

## **APPENDIX 36**

Executive summary, Consultation Report of  
2011 Draft SMP community consultation process



# Brownhill Keswick Creek Draft Stormwater Management Plan

## Community Consultation Report

**Lead Consultant** URPS

**In association with** Natalie Fuller & Associates Pty Ltd  
Harlen Graphics

**Prepared for** Brownhill Keswick Creek Stormwater  
Project

**Consultant Project Manager** Victoria Haupt, Associate  
Suite 12/154 Fullarton  
(cnr Alexandra Ave)  
Rose Park, SA 5067  
Tel: (08) 8333 7999 Fax: (08) 8331 0017  
Email: victoria@urps.com.au  
Website: www.urps.com.au

© URPS

All rights reserved; these materials are copyright. No part may be reproduced or copied in any way, form or by any means without prior permission.

The ideas, concepts and methodology set out and described in this document are and remain the property of URPS and are provided to the client in confidence. They may not be used or applied by the recipient or disclosed to any other person without the prior written consent of URPS.

## Executive Summary

A consultation process was undertaken between 31 October and 12 December 2011 regarding the Brownhill Keswick Creek Draft Stormwater Management Plan (the Draft Plan).

The consultation process was undertaken by an independent consultant team comprised of URPS, Natalie Fuller & Associates Pty Ltd, and Harlen Graphics, on behalf of the five catchment Councils: the Cities of Adelaide, Burnside, Mitcham, Unley and West Torrens.

This report summarises the feedback collected via the consultation process on the Draft Plan.

The consultation process aimed to:

- Provide information to stakeholders and the broader community regarding the Draft Plan;
- Receive feedback on the Draft Plan from stakeholders and the broader community;
- Collate and summarise feedback on the Draft Plan for use by the five Councils in finalising the Draft Plan.

The consultation process comprised three key aspects, namely:

- Preparation and distribution of information materials and feedback form;
- Conduct of briefings, meetings and open days;
- Receipt, collation and analysis of feedback.

### Preparation and distribution of information materials

A suite of information materials was prepared including:

- A summary report which summarised key aspects of the Draft Plan;
- A summary brochure which provided an overview of the Draft Plan, the consultation process and how people could access more information;
- Fact sheets addressing key components of the Draft Plan.

A feedback form and reply paid envelope were also provided to assist members of the community to provide their feedback on the Draft Plan.

The information materials and the feedback form were made available via a direct mail out to:

- 26,539 property owners and occupiers across the catchment;

- A number of community, sporting and recreation groups, schools, libraries, community centres and Adelaide Park Lands user groups;
- Federal and State Members of Parliament, State government Ministers, government departments and Councils;

The information materials and the feedback form were also made available:

- At each Council's offices where consultation materials were displayed and made available to take home, and the Draft Plan was on display;
- On a dedicated web page linked to the home pages of the five catchment Councils which provided background information, details of the consultation process, and electronic copies of the information materials. The website also featured an online version of the feedback form.
- At the open days.

### Conduct of briefings, meetings and open days

Members of the wider community could obtain further information about the Draft Plan by attending any or all of three open days which were held during the consultation period at the Unley Town Hall, the Mitcham Civic Centre and the West Torrens Civic Centre. The open days provided an opportunity to learn more about the Draft Plan and ask questions of members of the project team. In total, approximately 160 people attended the three open days.

It was recognised that there were a number of key stakeholders that had a special interest in the Draft Plan and therefore a number of key groups within the community were invited to meet with members of the consultation team as part of the consultation process. In total, six groups accepted this invitation to meet, with some groups meeting on more than one occasion.

Feedback on the Draft Plan from representatives of the Kurna and Ramindjeri peoples was also pursued via telephone and direct mail but to date no response has been received.

Invitations to be briefed were provided to Federal and State Members of Parliament, State government Ministers, government departments and Councils. Briefings were held with the Department for Health, the State Emergency Service, and the Department for Water.

### Feedback received

In total, 2,172 feedback forms were returned by members of the community, of which 2,149 were from respondents with an interest in at least one of the five catchment councils.

Twenty nine written submissions were received from individuals, groups or organisations.

