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# Overview

Bayside City Council has carried out a community engagement program to inform the development of the Red Bluff to Half Moon Bay Masterplan. This document outlines the engagement approach and provides a summary of stakeholder and community feedback on the Draft Masterplan.

# 1. Background

Development of foreshore precinct masterplans is identified in the Bayside Coastal Management Plan (2014) as a key tool in retaining and protecting the unique characteristics of each foreshore precinct. It is also used by Council and other stakeholders to gain approval from the Department of Environment, Land, Water and Planning (DELWP) to implement projects within the precinct.

The Red Bluff to Half Moon Bay precinct extends between Potter Street and Arkaringa Crescent in Black Rock. Half Moon Bay is unique along the Bayside foreshore as it supports a number of highly utilised recreational facilities in a very confined space.

Included within this precinct is the popular Half Moon Bay swimming beach, Half Moon Bay Surf Life Saving Club, Black Rock Yacht Club, the Cerberus Beach House kiosk and restaurant, and three private use bathing boxes.

The indigenous sculpture ‘The Ancient Yarra River with Bunjil’s eggs’ by Glenn Romanis, inspired by Carolyn Briggs’s story (Elder of the Boon wurrung) ‘the time of chaos’, is located on the top of Red Bluff. It depicts the ancient Yarra River, where it originally flowed 10,000 years ago and six eggs. The eggs represent the six traditional groups of the Boon wurrung people. The sculpture is encompassed in the shape of Bunjil’s eye, which represents his ever watchful gaze. This installation is oriented geographically to how Port Phillip Bay is today.

Half Moon Bay is a distinctive part of the foreshore with two rocky points, Red Bluff and Black Rock Point containing the bay to the north and south. The wreck of HMVS Cerberus is located in the waters of Half Moon Bay and three public boat ramps are also located within the site.

Development of the 2017 Masterplan will inform Council’s capital works program, funding applications and priorities for infrastructure renewal, replacement and redevelopment over the next ten years along this area.

## 1.1 Definitions and scope

Within this document, reference is made to precinct stakeholders. These stakeholders are:

#### Adjacent property owners/residents – living opposite the foreshore

#### Nearby property owners/residents – living within 500m of the foreshore

#### Foreshore users – cyclists, walkers, swimmers, wind surfers etc

#### Onsite stakeholder groups - Half Moon Bay Surf Life Saving Club (HMBSLC), Black Rock Yacht Club, Black Rock Sailing School

#### Private and commercial users - Boat Shed Licensors, Cerberus Beachouse Café & Restaurant

#### Environmental and ‘Friends of’ groups - Black Rock and Sandringham Conservation Association (BRASCA), Friends of Native Vegetation, • Friends of the Cerberus Inc

#### Access and disability groups

* Traditional custodian/Indigenous groups
* Government agencies - Parks Victoria and Department of Environment, Land Water and Planning (DEWLP)
* Fishers/anglers – accessing jetty at Half Moon Bay. Predominantly used during snapper season (Sept-May)

## 1.2 Glossary

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Item | Definition |
| AS2890 | Parking facilities standards |
| BCMP | Bayside Coastal Management Plan |
| BRASCA | Black Rock and Sandringham Conservation Association |
| CPTED | Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design |
| DEWLP | Department of Environment, Land, Water and Planning |
| GPT | Gross pollutant trap |
| HMBSLC | Half Moon Bay Surf Lifesaving Club |
| PWC | Personal water craft |
| Stakeholders | See above for stakeholder list |

## 1.3 Related Council documents and consultations

* Bayside Coastal Management Plan 2014
* Bayside Open Space Strategy 2012
* Sandringham Foreshore Management Plan 2010
* Jetty Road Path Improvement Project 2014

# 2. Engagement process

## 2.1 Engagement purpose

The engagement process was designed to provide stakeholders and the broader community with the opportunity to provide input into the design, staging and implementation priorities for completion of on-ground works on Council managed land.

Council sought community feedback on the following:

* The Draft Masterplan in its entirety
* Car parking and traffic flow
* Pedestrian movement through the precinct
* Half Moon Bay Surf Lifesaving Club’s request for changes to the facility
* How the space at Half Moon Bay Lookout is used and type of seating/picnic furniture to be installed; and
* Options to enhance usage of top carpark (Carpark B13).

Feedback from the community guides the development of the final Masterplan for the area, which in turn will guide future use of the site and capital projects for the next ten years.

## 2.2 Engagement methodology

The engagement utilised a number of methods, covering both onsite stakeholders and the broader community across two phases: the analysis phase; and consultation on the draft master plan.

