Submissions from Public Consultation March 2023 – Yanagin Reserve

1.

We have no objection whatsoever

2.

Agreed that a land swap makes the most sense, but that it should be a 1 for 1 land swap, i.e. no net loss to the Heritage Agreement and community land, even if that means more complex borders. The community should not have to suffer a loss because of historic encroachment which is not of its making; it was a matter for the home-owner to do their due diligence and respond accordingly.

3.

My husband and I support the proposed realignment of the boundary. I consider that if this is not accepted, there will be significant costs and inconvenience for 37 Yanagin and the council - a "simple" realignment of a fence line will have little impact

4.

Encroachments like this onto AHC land, especially HA land, should be met with penalty and a requirement to remediate. By doing a land swap the landholder gets their outcome at ratepayer cost and are off scott free. AHC has a role and responsibility to protect public land from encroachment such as this and must send a signal that it is wrong rather than facilitating it.

5.

By doing a land exchange, the property owner is removed from responsibility and gets exactly what they are after. The owner should be given a fine and required to remove private infrastructure and restore the area of encroachment on Yanagin Reserve. Yanagin Reserve is public land and a public asset, and under Heritage Agreement, and as such the property owners should be held to account. The reserve has valuable biodiversity assets and the Adelaide Hills Council has responsibility to protect them.