



COMMUNITY CONSULTATION  
REPORT

Borough of Queenscliffe Draft Coastal and Marine  
Management Plan

## Contents

### Contents 2

1.	Introduction .....	3
2.	Key themes from DEECA feedback and our response.....	5
3.	Key themes from the community feedback and our response .....	6
3.1	Quantum of actions in the plan and resourcing implementation .....	6
3.2	Document format, mapping and precinct descriptions .....	8
3.3	Native vegetation and weeds.....	8
3.4	Use and development and non-dependent uses .....	9
3.5	Master Planning and associated planning.....	10
3.6	Historic heritage considerations .....	10
3.7	Hooded Plover.....	12
3.8	Evidence base for the plan .....	12
3.9	Collaboration with other land managers .....	13
4.	Summary of key changes to the Draft Plan .....	14

DRAFT

# 1. Introduction

The draft Borough of Queenscliffe Coastal and Marine Management Plan was open for public comment from the 6<sup>th</sup> of June 2024 to the 5<sup>th</sup> of July 2024. The Draft Plan was made available on the Borough of Queenscliffe website, and the public comment period was advertised in the Victorian Government Gazette, the Geelong Advertiser and via Council's social media.

In addition:

- A media release was issued and published in the Bellarine Times.
- A number of community groups and organisations were directly contacted and invited to make a submission.
- A community drop-in session was held in Queenscliff on the 23rd of June.
- Separate meetings were held with community and environment groups on the 24th of June.

A total of nine (9) submissions were received by the closing date and a further two (2) late submissions were accepted.

Many of the public submissions contained commentary on matters including perceived inaction by Council, the exclusion of non-marine and coastal Crown land from the planning scope, the scope and currency of related Council plans, the Guidelines for the preparation of Coastal and Marine Management Plans and actions of other public land managers. We have not responded to these parts of the submissions in this report as they were out of scope for the project.

One submission proposed a significant number of alternative actions to replace those within the Draft Plan. The majority of these actions had previously been suggested to Council and responded to during the drafting process overseen by the Coastal and Marine Management Plan Project Steering Committee. This included considering the alternative actions in the action prioritisation process and incorporating alternative actions into the draft where they contribute to the objectives of the plan, were feasible and evidence based. We have not responded to the individual alternative actions proposed in this submission given they have previously been considered and addressed.

Issues raised in the consultation process have been grouped into themes, with the key issues summarised and responded to in this report. The key themes raised through the consultation process were:

- Quantum of actions in the plan and resourcing implementation
- Document formatting, mapping and precinct descriptions
- Native vegetation and weeds
- Use and development and non-dependent uses
- Master Planning and associated planning
- Historic heritage considerations
- Hooded Plover
- Evidence base for the plan
- Collaboration with other land managers

Council also received additional feedback from the Department of Energy, Environment and Climate Action (DEECA), which focused on ensuring the Plan aligns with the Guidelines for the preparation of Coastal and Marine Management Plans. The key issues raised in the DEECA submission included:

- Document formatting and mapping
- Roles and responsibilities for actions
- Additional detail on the *Marine and Coastal Act*, *Marine and Coastal Policy* and *Flora and Fauna Guarantee Act*
- Priority areas for environmental works
- Coastal Moonah Woodland community
- Coastal Protection Assets

## 2. Key themes from DEECA feedback and our response

Theme	Feedback summary	Response
Document formatting and mapping	<p>Colour coding for Goal 1 and Goal 3 are difficult to distinguish, precinct action coding requires clarification</p> <p>Improve the clarity and detail of maps in Section 2</p>	<p>Council will review colour coding for Goals and legend for precinct actions.</p> <p>Council will update the maps in Section 2 to improve readability.</p>
Roles and responsibilities for actions	<p>Consider adding a lead and partner to actions</p> <p>Council should be the lead for Action P3.2 (Implementation of the Dog Beach Adaptation Plan)</p>	<p>Council will update the 'partners' column in action tables and identify an action lead and partners</p> <p>Identify Council as the lead for Action P3.2</p>
Additional detail on the <i>Marine and Coastal Act</i> , <i>Marine and Coastal Policy</i> and <i>Flora and Fauna Guarantee Act</i>	<p>Expand the <i>Marine and Coastal Act</i> and <i>Marine and Coastal Policy</i> descriptions to include works, use and development</p> <p>Improve formatting of the <i>Flora Fauna Guarantee Act</i> section</p>	<p>Council will expand the policy and legislation descriptions and update formatting</p>
Priority areas for environmental works	<p>Request for the CMMP to include mapping of priority areas for works and more specific actions targeted to priority areas</p>	<p>Detailed priority areas and more specific actions will be defined through the development of the Native Vegetation Plan.</p> <p>Council will update the Draft Plan to more clearly outline the approach and will add an action deliverable to prepare and publish an addendum / map of priority areas once this work is complete.</p>
Coastal Moonah Woodland community	<p>Conservation actions for Coastal Moonah Woodland to be specific</p>	<p>Further work is required to identify the location of all of the Coastal Moonah Woodland community (or components of the community) on council managed marine and coastal Crown land before specific actions targeting the</p>

