



# Fairhaven to Eastern View Master Plan

---

## Consultation Report

Summary of submissions received January - May 2015

## Executive summary

The following report details consultation activities undertaken and summarises feedback received in relation to the Draft Fairhaven to Eastern View Master Plan 2015 which was released for consultation from January – May 2015 for a total of 12 weeks.

In total, 19 submissions were received. Four of those submissions were from a group or organisation representing a number of members, while 15 submissions were made by individual submitters.

Feedback received has been grouped into key areas and themes. Eleven key themes were identified from the submissions received. 'Environmental protection' was the most common theme identified amongst comments received and this theme had five identifiable sub-themes. This was then followed by comments supporting the installation of public amenities at the Arch. The majority of comments received overall related to one part of the study area in particular – the Memorial Arch.

These were:

1. Environmental protection (5 sub-themes identified, 27 comments overall)
2. Provision of public amenities (15 comments)
3. Tracks and fencing (10 comments)
4. Multi agency cooperation (9 comments)
5. Parking and traffic management (9 comments)
6. Safety (6 comments)
7. Boat ramp maintenance/upgrades (5 comments)
8. Estuary opening (3 comments)
9. Animal control (3 comments)
10. Power lines (3 comments)
11. Busses (2 comments)

An analysis of these themes and examples of the comments received under each area can be found in Section 4. Feedback Themes.

## 1. Background

The Fairhaven to Eastern View Master Plan is being developed by the Great Ocean Road Coast Committee (GORCC) in order to guide the management of coastal Crown land reserves between Painkalac Creek and Eastern View.

The draft master plan addresses a number of contiguous reserves along a six kilometre long, narrow stretch of beach and dune, between the shoreline and Great Ocean Road. It identifies key issues and corresponding objectives and actions to address these.

This plan has a five year timeframe (to 2020) and is intended to be reviewed and, if necessary, revised or replaced after that time. The pace of development in the region and the dynamic nature of the coast means review and revision of parts of the plan may be required before then.

The plan focuses on the following areas:

- Biodiversity conservation
- Cultural heritage conservation
- Land tenure
- Coastal processes and climate change
- Aesthetic character, scenic values and sense of place
- Recreation and tourism access and facilities
- Interpretation and visitor information

In January 2015 a draft version of the master plan was released for comment. The draft master plan can be viewed in full at [www.gorcc.com.au](http://www.gorcc.com.au).

## 2. Consultation activities

Submissions on the draft master plan were invited for a period of twelve weeks over the peak summer season on the coast (January/February 2015) and through to May 2015. This holiday period was selected due to high visitation rates and holiday home occupancy over this period ensuring as many regular visitors and property owners as possible were made aware of the consultation opportunity.

The draft plan was made available for viewing at the following locations:

- The Great Ocean Road Committee (GORCC) office (35 Bell Street, Torquay).
- On the GORCC website – [www.gorcc.com.au](http://www.gorcc.com.au)
- At the Aireys Inlet General Store
- On signs displayed on the Fairhaven to Eastern View foreshore (snapshot of full plan)

Opportunities to have input into the draft plan were communicated via:

- The GORCC Website (front page and internal page)
- Letter (mail out) to all Aireys Inlet, Fairhaven, Eastern View and Moggs Creek residents.
- Targeted contact with key stakeholders including the Aireys Inlet District Association, VicRoads, Fairhaven Surf Life Saving Club, Surf Coast Shire, Friends of Moggs Creek, Aireys Inlet Tourism and Traders Association and the Department of Environment, Land, Water and Planning.
- The GORCC Newsletter (1700 subscribers) – articles in three separate editions.
- Large signs on the foreshore between Fairhaven and Eastern View.
- Poster at the Aireys Inlet General Store
- Social media (Facebook and Twitter posts plus a Facebook ad sent out to 2900 users within a 40km radius of Torquay VIC resulting in 72 post clicks through to web page and plans).
- Articles (editorial) in the Surf Coast Times.

### 3. About the submitters

Three submissions were made on behalf of a group or organisation while ten submissions were made by individual submitters.