A petition stating that it contained 4,010 signatures was submitted to the City of Mitcham and forwarded onto the consultation process by the No Dam in Brownhill Creek Action Group. It is understood that since this time, the number of signatures to the petition has increased, but an updated version has not been received by the consultants undertaking the consultation process.

Five groups provided feedback via meetings with the consultant and/or project team. These groups comprised:

- Friends of Brown Hill Creek
- Residents living in close proximity to the proposed flood control dam at Brownhill Creek
- Residents for Effective Stormwater Solutions Inc. (RESS)
- South East City Residents Association
- Netley Residents' Association

The Department for Health, the State Emergency Service, and the Department for Water provided feedback at their briefing sessions, while written submissions were received from the Environment Protection Authority (EPA) and the Adelaide Airport.

### Summary of feedback received

Several key trends have emerged from the consultation process, taking account of the various avenues for community feedback.

Overall there is general recognition of the importance of undertaking flood mitigation works to reduce the impacts of flooding across the catchment. This was particularly evident from analysis of the feedback forms, with the majority of respondents (74% unweighted data) considering it is important/very important to undertake flood mitigation works compared with only 12% (unweighted data) not considering it not important/not very important. Respondents with an interest in West Torrens were more likely to consider flood mitigation works are important/very important.

Qualitative comments indicated that many respondents are supportive of 'getting on and doing something'. As several respondents stated:

*Well done! Please commence work as soon as possible.*

*We need some action now ie before it is too late. It's been 6 years since the last flood in Millswood and I can't see any changes.*

*Let's do it.*

This support for taking action is qualified however, by the need 'to get it right' and ensure that appropriate infrastructure measures are implemented that adequately reduce the impacts of flooding while at the same time delivering acceptable outcomes in terms of financial, environmental and social impacts. As one respondent stated:

*I would support this action as long as the appropriate environmental impact reviews had been done and there was minimal to no impact (detrimental) to the environment and local fauna.*

In relation to the Draft Plan, while views varied in relation to specific components of the Plan, the majority of respondents indicated overall support for the Plan. Based on the analysis of feedback forms, 71% of all respondents (unweighted) indicated support (4 or 5 rating) while only 13% opposed (1 or 2 rating), with an overall mean score of 3.9 (unweighted). Levels of support varied across the five catchment councils, with respondents with an interest in West Torrens showing higher levels of support (mean score of 4.4) compared to those in Mitcham (mean score 3.2).

Analysis of the feedback forms also clearly indicates that support for the Draft Plan was higher amongst those respondents who attributed higher levels of importance to the need for flood mitigation as well as those currently at risk of flooding.

In relation to specific infrastructure components proposed in the Draft Plan, analysis of the feedback forms indicated high levels of support for all components across all five catchment councils with the exception of the proposed flood control dam at Brownhill Creek where there were both lower and more variable levels of support across the councils.

In relation to the components that were supported, feedback form responses indicated consistently high levels of support from all respondents (with weighted and unweighted data showing negligible differences), being supported by at least 70% of respondents from each council area for:

- Channel upgrades
- Minor channel and bridge works
- Improvements to planning and development processes
- Improvements to community awareness and emergency response
- Improvements to creek maintenance

Support for these infrastructure components is reflected by respondents own words:

*Continual monitoring and improvements can only enhance the long term benefits of this stormwater management plan*

Creek maintenance is "always worthwhile"

*Anything that reduces the likelihood of my house flooding is good....*

*Channel upgrades will hopefully maintain environmental habitat and reduce erosion from flooding*

Components with more variation in levels of support were the detention basins at Glenside and the South Park Lands and at Ridge Park Reserve Myrtle Bank, and bypass and diversion culverts. These variations were however within 14% between the highest and lowest proportions of respondents indicating support. It is noted that respondents with an interest in both the City of Adelaide and Burnside were more likely to oppose these three components. Concerns regarding the proposed South Park Lands proposal were also expressed in a meeting conducted with the South East Residents Association (SECRA) and reiterated in their written submission.

Analysis of the feedback forms received showed that the flood control dam at Brownhill Creek Recreation Park was the least supported component of the Draft Plan overall and showed the most varying levels of support between the council areas. Using unweighted data, 60% of all respondents indicated support and 32% opposed. When subjected to weighting, support increased to 71% and opposition reduced to 19%.