Theme	Feedback summary	Response
		<p>conservation of this community can be defined.</p> <p>Council will update the Draft Plan to include an action to undertake mapping and a quality assessment of Coastal Moonah Woodland (to inform the Native Vegetation Management Plan)</p>
Coastal protection assets	Clarity regarding the ownership and maintenance responsibilities for coastal protection assets has been provided by DEECA.	<p>There remains lack of clarity around ownership/management of coastal protection assets and Council feels there may be some inconsistencies between DEECA's advice and VEAC recommendations.</p> <p>Council will continue to work with DEECA through finalisation of the Draft to come to an agreed understanding of roles and responsibilities.</p>

### 3. Key themes from the community feedback and our response

#### 3.1 Quantum of actions in the plan and resourcing implementation

##### *Issues raised*

Several submissions raised concerns about the number of actions in the plan, including the number of unfunded actions and the ability to resource implementation of the plan.

##### *Response*

The CMMP is a strategic document that sets out the actions required to achieve its objectives. Once approved, the Plan will guide applications for external funding including from the Victorian Government. It is the view of Council that the financial scope of the Plan should stretch beyond what we know we can currently fund. The intention is that this CMMP sets the foundations for management and shifts Council's from reactive management to a more planned and systematic approach. An annual planning process will be undertaken to inform both Council's budget process and to identify opportunities to secure external funding.

#### **No change to the Draft Plan**

#### 3.2 Document format, mapping and precinct descriptions

##### *Issues raised*

Two submissions raised issues with the format of the document, including lack of clarity and detail in the maps and the amount of background information in the Plan. Comparisons were made with other Coastal and Marine Management Plans with a preference for the Plan to be more like those that had been developed by other marine and coastal Crown land managers. There was also a request to include maps of zones and overlays at the precinct scale. Additional feedback was made regarding precinct descriptions including requests for more detail on some aspects and clarification on inclusions/exclusions and the extent of precincts.

### *Response*

Council acknowledges that the maps contained in the Draft Plan lack detail and were not of sufficient resolution to support interpretation. There were also issues with the readability of the online version of the document and some errors occurred during the graphic design process.

It is Council's view that the supporting information in the Draft Plan is necessary to describe the range of issues and opportunities considered during the planning process as is required under the Guidelines for the preparation of Coastal and Marine Management Plans.

Council will undertake further work to edit the document and improve the layout and design including the readability of maps. Council will also review and update the precinct descriptions in response to individual comments made. Council previously investigated the inclusion of maps displaying zones and overlays however it is not feasible to provide this information within the document in an accessible manner.

## **Update Draft Plan as per response**

### 3.3 Native vegetation and weeds

#### *Issues raised*

Several submissions raised issues with respect to the management of native vegetation and weeds. Some submissions called for an increased focus and investment in the control of weeds and felt that Council should not be undertaking revegetation activities or works to control access (such as fencing) as they felt the most important strategy was the removal of weeds. However, other submissions called for greater emphasis on revegetation including replanting of climate resilient species and/or expansion of native vegetation into open space areas. There was also a request for a greater focus on vegetation and biodiversity audits.

#### *Response*

Council acknowledges that many individuals and organisations feel strongly that controlling weeds should be the highest priority. However effectively controlling well-established weeds can be difficult and costly, and consideration must be given to the feasibility of reducing spread and achieving outcomes for areas of high value. It is Council's position that priority actions to support coastal vegetation communities should be evidence-based. Council is currently undertaking a project to map and assess the condition of native vegetation communities on marine and coastal Crown land. This information will inform the development of a Native Vegetation Management Plan, which will consider the range of threats to native vegetation, set out detailed priority areas and on-ground actions and describe the expected outcomes from implementation of the plan.

The preparation of the Native Vegetation Management Plan was listed as a medium-term action in the Draft Plan – this will be brought forward as a short-term action in the Final Plan. An additional action will be included to undertake detailed mapping and a quality assessment of the threatened Coastal Moonah Woodland Community. Further details regarding Council's identification of detailed priorities for management of native vegetation through the development of the Native Vegetation Plan will be included in the supporting narrative under Chapter 5. An additional action deliverable be included to prepare and publish a map of priority areas once this plan is complete.

