

# North Road Foreshore Master Plan

---

## COMMUNITY CONSULTATION REPORT

Prepared by

Thompson Berrill Landscape Design Pty Ltd

for

Bayside City Council

April 2019

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

		<b>PAGE #</b>
<b>1.</b>	<b>CONSULTATION PROCESS</b>	<b>3</b>
1.1	Community Consultation	3
1.2	Summary of response to consultation	4
<b>2.</b>	<b>DETAILED RESPONSE TO KEY ISSUES RAISED DURING CONSULTATION ON THE DRAFT MASTER PLAN</b>	<b>6</b>
2.1	Bay Trail Duplication	6
2.2	Lighting	9
2.3	Parking and Vehicle Access	11
2.4	Vegetation Management	12
2.5	Water Access and Coastal Management	16
2.6	Sandown Street Dog Beach	19
2.7	General	22
2.8	North Point Café Redevelopment	23

REV	DATE	AMENDMENT
A	11/4/19	Draft for comment

# 1. Consultation Process

Initial consultation was completed at North Road Foreshore Precinct as part of *Bayside Coastal Management Plan 2014* and this informed development of the Draft Master Plan. The Draft North Road Foreshore Master Plan was displayed for broader community consultation between December 2018 and February 2019. Feedback received will be used to finalise the Master Plan recommendations, staging and implementation priorities for completion of on ground works on Council managed land.

## 1.1 Community consultation

Community consultation on the Draft Master Plan was completed over a fourteen-week period from 3 December 2018 to 17 February 2019. This included:

- **Site Walkover with adjoining residents** notified by letter box drop.
  - Thursday 15 November 6:00-7:30pm
  - Saturday 18 November 2018 10:00-11:30amThis was to discuss vegetation management adjoining private property prior to release of the Draft Masterplan.
- **Article in Let's Talk Bayside** was distributed in November 2018.
- **Leader Advertising:** 3 x ads in Leader on 11 December 2018, 8 and 15 January 2019. An Editorial in the Leader was also published on 15 January 2019.
- **Postcards letterdrop** to 6000 residents were issued on 10 December 2018, with second distribution on 28 February 2019.
- **Postcards display** at North Point Café, Brighton Library and Council's Corporate Centre.
- **Council Website** - <https://yoursay.bayside.vic.gov.au/NorthRdForeshoreMasterplan>  
The draft Master Plan and full report was displayed on Council's website for community feedback via the 'Have Your Say' online portal.
- **On site signage displays** (both freestanding and stickers on footpath)
- Website news articles and via social media advertising between December 2018-February 2019.
- Have Your Say provided 3 updates via email.
- Digital screens at the Corporate Centre.
- **Community Drop in Session**
  - Thursday 17 January 2019 from 5:00pm-7:00pm
  - Saturday 19 January 2019 from 9:00-11:00am
  - Sunday 20 January 2019 from 9:00-11:00amThese provided an opportunity for interested people to attend and ask questions, provide direct feedback to Council officers and the consultant team. Attended by 200 people.
- **Community Meeting**
  - Monday 4 February 2019 from 5:30pm at the Brighton LibraryThis provided an opportunity for interested people to attend and ask questions, provide direct feedback to Council officers regarding the North Point Café proposal. Attended by 43 people.
- Brochures distributed at Dogs' breakfast event at the dog beach on Saturday 19 January 2019.

## 1.2 Summary of response to consultation

There was extensive community feedback on the Draft Master Plan during the consultation period from 3 December 2018 to 17 February 2019. Over 240 people attended the community drop in sessions, over 200 provided written feedback via the 'have your say' link on Council's website and there were numerous other written submissions supplied via letter and e-mail.

The following is a summary of key themes and proposed changes to the masterplan arising from community consultation. For a more detailed summary of community feedback and the response to key issues raised refer to Section 2 of this report.

### 1.2.1 Vegetation Management - Trees

72% of the 72 respondents did not support the planting of the 59 additional shade trees on the foreshore as shown on the Draft Master Plan. There were numerous written submissions from residents opposed to new tree planting with the majority suggesting that the existing level of tree cover and shade on the foreshore is sufficient and that the impacts on their views far outweighed the benefits of new tree planting.

#### Recommendation:

- Remove all proposed new tree planting from the master plan.
- Amend the Vegetation Management recommendations on Pg 14 as follows - *Retain the existing mix of garden beds and open grass areas. Protect existing trees and replace only as needed within existing garden bed areas using similar indigenous species.*

### 1.2.2 Vegetation Management – Garden Beds Adjoining Private Property

51% of respondents supported the replanting of garden beds with appropriate indigenous species while 21% were opposed. Some residents are extremely passionate this issue having spent time and resources on planting of garden beds adjoining their property. As the foreshore is Crown land and subject to the provisions of a Vegetation Protection Overlay (VPO) in the Bayside Planning Scheme there are restrictions on pruning/removal of native vegetation and on what can be planted by residents in these garden beds.