It was identified that extensive community consultation relevant to the defined area had already been undertaken with the local community, clubs, businesses and other community organisations through the *Bayside Coastal Management Plan 2014* and *Bayside Open Space Strategy 2012*. Therefore, the consultation project commenced with an analysis of previously collected consultation information (with confirmation from stakeholders) to inform development of The Red Bluff to Half Moon Bay Foreshore Draft Master Plan; followed by distribution of the draft Master Plan for broader community consultation and feedback. This report presents the findings from the post-draft consultation phase.

### 2.2.1 Analysis phase

Prior to the development of the Draft Masterplan, the following consultation activities were undertaken:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Date | Activity |
| Early 2017 | **Review of previous consultation**Community consultation and Council endorsed recommendations and priorities arising from the following documents were reviewed and reconfirmed with precinct stakeholders:* Bayside Coastal Management Plan 2014; and
* Bayside Open Space Strategy 2012.
 |
| Tues 21 March 20173pm – 6 pm Black Rock Yacht Club14 attendees, representation from 7 stakeholder groups | **Precinct Stakeholder Meetings**The meeting confirmed the project scope and objectives and facilitated discussion of key issues and opportunities to be considered in development of the Master Plan. The draft meeting notes were supplied to all precinct stakeholders allowing those unable to attend to provide further comment via e-mail and phone via the Project Manager to inform development of the Draft Masterplan. |
| Fri 21/4/2017 10am-12pmBlack Rock Yacht Club6 attendees | **Site meeting**Site walkover with Traditional Owners and Community Stakeholders.The three Registered Aboriginal Parties (RAP) applicants invited to review and discuss cultural heritage factors to be considered in the development of the Masterplan. |

### 2.2.2 Community consultation phase

Community consultation on the draft Master Plan was completed over a six week period from 28 August 2017 to 25 October 2017. This included:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Date | Activity |
| Aug - Oct 2017 | **On site signage displays*** General signs along the foreshore announcing the opportunity to have your say in 4 locations
* Specific signage to reflect proposals at 3 key sites – Red Bluff beach access, Red Bluff Look out, B14 Car Park
 |
| Aug 2017 | **Flyer distribution*** Letterbox drop to all properties within 1km of catchment announcing opportunity to have your say
* Flyers left at the Cerberus Café and HMBLSC for public collection
 |
| Aug 2017 | **Other communication/project promotion*** Advertisements in Bayside Leader newspaper
* Facebook promotions
* Emails to Bayside City Council networks (3,500+ people)
* Council news item
 |
| Sat 16 Sept 2017 2pm–4pm Black Rock Yacht Club40 attendees | **Saturday Community Information Session**This provided an opportunity for interested people to attend and ask questions, provide direct feedback to Council officers and the consultant team.  |
| 25 Aug – 25 Oct 2017 1,300 unique visitors49 unique contributors | **Council website** **(Have Your Say:** [**www.yoursay.bayside.vic.gov.au**](http://www.yoursay.bayside.vic.gov.au)**)**The draft Master Plan and full report was displayed on Council’s website for community feedback via the ‘Have Your Say’ online portal. |
| Sun 24 Sept 2017 2-3pm18 attendees | **Walking Tour**Council officer lead a site based walking tour to highlight specific areas of interest within the area and obtain community feedback. |

# 3. Consultation findings

The following section summarises the key themes which arose in community feedback on the Draft Master Plan. In the interest of stakeholder and community privacy, individual quotes have not been included within this public document. Where there was more than one mention of a topic or item, the number of mentions has been specified in brackets and italics.

## 3.1 Support for actions

Throughout the feedback a range of specific actions and approaches received positive feedback and community support.

* Re-setting of the entry to B13 car park *(4 mentions).*
* Use of brush matting and Boxthorn to prevent erosion *(2 mentions)*.
* Realignment of the Bay Trail at B15 car park.
* Pedestrian walkway from car park B15 to Cerberus Way (improve safety).
* Raingardens and GPTs will help reduce stormwater run-off and pollution in the bay.
* Support increased measures to prevent people accessing the top of the cliffs (provided it doesn’t negatively impact on the view).

## 3.3 Half Moon Bay Surf Lifesaving Club premises extension

HMBSLSC patrols the foreshore with members trained and prepared for emergency situations. The Club identified a number of challenges with the current structure has approached Council to request modifications be made to the structure to accommodate the changing needs of the Club.