## Update Draft Plan as per response

### 3.4 Use and development and non-dependent uses

#### *Issues raised*

Several submissions raised concerns regarding a perceived emphasis on new development proposals and more intensive uses in the Draft Plan, particularly around Point Lonsdale. Another submission raised concerns around non-coastal dependent uses and argued that the Draft Plan did not provide for alternative uses or leases not to be renewed. One submission identified that the scope of the Point Lonsdale Lighthouse Reserve project was under review, and the plan should reflect this.

#### *Response*

Council disagrees that the Draft Plan has an emphasis on new development. Council has carefully considered the need to ensure that buildings and facilities support community use of marine and coastal Crown land and protect environmental and cultural values. Actions that provide for infrastructure and facilities are limited to the following activities:

- Upgrade of existing toilet facilities and investigation of an additional toilet facility at Point Lonsdale in response to community requests.
- Delivery of upgrades via the Point Lonsdale Lighthouse Reserve Project.
- Planning for a bike park on Department of Transport land as an alternative to the current unauthorized activities at Humps and Bumps.
- Investigation of roofed accommodation at Golightly.
- Landscape planning and facilities upgrades at Shortlands Bluff.

Works delivered through the Point Lonsdale Lighthouse Reserve Project are overseen by a project control group. At the time of this consultation report the PCG and Council were seeking relevant approvals to vary the scope of the project. The Final Draft Plan will reflect the approved revised scope of works.

Other proposals for facilities and infrastructure will be considered through Master Planning processes guided by the Marine and Coastal Policy's Planning and Decision Pathway (see below).

The Draft Plan clearly recognises that the Marine and Coastal Policy seeks to relocate non-dependent uses away from marine and coastal Crown land, however, it also acknowledges the unique complexities of achieving this in the Borough. It is Council's view that the actions in the Draft Plan to relocate the CFA Shed at Point Lonsdale and proactively review each lease and license against policy and legislation before entering any new agreements sufficiently address this matter.

## No change to the Draft Plan except to update the description of the Point Lonsdale Lighthouse Reserve project

### 3.5 Master Planning and associated planning

#### *Issues raised*

Several submissions provided feedback on the master planning actions within the Draft Plan and associated heritage and landscape planning. There were concerns that the list of issues

to be considered in the master planning process (Precinct 2 and 3) are pre-emptive of the master planning process. There were also requests for planning identified as future opportunities to be brought forward (i.e. Heritage Conservation Plan for Shortlands Bluff, Restoration Plan for Gun Emplacements, Reviewing the Point Lonsdale Lighthouse Landscape Plan/preparation of a master plan, Master plan for the recreation node adjacent Point Lonsdale).

#### *Response*

Council acknowledges that the master planning process needs to consider the values, issues and opportunities as part of the planning process and be informed by consultation with the community by seeking input on the priorities for each area and design concepts. The listing of issues to be considered within the master planning actions was not intended to be pre-emptive, rather to highlight the known issues at these locations. Council will update the Draft Plan to outline the steps in the master planning process and make it clearer that the list of issues is preliminary in nature.

In developing the Draft Plan Council carefully considered the relative priority of nominated planning activities and the available resources to deliver planning actions within the 5-year life of the CMMP. It is not feasible to complete all of the planning identified as a 'future opportunity' in addition to the nominated planning actions within the Draft Plan. However, if additional resources become available or the relative priority of these activities changes during implementation of the plan, the timing of future opportunities can be reviewed.

### **Update Draft Plan as per response**

## 3.6 Historic heritage<sup>1</sup> considerations

#### *Issues raised*

Two submissions identified opportunities for the CMMP to better recognise the historic heritage values of marine and coastal Crown land and include more actions to enhance heritage values including the preparation of a heritage design manual, restoration of military installations and installation of public viewing platforms.

#### *Response*

Council recognises that the Borough's historic heritage elements contribute to its character and sense of place. Council will review and update the Section 2.3 Character and the precinct descriptions to better reflect the unique historic heritage values of the Borough.

Actions to protect historic heritage have been included in Precinct 1, Precincts 4 and 5 as the priority. Additional heritage planning is identified as a future opportunity for the CMMP. It is Council's view that the balance of actions is appropriate.

## 3.7 Hooded Plover

#### *Issues raised*

Feedback was provided on activities outlined in Precinct 1 to support the protection of

---

<sup>1</sup> Maritime, military and non-Indigenous settler heritage



Hooded Plover. This included the suggestion for a training and information session for Council staff and the community, mapping/control of weeds that are limiting areas for nesting and modifying the wording of the action regarding fox control. In addition, there was a request for support from Council staff to assist with the installation/removal of signage and temporary fencing.

#### *Response*

Council supports the addition of the suggested deliverables and activities as per the feedback.

### **Update Draft Plan as per response**

#### 3.8 Evidence base for the plan

##### *Issues raised*

Two submissions raised concerns around the evidence base for the Draft Plan including a perceived lack of baseline data on coastal uses and limited commitment to collect data to guide future actions.