The four submissions made by (or on behalf of) a group or organisation were submitted by:

- The Lorne Ward
- The Surf Coast Shire Council
- Aireys Inlet District Association
- Eastern View Archway Group

The demographic breakdown of the individual submitters is detailed below:

- 10 (67%) were permanent residents, 5 (33%) were holiday home owners and one submitter was also a local business owner.
- 5 (33%) were aged between 45-54 years, 5 (33%) were aged between 55-64 years, 3 (20%) were aged between 65-74 years. 2 (13%) of submitters were aged 75 years plus while one submitter was aged between 35-44 years.

### 4. Feedback themes

Analysis of the feedback received uncovered several strong themes and areas of consensus among the submissions made. From a total of 19 submissions, 11 key themes were identified. These themes are detailed and described below and examples of comments received under each theme have been provided.

THEME	DESCRIPTION	NO. OF COMMENTS	EXAMPLES OF COMMENTS RECEIVED FROM SUBMITTERS
<b>1. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION (TOTAL)</b>	Environmental protection was an important issue for submitters, and various sub-themes fit under this overall banner.	<b>27</b>	SEE BELOW
<b>i. Environmental protection</b>	Comments here related to concerns around dune damage and erosion, with different	12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <i>"I would also like to see the dunes better protected; there are signs, but people wander in to them anyway: kids to play around; older people to</i></li></ul>

<p><b>(dunes &amp; erosion)</b></p>	<p>opinions given as to the causes of these issues and how to mitigate them.</p> <p>Varied locations and specific areas were also highlighted as areas of concern.</p> <p>Concerns were raised around human behaviour (illegally entering dunes) and drainage.</p> <p>Comments made on dunes were also related in several cases to comments made on Theme 3. Tracks and Fencing (see below)</p>		<p><i>change or simply get some privacy.”</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>“Drainage at Alans Bridge should be diverted to the west away from the gully adjacent to the Surf Club to minimise foreshore depletion and subsequent increase in wave attach on the southwest corner of the dune protecting the new clubhouse.”</i></li> <li>• <i>“The constantly changing moods of the sea have made the dunes in my area, wider now than they ever were in 50’s. I have photos to prove this.</i></li> <li>• <i>“Monitoring of off track access across the foredune is sadly non-existent.”</i></li> <li>• <i>“Remedial steps require to protect dunes east of the FSLC. Signs and fences have proven to be totally inadequate at stopping visitors ‘playing’ in the dunes.”</i></li> <li>• <i>“Actively investigate and implement a preferred option to manage erosion and prevent further retreating of shoreline adjacent to car parks.”</i></li> </ul>
<p><b>ii. Environmental protection (litter and waste management)</b></p>	<p>Comments under this theme centred around three different concerns –</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A feeling that there was a lack of bins provided</li> <li>2. That current litter pick-ups were not thorough or often enough or in the right locations</li> <li>3. A multi-agency approach was required to ensure litter was removed on land managed by all authorities.</li> </ol> <p>Comments made on dunes were also related in several cases to comments made on Theme 2. Provision of Public Amenities (see below)</p>	<p>7</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>“Are garbage bins provided at the Arch? Numerous inspections has demonstrated that there is a significant amount of garbage littered across the GOR and evidenced in the surrounding verges. The residents’ garbage bins are regularly used by people travelling the GOR.”</i></li> <li>• <i>“Twice weekly litter patrols are totally inadequate and the only litter picked up is what can be seen in the car park.”</i></li> <li>• <i>“Surely a worthwhile litter patrol – one that does more than perform a visible but tokenistic rubbish removal function – would be one which embraces (including with regard to funding associated costs) all of the multi-agency areas of responsibility at high visitation locations such as the Memorial Arch at Eastern View”</i></li> <li>• <i>“Additional bins for rubbish along with regular inspection is required. Recent tourist increase has seen an increase in rubbish/litter in the Painkalac Creek surrounds.”</i></li> </ul>
<p><b>iii. Environmental protection (other)</b></p>	<p>Other comments under the environmental theme ranged greatly from suggestions around water quality to a need for more signage to improve human behaviour (reducing impacts)</p>	<p>4</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>“When I was young there used to be lots of spiny spiders (Austracantha Minax) in and about the dunes, but I haven't seen any for years. I don't know what this says about the ecology of the area.”</i></li> <li>• <i>“Monitor water quality for E.coli and other indicative pollutants in both Moggs and Painkalac Creek for environmental health and public health.”</i></li> <li>• <i>“(We) agree that some rationalisation of visitor signage needs to happen and that excess and out of date signage removed on a regular basis. This is especially true where the natural environment is to be protected.”</i></li> </ul>