This component of the Draft Plan was rated the lowest by respondents with an interest in each of the councils with the exception of West Torrens where it was rated the second lowest (after the detention basin at Ridge Park Reserve). Levels of support across councils ranged from 22% support and 74% opposition in Mitcham, to 82% support and 7% opposition in West Torrens.

A petition submitted to the City of Mitcham and copied to the consultation process contained 4,010 signatures supporting the statement *"We, the undersigned, hereby PETITION Council to protect the environment and heritage of Brownhill Creek by opposing the damming of the Creek"*. It is understood that since being submitted to the consultation process, the number of signatories to this petition has increased.

Based on the feedback forms as well as information received via meetings and written submissions (excluding the petition which is dealt with separately below), three key viewpoints emerged with respect to the flood control dam in Brown Hill Creek:

- Strong opposition to any dam on Brownhill Creek with a view that alternative infrastructure solutions that are available;
- Strong opposition to the proposed location of the dam in the Brownhill Creek Recreation Park based on concerns regarding visual amenity, heritage and the natural environment, but open to the possibility of another location along Brownhill Creek;
- Support for the dam together with concerns that the 'no dams' position may continue to delay implementation of mitigation works.

These differing viewpoints are reflected in qualitative comments recorded on feedback forms which included:

*No dam. Explore other options.*

*This is environmentally destructive and economically irresponsible. I suggest you look for alternative methods rather than putting a 15 metre cement wall through a beautiful national park, which I frequent on a constant basis, and grew up playing in and around*

*Brownhill Creek is about keeping the flow, not major infrastructure to retain water. The creek needs to be returned to its natural course over time, with proper stormwater management along its course.*

*Brownhill Creek Recreation Park is an historic natural place for the public (from all over Adelaide) to enjoy. Dams do not have a place in a public park. It is of heritage value and would be ruined.*

*A dam in Brownhill Creek Recreation Park would be environmentally negligent and economically irresponsible.*

*Dams have been used in England to prevent flooding, which have been successful, so I believe it will also work here*

*We support the idea of a controlled dam at Brownhill Creek Recreation Park providing the area remains aesthetically unharmed.*

*I strongly agree with the flood control dam. Strongly agree with other flood mitigation proposals. Strongly agree with this construction*

*Build a dam for goodness sake!*

*I consider that the dam is essential in providing flood mitigation for many flood prone properties*

In addition to this feedback received via feedback forms, other written submissions and meetings, the petition received specifically called for “Council to protect the environment and heritage of Brownhill Creek by opposing the damming of the Creek”.

Other comments and views that were expressed regarding the Draft Plan included:

- Concerns relating to the communication and consultation process both in relation to the current Draft Plan and on previous versions, while others acknowledged the extent of the direct mail out undertaken for the current consultation process and the number of open days conducted across the catchment.
- Queries relating to the timing for implementation of the Draft Plan (once approved) as well as how it will be funded. Others expressed frustration about the continued delay in implementing the Draft Plan.

- Specific design and ongoing management details regarding the detention basin proposed at the Glenside Campus.
- The need for risk mitigation and safety factors to be considered as part of the detailed design of the proposed works.
- The desire by the SES to share project flood modelling to inform their FloodSafe program and Emergency Response Plan to effectively target community engagement.
- Scepticism regarding the cost effectiveness of the Draft Plan.
- The assumptions the Draft Plan is based upon.
- The scope of the Draft Plan, including its lack of consideration of retention and reuse of stormwater, non-structural solutions like FloodSafe and revegetation, stormwater quality, water conservation, amenity, conservation, heritage, biodiversity, recreation and environmental flows.
- Concern over private property acquisition associated with channel upgrades.
- Concerns relating to the South Park Lands detention system including adverse impacts on the butterfly habitat, mosquitoes, dust, odour and pollution, contamination risk, impact on the BMX facility and impacts on trees. Also concerns that the Park Lands are being appropriated to protect private property.
- Alternative and/or additional flood mitigation options to those that are proposed in the Draft Plan.
- The need for all upstream mitigation actions to be undertaken in an environmentally and socially sustainable manner.