in transport to access the parks.	7	No	No change. Improvements to transport options are beyond the scope of the management plan.	6
30	Ensure that the recreation and outdoor activities not at odds with protecting natural values.	9, 17	No	No change. Feedback is consistent with the direction in the plan. Consideration for recreation and outdoor activities are assessed prior to authorisation in parks.	5
31	Keep mountain biking in certain areas of the parks and leave some areas for foot access only.	9	No	Feedback is consistent with the direction in the plan. Mountain biking is only permitted on a number of trails in Glenthorne National Park-Ityamaiitpinna Yarta. There are walking trails only in the park in addition to those in Marino and Hallett Cove conservation parks.	5
32	Expressed support for the provision of cycling, horse riding, and suitable parking for horse floats in the southern area of Glenthorne National Park-Ityamaiitpinna Yarta.	10	No	No change. Feedback is consistent with the direction in the plan. These are being are being planned for during the establishment of the park.	4
33	Suggested a trail specifically for horse riding to encourage more use and avoid competition with cyclists and walkers.	10, 15	No	Horse riding is supported in the plan and is permitted on some management tracks within Glenthorne National Park-Ityamaiitpinna Yarta. A horse only trail is not envisaged in these parks during the	7



				life of this plan. All trail users are encouraged to adhere to the Trail Users Code of Practice.	
34	Suggested the plan provide more focus on connecting people with nature and the benefits it provides for the wellbeing of the community.	14	No	The plan acknowledges the positive outcomes that providing opportunities for recreation and connecting people with nature provides the community.	5
Theme 3: Working with community					
35	The statement about 2000 implements 'taken' from Hallett Cove should state that they are stored at the SA Museum. Otherwise the question remains, who has 'taken' them and where?	1	Yes	The sentence has been revised and 'taken' has been replaced with 'found'. The current location of the implements is inconsequential in the context of the strategic level of the plan. Further, the paragraph has been relocated to Theme 4 to provide an example of Kaurna heritage in the area prior to European colonisation.	3
36	'Community' should be broad enough to include Schools and other educational institutions. They are not mentioned in this section.	1	Yes	Theme 3 has been revised including an additional strategy to include a focus on facilitating relationships with schools and universities to support and encourage the use park features for education, and to undertake research and monitoring.	3
37	Suggested highlighting the social, economic, education and recreation benefits that cooperation between the RSPCA, government, education institutions, local businesses, and the community can provide.	5, 14, 19	Yes	The plan has been updated to highlight the benefits that can be achieved by relationships between stakeholders and users groups.	1
38	Expressed support for the involvement of volunteer groups in the detailed planning of maintenance within the parks.	5	No	No change required. The plan acknowledges that continuing to support and work with volunteers is a priority.	4
39	Including a focus on Kaurna culture and involving Kaurna in the management of parks is important.	18, 33	No	No change required. The plan supports working with Kaurna to promote their culture and incorporate traditional knowledge in park management programs.	4
40	Suggested including an area for bush food to educate people about native plants, their uses, and significance for Kaurna people.	19, 33	No	No change. Scope for these opportunities has been included in the plan.	5



Theme 4: Interpreting and protecting our shared history					
41	Suggested greater acknowledgement of Kurna heritage in the precinct to support the 'shared history' element.	1, 33	Yes	A new paragraph has been added to the beginning of the theme acknowledging Kurna occupation, culture, and connection to the area.	3
42	Suggested that protective measures be implemented to protect the remains of the Shepherd's Hut ruin in Hallett Cove Conservation Park.	1	No	Noted. The plan includes scope to protect structures and sites of heritage significance. Prioritisation and measures to be adopted will be developed at the operational level and not appropriate to be specified in this strategic plan.	6
43	Suggested that the olive grove in the heritage precinct of Glenthorne National Park-Ityamaiitpinna Yarta be removed to prevent the risk of fruit-fly and limit the spread of seedlings.	2, 4	No	Noted. The olive trees will be maintained and managed as a heritage grove. If fruit fly is identified the appropriate biosecurity measures will be implemented. Olive seedlings outside the grove will be managed as part of the ongoing pest management program.	7
44	Note that the historic bluestone quarry in Glenthorne National park-Ityamaiitpinna Yarta is mentioned but its location is not identified in either figure 1 or 2.	5	Yes	The site of quarry has been added to figures 1 and 2.	3
Theme 5: Managing fire					
45	Suggested detail on how prescribed burns take into account the risks and impacts of fire to native animals.	17	No	Planning for prescribed burns occurs at the operational level. This includes assessing the potential impact on native animals and plants, and ensures habitats are available for animals to move into until the original habitat regenerates.	6
46	Expressed support for low intensity prescribed burns. Suggested using these for training purposes.	21, 25	No	Prescribed burning in these parks has been supported in the plan. Training opportunities is an operational matter and not within scope to be discussed in this plan.	4



Table 3 – YourSAy Survey questions

The questions included in the survey are outlined below. In most cases, respondents provided a mix of quantitative (checkbox and lickert scale) and qualitative (open text) data within the survey. Seven survey respondents did not provide additional text for questions 3 and 4. In these cases, respondents feedback has been interpreted by the level of support indicated for each of the themes and objectives.

Number	Question	Question type
1	Postcode	Open text
2	What is your relationship with these parks?	Checkbox
3	The draft plan identifies five Themes that outline park priorities and management objectives and strategies. On a scale of 1 to 5 (1 being least important and 5 being most important), how important are these Themes to you?)	Lickert scale
4	Do you have any comments regarding any of the Themes?	Open text
5	Each Theme sets out an objective for management activities. On a scale of 1 to 5 (1 being strongly don't support and 5 being strongly support), please rate your level of support for each objective.	Lickert scale
6	How could the objectives be improved?	Open text
7	Are there any other objectives you think should be included?	Open text
8	Are there any strategies that you feel shouldn't be included? Why?	Open text
9	How could the strategies be improved? Are there strategies that you would like to see included that aren't currently in the draft plan? Please detail.	Open text
10	Do you have any other feedback on the draft plan which you would like considered in finalising the plan? Please refer to the page, section, paragraph and/or objective or strategy upon which you are commenting. If you are commenting on the accuracy of information, provide references for your information sources.	Open text