<p><b>iv. Environmental protection (weeds &amp; vegetation)</b></p>	<p>Four comments made were in relation to the removal of environmental weeds. All submitters commenting under this theme felt this should be a priority.</p>	<p>4</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>It is also now the case that the dying and diseased cypress pines, once considered to be things of beauty by some, should be removed as a high priority. They should be replaced with suitable native</i></li> <li>• <i>“In the move to eradicate environmental weeds GORCC is able to do this on land controlled by them. (We are) concerned that any land outside their control (e.g. VicRoads) may not be subject to the same strict controls. The Masterplan should acknowledge where the line of responsibility begins and ends to ensure proper oversight.”</i></li> <li>• <i>“Biodiversity conservation is my major concern - protection of endangered Hooded Plovers that breed each year in the area, control of environmental weeds and protection of the dune system.”</i></li> </ul>
<p><b>v. Environmental protection (Hooded Plovers)</b></p>	<p>Two submitters expressed their concern for the survival of vulnerable Hooded Plovers with a particular emphasis on fox control.</p>	<p>2</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>“Dog laws need to be re-visited with the Surf Coast Shire to ensure protection of endangered Hooded Plovers Fox control is a major issue ...”</i></li> <li>• <i>“The most important action to conserve the hooded plover habitat is to have a comprehensive and serious fox eradication program. I regularly see foxes coming right up to the door of my house. They are obviously breeding in the area unchecked...”</i></li> </ul>
<p><b>2. PROVISION OF PUBLIC AMENITIES</b></p>	<p>There were strong feelings expressed around a desire for public toilets at or near the Arch (and in that general precinct/area). Most submitters that commented on this issue felt that the lack of toilets are causing litter, pollution and public nuisance issues, partly due to the heavy use of the area by bus lines (who regularly stop at the Arch).</p> <p>Many suggestions were made regarding solutions to the issue, including eco-toilets, encouraging use of the Fairhaven Surf Life Saving Club toilets, encouraging buses to stop at other towns for toilet breaks and stopping (or limiting) buses from parking in the area, however building new amenities on site was the most popular suggestion from submitters overall.</p>	<p>15</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>“Could Eco toilets be introduced at the Great Ocean Road sign car park? We have seen a number of these in our outback travels.”</i></li> <li>• <i>“Providing a toilet facility is stated as problematic due to lack of water/sewerage, construction and servicing cost and HIGH USAGE. Isn't High Usage the very reason to install toilets now?”</i></li> <li>• <i>“The question of toilet and changing facilities at the Arch require further examination as some facility is required for the passing tourists despite the objection of local property owners.”</i></li> <li>• <i>“Toilet facilities at the FSLSC should be better signposted as available to the public.”</i></li> <li>• <i>“While it may be difficult to install a public toilet facility, due to the expected high usage (your words) it appears that you have failed to address the problem of frequent public urination, occasional defecation and persistent dumping of toilet tissues, nappies and used female hygiene products at this site.”</i></li> <li>• <i>“Rebuild toilet at P’lac Creek to accommodate significant increase in tourist numbers The existing two large “rooms” with only one toilet each is inadequate.”</i></li> <li>• <i>Actively consider and plan for toilet facilities at the Arch, while this may be</i></li> </ul>