#### Recommendation:

- Maintain a consistent approach to maintenance of garden beds directly adjoining the private property boundaries and fences in accordance with the Vegetation Protection Overlay and Council's Nature Strip Planting Policy as with other areas within Bayside.
- Retain existing native and indigenous trees. Residents may request Council to prune only where the tree branches overhang or impact on existing fencing or buildings.
- Retain existing native and indigenous shrubs. Residents may apply to Council for permission to prune only to maintain shrubs (not trees) at their existing fence height.
- Continue to liaise with residents to replace existing exotic and weed species with local indigenous species over time.
- Infill garden bed planting with drought tolerant indigenous low shrubs, groundcovers and grasses (available at Bayside Community Nursery or other indigenous plant nursery).

### 1.2.3 Bay Trail Duplication

89% of the 178 respondents supported duplication of the Bay with only 6% opposed and a further 5% unsure of the concept design. Council resolved to proceed with the duplication at the Ordinary Council Meeting on 19 February 2019.

#### **1.2.4 Lighting**

62% of the 34 respondents indicated lighting would increase/improve their use of the Bay Trail with 29% opposed. The Bay Trail is a major recreational commuter path for cyclists and pedestrians. The rate of usage has increased and is forecast to continue to increase with corresponding demands from the community to increase the level of safety and security which is already enjoyed along the rest of the Bay Trail. Continuous public lighting is provided along the trail through City of Port Philip and extension of lighting along the Bay Trail through the North Road foreshore precinct from Head Street through to Middle Brighton Baths will improve visibility, increase safety and will provide additional sustainable travel choices. Some respondents expressed concern about the visual impact on pole lighting on views from adjoining property, potential increase in anti-social behaviour and the general loss of ambience on the foreshore.

##### Recommendation:

Amend the master plan to remove reference to new pole lighting and use only low level bollard lighting (<1.5m high) along the Bay Trail removing redundant pole mounted fittings in other areas through the precinct where possible.

#### **1.2.5 Parking and Vehicle Access**

85% of the 26 respondents agreed that the proposed changes would improve pedestrian safety and 73% indicated that changes would make it easier for vehicle movement and parking. Issues raised by respondents included requests for additional accessible parking bays closer to the café and changes to the existing mix of car and boat trailer parking to reflect increasing need for car parking following redevelopment of the playground.

##### Recommendation:

- Investigate provision of two more accessible parking bays and one 5 minute drop off bay on North Road at the Café to improve access and reduce congestion in the B1 car park.
- Investigate a trial reduction of signed boat trailer only parking spaces to increase available spaces for cars, especially mid-week. (subject to further traffic engineering assessment and investigation)

#### **1.2.6 Water Access and Coastal Management**

87% of the 53 respondents supported establishment of improved access to the water and Bay at the end of North Road as part of broader recommendations to address coastal erosion, repair of the seawall and path and improved stormwater management. Issues raised by respondents included potential conflicts between pedestrians and cyclists, litter and suggestions for establishment of a sand beach.

#### **1.2.7 North Point Café Water Access and Coastal Management**

80% of the 177 respondents supported redevelopment of the North Point Café including expansion of the footprint to include the rear car park area with 13% opposed. 67% of respondents supported extension of the current operating hours and liquor licence with 21% opposed. This redevelopment of the café is being considered by Council as a separate process with recommendations from this process to be adopted to the final masterplan.

## 2. Response to the key issues raised during the consultation on the Draft Master Plan

The following summarises the relevant key issues raised in community consultation on the Draft Master Plan as displayed for comment. The number of respondents for each issue, including those received via the website, via e-mail, at the drop in session and walk around, are noted in brackets where more than one person commented. Where comments have been supplied by the same person via multiple platforms (website/letter/email) 1 response is recorded per issue rather than per platform. The response column outlines the proposed recommendation for changes to the plan for consideration in finalisation of the Master Plan.

ITEM	COMMENT	RESPONSE
------	---------	----------

### 2.1 BAY TRAIL DUPLICATION

#### ***Have Your Say - Do you use the Bay Trail?***

178 Respondents	Responses	
	%	No.
Use trail as a pedestrian	80%	142
Use trail as a cyclist	62%	111
Live between Sandown St & RBYC	33%	58

#### ***Have Your Say - Rate your support for the design***

178 Respondents	Responses	
	%	No.
Fully support concept	74%	131
Somewhat support concept	15%	27
Don't support concept	6%	10
Unsure about concept	5%	9

ITEM	COMMENT	RESPONSE
2.1.1	Why isn't the path in front of the Yacht Club being widened – this is a congestion point. The design for duplication doesn't address a way to make cyclists slow down when moving from existing trail in front of yacht club to the duplicated path even with the sharp turn (25 responses)	The intent is to provide a new separate pedestrian path on the beach side of the existing path. This approach was endorsed by Council at meeting 19 February 2019.  <i>Recommendation</i> Amend Figure 15 pg 14 to show duplicated path in front of Royal Brighton Yacht Club as per Council endorsed plan.
2.1.2	Agree with recommendations to duplicate the Bay Trail from a safety perspective (15 responses)	<i>Recommendation</i> No change to plan.
2.1.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Duplication will increase usage, adding to the congestion that already exists – it is dangerous. (2 responses)</li> <li>Duplication of the path is a waste of money</li> </ul>	Assessment of existing use of the Bay Trail indicates that provision of separate pedestrian and cycle paths through this narrow confined over the