##### *Response*

Council recognises that it has had limited information on some marine and coastal values and threats and the condition of assets to support the preparation of the Draft Plan. Because of this, the Draft CMMP has a focus on establishing an improved evidence base to inform and guide the management of the coast. Council disagrees that there is a limited commitment to collect data to guide future actions on marine and coastal Crown land. Included in the Draft Plan are a significant number of foundational actions to improve Council's knowledge base; these include a Cultural values assessment (led by WTOAC), signage and fencing audits, improving asset management systems, fauna assessment, native vegetation and biodiversity planning, further coastal hazard studies, assessment of coastal hazard risks to infrastructure and preparation for a Coastal Hazard, Adaptation and Resilience Plan. Council is also committed to improving its monitoring and evaluation processes to understand progress towards the objectives of the CMMP. The specific monitoring and data collection needs will evolve and mature as Council completes the foundational work documented in the CMMP.

### **No change to Draft Plan**

#### 3.9 Collaboration with other land managers

##### *Issues raised*

Three submissions queried the level of collaboration with adjacent marine and coastal Crown land managers during the development of the Draft Plan and suggested that further opportunity for collaboration be sought as a priority during implementation. Suggestions included working with the City of Greater Geelong, aligning planning and implementation processes.

##### *Response*

Council has worked closely with several adjacent marine and coastal Crown land managers in preparation of the Draft Plan. However, the focus of the plan is to provide a framework for the management of the marine and coastal Crown land for which the Borough of Queenscliffe is the nominated land manager. Whilst the Marine and Coastal Act provides for integrated

planning, the Minister directed the Borough to prepare a plan for the land under its responsibility. Council agrees there is a need to improve collaboration between marine and coastal Crown land managers and the Draft Plan details actions to this effect. At the time of drafting the Plan and the preparation of this Consultation report neither the Southeast Bellarine CMMP nor the South East Bellarine Biolinks Master Plan had been finalised. Council will include an additional action in the CMMP around collaboration between Council and CoGG for cross-boundary management issues.

**Update Draft Plan as per response**

DRAFT

## 4. Summary of key changes to the Draft Plan

Feedback theme	Proposed change to the Draft
Quantum of actions in the plan and resourcing implementation	No change to Draft Plan
Document format, mapping and precinct descriptions	<p>Edit sections 1-8</p> <p>Review and update the precinct descriptions in response to individual comments and ensure Queenscliff Kindergarten is reflected in the Precinct 7 description and mapping (and associated action)</p> <p>Review colour coding for Goals and legend for precinct actions.</p> <p>Update maps in Section 2 to improve readability.</p>
<p>Native vegetation and weeds</p> <p>Coastal Moonah Woodland</p> <p>Priority areas for environmental works</p>	<p>Bring forward the preparation of the Native Vegetation Management Plan as a short-term action</p> <p>Include an additional action will be included to undertake detailed mapping and a quality assessment of the threatened Coastal Moonah Woodland Community.</p> <p>Provide further details regarding Council's approach to the identification of detailed priorities for the management of native vegetation through the development of the Native Vegetation Plan.</p> <p>Include an action deliverable to prepare and publish an addendum / map of priority areas once this work is complete.</p>
Use and development and non-dependent uses	Update the description of the Point Lonsdale Lighthouse Reserve project to reflect the approved revised scope of works
Master Planning and associated planning	Update the supporting text in Section 7 to outline the steps in the master planning process and make it clearer that the list of issues listed against Master Planning actions are preliminary in nature.
Historic heritage considerations	Review and update Section 2.3 Character and the precinct descriptions to better reflect the unique historic heritage values of the Borough.

Feedback theme	Proposed change to the Draft
Hooded Plover	<p>Include additional actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A training and information session for Council staff and the community (to be included in Action 5.3)</li> <li>• Mapping/control of weeds that are limiting areas for nesting.</li> </ul> <p>Modify the wording of the action deliverable for action P1.5 (fox control).</p> <p>Update action P1.3 to include support from Council staff to assist with the installation/removal of signage and temporary fencing.</p>
Evidence base for the plan	No change to Draft Plan
Collaboration with other land managers	Include an action in P1 to collaborate with City of Greater Geelong for cross-boundary issues
Roles and responsibilities for action	<p>Update the 'partners' column in action tables and identify an action lead and partners</p> <p>Identify Council as the lead for Action P3.2</p>
Additional detail on the <i>Marine and Coastal Act</i> , <i>Marine and Coastal Policy</i> and <i>Flora and Fauna Guarantee Act</i>	Expand the policy and legislation descriptions (Marine and Coastal Act, Marine and Coastal Policy) and update formatting for the text related to the Flora and Fauna Guarantee Act