			<p><i>difficult it is important to provide appropriate facilities to prevent toileting in the dunes and residents' gardens.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>"IF GORCC is resisting the idea of a toilet (at the Memorial Arch) there will have to be a logistical solution of some kind. Perhaps working with the tourist bus companies to stagger visits away from the morning peak would help."</i></li> <li>• <i>"Require signage (translated into) Asian languages about litter, toilets and cigarette butts. Notify all bus operators about towns with toilets."</i></li> </ul>
<b>3. TRACKS AND FENCING</b>	<p>Comments under this theme were varied, and some comments from some submitters were directly in contention with other comments from other submitters.</p> <p>General agreement was communicated around the need to protect the environment, however some felt that fencing and track formalisation was already adequate whereas others did not and requested further works.</p>	<b>10</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>"Monitoring of off track access across the fore dune is sadly non-existent."</i></li> <li>• <i>"The fencing Objectives and Actions appear to be sufficient to restrict roadside parking and limit beach and dune access, however it has been suggested that some form of fencing should be installed at the toe of the dune on the Fairhaven side of the Inlet to alleviate visitor pressure."</i></li> <li>• <i>"There are many more access points (tracks) along the Fairhaven coast than most other beaches. This has the advantage, especially where the topography is relatively flat, of diluting the effect of human encroachment and allows more pedestrian access."</i></li> <li>• <i>"While clearing of the non-native vegetation is to be commended, it would be contradictory to your plan to widen or gravel beach paths and formalise and therefore destroy the unique and unspoiled natural beauty of the area. Bush tracks beach paths and trails have their own unique charm and allurements."</i></li> </ul>
<b>4. MULTI-AGENCY COOPERATION</b>	<p>Concerns were raised around the need for better cross-agency coordination in order to achieve objectives and outcomes.</p> <p>Some submitters called for better cooperation and/or more (or clearer) reference to the roles and management areas of other agencies in the master plan.</p>	<b>9</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>"There is a perceived lack of collaboration between the various agencies, and land managers. "</i></li> <li>• <i>"In the move to eradicate environmental weeds GORCC is able to do this on land controlled by them (We are) concerned that any land outside their control (e.g. VicRoads) may not be subject to the same strict controls. The Master Plan should acknowledge where the line of responsibility begins and ends to ensure proper oversight."</i></li> <li>• <i>"It is submitted that the Master Plan should acknowledge the need for coordinated efforts across management boundaries and partnership with Council in relation to open space management including signage and fencing to ensure a consistent approach."</i></li> <li>• <i>"Perhaps the most obvious manifestation of failure to achieve multi-agency cooperation in the study area concerns litter control at the Memorial Arch."</i></li> </ul>



			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>“Apart from passive acknowledgement of multi-agency participation in the subject area of the Great Ocean Road (see pages 12 and 18), the Draft Master Plan provides no insight into plans for multi-agency cooperation during the planning period – nor, indeed, whether involvement of multi-agencies on this part of the Surf Coast impacts the planning function positively or negatively.”</i></li> </ul>
<b>5. PARKING AND TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT</b>	<p>Comments on parking or traffic management could be divided into two sub-themes:</p> <p>a) Calls for parking formalisation and/or restriction to protect the character of the area and the natural environment.</p> <p>b) Concerns around road safety in regards to the Great Ocean Road itself, particularly calls for a speed limit decrease. *</p> <p><i>*It should be noted that the Great Ocean Road itself (including speed limits) is not under GORCC management and that this issue cannot directly be addressed by GORCC. GORCC can, however, pass comments received onto relevant management authorities and play an advocacy role on issues where GORCC is a stakeholder (if and where appropriate)</i></p>	<b>9</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>“Car parking would be better managed if lines were painted indicating parking spaces. This might ameliorate the free-for-all approach currently in operation.”</i></li> <li>• <i>“Remarkably, at the Memorial Arch site there is no reduction in the 80kph speed limit which applies generally along the Great Ocean Road (reduced, for example, to the 60kph limits applying in other high-use or urban locations along the Coast), nor are there any yellow line-markings to prohibit parking on the roadway under the Memorial Arch or on the Coalmine Creek bridge.”</i></li> <li>• <i>“It is noted that one determinate of visitor numbers is access to parking and that this should be managed to maintain the natural character of the area: nowhere in the document is the limitation to existing parking areas noted as an objective.”</i></li> <li>• <i>“It is also recommended that GORCC, together with Surf Coast Shire, lobby VicRoads to reduce the speed limit in this location to improve traffic safety.”</i></li> <li>• <i>“We have been concerned for some time about the speed and volume of traffic travelling on the Great ocean Road through Moggs Creek, where the speed limit is 80km per hour. It would be much safer for all, particularly children, who cross the road to go to the beach is the speed limit was reduced ... as at Fairhaven”</i></li> </ul>
<b>6. SAFETY</b>	<p>Comments regarding safety centred around three sub-themes:</p> <p>a) Calls for water safety measures including signage and/or increased lifesaving patrols.</p> <p>b) Calls for repairs of or maintenance emergency triangle system.</p> <p>c) Calls for reduced speed limits on the Great Ocean Road (see above).</p>	<b>6</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>“The emergency triangle system must be repaired and maintained.”</i></li> <li>• <i>“I did not see anything in the plan about maintaining the emergency triangle signs (the rivets were always in need of replacement) or the recycled plastic signs (paddle pops) at each track. Should this be included in the plan?”</i></li> <li>• <i>“Surf Coast Shire recommends that the Master Plan consider a review of water safety signage at beach access points.”</i></li> <li>• <i>“The beach at Moggs Creek as you know can be dangerous, with rips and unexpected deep water close to the beach. These pose little danger to the experienced beach goers, but newcomers and tourists can easily get into</i></li> </ul>