### 3.3.1 Challenges with feedback on HMBLSC changes

Whilst Council requested community feedback on the proposal from HMBSLSC, it acknowledges that there are some challenges when considering this feedback, namely:

* Any potential works will require Coastal Management consent from DELWP, regardless of community opinion.
* A Cultural Heritage Management Plan is also required before any development can be considered due to risk of disturbance to the culturally sensitive Shell Midden site.
* Feedback provided was predominantly from members of the HMBSLSC, and is in favour of the extension.
* Due to the time of year of consultation and challenging weather conditions, it was hard to reach community members not associated with the onsite clubs (eg. HMBSLC, Black Rock Yacht Club)

Council recognises that the Shell Midden site at Half Moon Bay is extensive and not well documented, and there has been significant site disturbance through historical development building work that took place prior to the site being recognised as culturally sensitive. Preparation of a Cultural Heritage Management Plan (CMHP) in accordance with the Aboriginal Heritage Act 2016 is required to determine site protection and the appropriateness of and impacts of any future building works in the area. Only after the Cultural Heritage Management PlanCHMP has been developed can the sustainability of the site for further building and vegetation works be assessed. The cultural heritage management planCMHP will also address other concerns raised within this consultation, specifically:

* Loss of vegetation and erosion issues due to past building activities in the area;
* Updating of picnic and seating areas; and
* Retaining and rehabilitating vegetation between boatsheds and the lifesaving club.

### 3.3.1 Online feedback

The online forum run through the *Have Your Say* website covered three questions specific to the plans around the HMBSLC extension. This forum was promoted through flyers and letter box drops to the local area, social media posts, Council news articles and advertisements in the local newspaper. Respondents were promoted to type in their answers. These typed answers were then analysed to identify themes, as presented in the following sections.

### 3.3.1 HMBSLC extension approval

The initial online forum topic asked if the HMBSLC should extend their premises. Of the 29 responses, 22 were in favour of the extension and 3 were against, with the remaining 4 suggesting some form of alteration with caveats.

Of those who felt the extension application should be approved, the primary reasons stated revolved around a perception that the proposed land for the extension is unused, that the LSC is a vital service to the community, and that the beach is busy.

Two of those who didn’t support the extension and one who specified caveats stated a concern that the proposed new ramp would act as a groyne, with flow-on effects risking the quality of coastal beaches. The focus of this question was more so on the extension aspect of the proposal therefore these comments were not in line with the topic. This has been considered in a later section specific to the boat ramp aspect of the application. A further comment highlighted the risk of loss of vegetation and potential erosion from extending the building. One of those commenting mentioned the Shell Midden site as a factor in their decision-making.

A few suggestions were made that may alleviate the need for an extension:

* Council to provide storage for the HMBSLC "surf boats" and other equipment on council owned property, inland;
* Give the lifesaving club exclusive use of the existing ramp opposite the Beach House;
* Give the lifesaving club a motorised vehicle to transport equipment; and
* Build upwards (one additional level) instead of outwards.

### 3.3.2 HMBSLC veranda alteration

When asked in the online forum whether the HMBLSC should be permitted to alter its veranda to allow for ramp widening, all of the 12 responses were in favour of this alteration. Need for compliance was a strong theme in these comments (9 comments mentioned compliance). No concerns about potential negative impacts of the upgrade were raised.

### 3.3.3 HMBSLC ramp extension

The third question on the online forum asked whether the boat ramp should be extended along the seawall to allow access from the existing roller doors. Ten out of the 12 responses were in support of this plan, primarily due to perceptions that it would be safer for lifesavers and the general public.

One comment expressed concern regarding the environmental impact and one comment was not relating to the topic. Furthermore, it should be considered that there were three comments in the initial question (about the building extension) that raised concerns about the potential for a boat ramp extension to create a groyne.

### 3.3.4 Additional consultation feedback

Feedback on this topic was also received through information sessions and email submissions.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Topic | Community feedback |
| Vegetation protection | Concerns regarding loss of vegetation and erosion issues due to past building activities in the area. |
| Not proceed with application | The consultation revealed support *(5 mentions)* for refusing the HMBLSC extension application, received via email directly to a Council Officer. A further four people mentioned that it is common for LSC to have to carry their equipment over sand and therefore current infrastructure should be adequate. |
| Building aesthetics | The current building architecture not visually appealing *(3 mentions)*, looks incomplete.Area around the current building being untidy *(2 mentions)*. |

## 3.4 Item-specific feedback

### 3.4.1 B13 car park

Whilst a number of people praised the resetting of the entry to this car park, there was a concern raised that users of the bay trail need to be more aware of traffic interaction.