			<i>difficulties. What is the possibility of having some sort of life-saving here?"</i>
<b>7. BOAT RAMP</b>	<p>Four submitters called for upgrades to the existing ramp in the study area.</p> <p>One submitter felt this boat ramp should not be formalised.</p>	<b>5</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>"We would question the rationale behind not upgrading the informal ramp at the western end of the Eastern View beach. This is not only the only launching ramp before Lorne and is therefore used extensively by locals, but is also used by the Fairhaven Life Saving Club as a launching ramp in emergency situations."</i></li> <li>• <i>"Informal ramp at Easter View should be maintained as it is used by the FSLSC for rapid access to the western end of the beach in emergencies."</i></li> <li>• <i>"I'm pleased you don't plan to formalise the boat ramp, and would like it closed. It is increasingly being used by visitors/fishermen to drive down and park on the beach. This is intolerable."</i></li> </ul>
<b>8. ESTUARY OPENING</b>	<p>Three comments were made calling for measures around estuary opening procedures to be included in the master plan.</p>	<b>3</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>"We recommend that the Master Plan consider a review of water safety signage at beach access points and also considers Council's role in artificial estuary mouth openings at Painkalac Creek."</i></li> <li>• <i>"There is nothing in the Masterplan to indicate appropriate and inappropriate opening of the Inlet when there is threat of flooding. Acknowledgement of the conditions where this action should be undertaken and reference to appropriate measures should be included."</i></li> </ul>
<b>9. ANIMAL CONTROL</b>	<p>Three comments were made in regards to access of horses and dogs to the areas. All three indicated stricter controls and/or enforcement were required.</p>	<b>3</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Dog laws need to be re-visited with the Surf Coast Shire to ensure protection of endangered Hooded Plovers</i></li> <li>• <i>My partner and I do not approve of horse-riding being allowed on the beach (or on surrounding bush trails for that matter) due to horse manure and erosion and weed introduction in the bush.</i></li> </ul>
<b>10. POWER LINES</b>	<p>Two submitters requested that powerlines be put underground.*</p> <p><i>*It should be noted that power lines are not under GORCC management and that this issue cannot directly be addressed by GORCC. GORCC can, however, pass comments received onto relevant management authorities and play an advocacy role on issues where GORCC is a stakeholder (if and where appropriate)</i></p>	<b>3</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>"GORCC should support any move by Powercor et.al to underground the electricity power lines from Fair Haven to Eastern View"</i></li> <li>• <i>Essential to provide car parking to allow access to the beach.</i></li> <li>• <i>4. Undergrounding of power lines should have been implemented along this section of the great ocean road</i></li> <li>• <i>The importance of fire prevention cannot be left to chance. Putting power lines underground should be a priority.</i></li> </ul>

<b>11. BUSSES</b>	Two submitters asked that the Master Plan better reflect the use of the area by buses. Comments made on dunes were also related in several cases to comments made on Theme 2. Provision of Public Amenities (see above).	<b>2</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>It simply beggars belief that the words “tourist coach” or “bus” fail to appear anywhere in a document which purports to be an inclusive Master Plan for an area exhibiting such brittleness on a range of biological and land management issues”.</i></li> </ul>
-------------------	--	----------	---

## 12. Next Steps

All feedback received on the draft Fairhaven to Eastern View Master Plan will now be considered in the development of a final plan.

Based on feedback received through community consultation, additional actions and inclusions for the final master plan will be submitted to the GORC Committee in June for consideration and approval. A final master plan will be developed and submitted to the Committee for approval in the second half of the year. It will then be submitted to the Department of Environment, Land, Water and Planning for Coastal Management Act consent, prior to its public release. This is expected to occur in September-October 2015.

Once approved and publically released, the final master plan will be used by GORCC and other stakeholders to guide management of the area until 2020.