A range of specific concerns were raised during the consultation regarding this location:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Topic | Community feedback |
| Traffic flow and signage | Suggest the northern exit be made left turn only.Install signs in B15 to encourage use of B13. |
| Car park surface | Query as to whether line marking is possible on a gravel surface.Concern regarding the edge of asphalt for disabled parking bays (uneven walking surface). |
| Fees | Suggest reduced parking fees to encourage use. |
| Stormwater run-off | Drain maintenance and cleaning needed. |

### 3.4.2 B14 car park

The key concern raised for this car parking area was the mixed use (boat launching, car traffic and pedestrians) and how these users can safely share this space. Specifically:

* There may be potential safety challenges due to the sharing of boat launching and waiting areas with other patrons;
* Concern that pedestrian areas are over-regulated and may not be used as instructed;
* Concern that boat ramp users may not follow safety regulations; and
* Perception that there is a missed opportunity for re-structuring to better meet these mixed use needs.

### 3.4.3 B15 car park

The majority of comments regarding this car park were providing positive feedback on the planned change of structure for pedestrian access thoroughfare and stormwater management (see section 3.1). However, there was a suggestion that pedestrians should give way at the car park entry and a concern that the raised pavement may be a problem for cyclists.

### 3.4.4 Black Rock Yacht Club

Eight comments were submitted raising concerns about the area in front of the yacht club (rigging area) and the risk to public safety by conflicting usage by pedestrians, boat ramp users, and public motor vehicle access. There were calls for either improved marking or contrasting surface area colour so pedestrians and traffic can be more aware of the risks, timed parking restrictions (no access during daylight savings), or limiting access to boats only.

### 3.4.5 Boat ramps

Whilst some community members indicated that they feel the current boat ramp provision is sufficient, there were others who were concerned about potential safety risks with increasing mixed use and inappropriate use when sandbars are present. A suggested solution to the potential increased use was to install cameras that feed through to a phone app so potential users can remotely view whether the boat ramp is busy.

One community member suggested that a dedicated emergency ramp may be necessary, however there were also concerns raised about the potential damage to the bay if an additional ramp was added *(3 mentions)* or if the bluestone sea wall ramps were altered.

### 3.4.6 Cerberus Beach House Café and Restaurant

The general theme of stated concerns relating to the Cerberus Beach House Café and Restaurant relate to appropriateness of car parking design.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Topic | Community feedback |
| Car park orientation | Concern that the loading bay positioning may conflict with foot traffic.Designated bus parking being of insufficient size.Concern that the plan places prioritization of parking for a private business over community access.Suggestion of reverse-in parking near the café. |
| Bollards | Call for urgent installation of bollards. |

### 3.4.7 Boat sheds

Feedback received regarding the boat sheds was mostly technical in nature.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Topic | Community feedback |
| Lease terms | Suggestion that references to lease terms not be included in the document. |
| Value | Suggestion that the value of the boat sheds be better recognised in the document. |

### 3.4.8 Amenity and maintenance

A range of suggestions regarding particulars of current infrastructure maintenance and upgrades to improve amenity were put forth:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Topic | Community feedback |
| Sea walls | Suggested linking of sea walls to improve safety *(2 mentions)*. |
| Rails and fencing | Query as to why hand rails are required on both sides of access ramps.Concern that the steel handrail material will be too hot and slippery.Concern that some features of the proposed fence to block access to the top of cliffs will introduce issues. Specifically the top rail will make scaling the fence easier, fence height too high and risk of increased erosion from construction.Concerns regarding the proposed security fencing for the base of red bluff cliff. Specifically that it will become damaged from coastal climate, construction will damage the area, it won’t deter people from using the area, and it will detract from the ambience of the area. |
| Signage | Concern that the proposed signage for white cliffs might impact on the ambience of the area and erosion *(2 mentions)*.Call for improved signage on Beach Road.Request for reinstatement of compass plate at Red Bluff. |
| Maintenance | More volunteers need to undertake foreshore weed eradication *(2 mentions)*.Rock walls on access ramps require constant maintenance *(2 mentions)* with one mention of the need for qualified stonemasons.Call for walking trail maintenance *(2 mentions)* to cover exposed roots and repair pot holes.Call for removal of waste rubble from the beach to improve safety and visual appeal.Request for specific tree overhang management strategies, including avoidance of overhang removal and pruning flush with bough.Suggestion that more bins be installed in the area, and improved maintenance of current bins. |
| Public amenity | Call for a re-design of the public toilets at HMBSLC *(3 mentions)*Call for more picnic areas in the shade *(2 mentions)*.Call for more locations with water available for dogs and birds.Call for new picnic tables to not be made of metal due to heat.Call for secure bike parking. |
| Erosion protection | Recommend installation of an erosion protection wall in the Midden area. |

There were also a range of suggestions regarding the creative and content for signage to be installed at the base of Red Bluff Cliff:

* “Danger, cliffs insecure”
* “Do not climb on cliffs”
* “Climbing destabilises cliffs causing erosion”
* “Climbing damages indigenous plants which prevent erosion”
* “For your safety, cliff eroding dangerously”
* “Entry beyond this fence is illegal and could attract a fine”
* Use imagery for those who don’t speak English

### 3.4.9 Vegetation and Views

Maintaining indigenous vegetation in the area is governed by a Vegetation Protection Overlay (VPO1) to maintain habitats for local wildlife. Bayside Council recognises the importance of consulting with the BRASCA on any works that may impact on the conservation of this area.

Consultation feedback put forth a range of suggestions regarding vegetation and views in the defined area.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Topic | Community feedback |
| Protected vegetation | Acknowledge Mallee Drumstick fungus and ensure works are not undertaken in known sites.Call for repair of vegetation areas where insect habitats have been removed or damaged and prevent future removal or damage. |
| Infill planting required | Bay Trail path between love Street and Arkaringa Crescent.‘zig zag path’ opposite Bayview CrescentExtend E4 area as marked on page 10 to include the space between the Lifesaving club and boatshed. |
| Offsets | Require offsets for removal of vegetation to occur in the Bayside foreshore and not elsewhere. |
| Views | Concerns regarding new signage blocking views.Concern that boxthorn will detract from the view, coupled with a call for more plants in front of cliffs *(3 responses)*.Open-up tea-tree areas for improved views and more parking. |
| HMVS Cerberus | One person called for there to be more focus on the HMVS Cerberus as it is perceived to be a drawcard to the area (including works to turn it into a reef), whereas another called for it to be removed or for maintenance funding to be ceased. |
| Signage | Request for reinstatement of interpretive signage regarding the Cerberus, but in a way that doesn’t interrupt views. |
| Vegetation maintenance | Palm tree removal will require harnessed professionals *(2 mentions)*.Suggestion that rainwater be channelled into bushes instead of stormwater. |

### 3.4.10 Walking trails

There were two key items of feedback relating to walking trails:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Topic | Community feedback |
| Potter Street lookout | Concern about the loss of access to Potter Street lookout *(7 mentions)* |
| Cyclist use of trails | Concerns regarding cyclist use of proposed new crossing locations. This includes a call for cyclist speed restrictions when approaching intersections, warnings for trail users when they are approaching an intersection, and removal of vegetation for better sightlines. |

### 3.4.11 Out of scope feedback – Seaview Crescent

A range of additional feedback items were received specific to the Seaview Crescent end of the beach, which falls outside of the geographic area of the Red Bluff and Half Moon Bay master plan. These have been noted so that they can be considered in the Council planning processes for which they are applicable.

* Clean up dead trees.
* Drinking fountain.
* Upgrade toilet block.
* Fix / clean up drain (rubbish and lose rocks).
* Clean up dead seaweed.
* Open up the viewing area.
* Additional seating.
* Dogs only allowed in Seaview area or Edward Street Beach.

## 3.5 Error corrections

Community and stakeholder feedback identified some potential errors in the Masterplan document which will be reviewed and amended if validated.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Page | Correction |
| 3 | Review photo dates for photos 6, 7 and 8 and update as necessary. |
| 2 | Amend text relating to land management to correctly express Parks Victoria involvement.“*Parks Victoria manage the Black Rock Jetty, as Committee of Management on behalf of the Crown (State Government of Victoria). The Department of Environment, Land, Water and Planning (DELWP) are responsible for the sea wall and other coastal stability measures at Half Moon Bay and elsewhere along the Port Phillip shoreline.”* |
| 2 | Replace ‘Bathing Boxes’ label on photo 4 with ‘Boatsheds’ |
| 9 | Replace reference to ‘Black Rock sandstone’ with ‘Beaumaris sandstone’ as per the Geoscience Australia reference. <http://dbforms.ga.gov.au/pls/www/geodx.strat_units.sch_full?wher=stratno=1832>  |
| 10 | Re-word as per suggested text to celebrate vegetation more and recognize the purpose as gardens for wildlife: *“This area of foreshore includes Coastal Headland Scrub (EVC 161) and Spray-Zone Coastal Shrubland (EVC 876) with the varied vegetation providing important habitat [and refuge] for [a range of indigenous] native birds, mammals, especially bats, reptiles and invertebrates in contrast to most of the neighbouring urban environment.”* Words in square brackets could be removed |
| 2 | Replace boat shed numbers with address details |