ITEM	COMMENT	RESPONSE
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Disagree with duplication stop making changes to path, find an alternative route for cyclists</li> <li>• Duplication of trail to the rock revetment is unnecessary</li> <li>• How do you reduce the environmental impact on the landscape from the works and increased usage?</li> </ul>	<p>long and medium term area is the most sustainable method to improve safety and meet continuing increase in use of the Bay Trail.</p> <p><u>Recommendation</u> Refer 2.1.1</p>
2.1.4	<p>Disagree with the addition of more concrete and rock from an aesthetic perspective/at the expense of decreasing the beach/foreshore amenity around Sandown Street (5 responses)</p>	<p>This area is subject to ongoing coastal erosion which is expected to worsen with impacts of forecast sea level rise. Protection of the beach and public access is not possible without the rock groynes and concrete boardwalk.</p> <p><u>Recommendation</u> No change to plan.</p>
2.1.5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improve signage for cyclists and pedestrians regarding speed, paths, including multi-lingual signs, and being aware of all users of paths (6 responses)</li> <li>• Consider adding 'rumble strips' to slow cyclists down through this section (2 responses)</li> <li>• Textured line markings do not allow rollerbladers to travel safely, as the textured strips lessen the grip on the path – consider a different way to slow traffic down</li> </ul>	<p>Signage and surface line marking will be used to guide priority for cyclists and pedestrians as part of implementation of new works. Use of raised strips is not preferred as they can increase trip hazards.</p> <p><u>Recommendation</u> No change to plan.</p>
2.1.6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pedestrian path needs to be widened to reduce congestion.</li> <li>• Paths should be at least 3m wide</li> <li>• Path should be at least 3 times wider than they currently are to accommodate all types of users</li> <li>• Consider two types of pedestrian users of trail – walkers and runners (walkers are too slow, and runners end up using cycle path)</li> <li>• Have stopped using this area because it is too short and too narrow – I'm a local so it is a shame</li> </ul>	<p>The new Bay Trail duplication path between Sandown Street and Royal Brighton Yacht Club will be a 3 metre wide path and will be developed in accordance with current Austroads standards.</p> <p><u>Recommendation</u> No change to plan.</p>
2.1.7	<p>Sharp turn on cycle path (right angles) are dangerous do not include these in new sections.</p>	<p>Duplication of the boardwalk will remove the need for right angle merge sections.</p> <p><u>Recommendation</u> No change to plan.</p>

ITEM	COMMENT	RESPONSE
2.1.8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Design for duplication of trail doesn't take into account sand/gravel build up on the path which is a safety hazard for cyclists. Especially winter evenings when visibility is low. (2 responses)</li> <li>Duplication design – slightly camber the new section to encourage run off when the sea level is high.</li> </ul>	<p>Build-up of sand is an ongoing challenge to path management in foreshore areas. New path will be cambered to reduce build up however, ongoing maintenance will be required to address sand build up after windy days.</p> <p><u>Recommendation</u> No change to plan.</p>
2.1.9	Based on works down near 'Ostend' changes to the paths will increase the amount of sand intruding on our fences – this is will require more clearing.	<p>Build-up of sand can vary due to prevailing wind conditions. New path and boardwalk levels and approach to sand management will be confirmed as part of detailed for the new section of path.</p> <p><u>Recommendation</u> No change to plan.</p>
2.1.10	Cyclists to use the bridge/boardwalk instead of pedestrians	<p>The duplication will mean a new boardwalk section will be provided to separate pedestrian and cyclist traffic. Pedestrians will use the existing boardwalk as this aligns better with the coastal side walking path.</p> <p><u>Recommendation</u> No change to plan.</p>
2.1.11	<p>Path surfaces/colour should be different for cyclists and pedestrians</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Cycle path should be concrete</li> <li>Pedestrian path should be soft fall, so when pedestrians are knocked down by cyclists the surface is soft</li> <li>Surface should be all ability access friendly (3 responses)</li> </ul>	<p>Path surfaces will be differentiated at intersections only. All paths will meet all ability access requirements.</p> <p><u>Recommendation</u> No change to plan.</p>
2.1.13	People regularly leave their dog off lead on the pedestrian and cycle paths early in the mornings causing a hazard – why aren't Council officers there to enforce regulations (i.e. before 8am in the morning) (2 responses)	<p>This issue has been referred to local laws.</p> <p><u>Recommendation</u> No change to plan</p>
2.1.14	What legalities (if any) are there of pedestrians using the path labelled "Cycle Only"	Signage seeks to provide clear guidance to cyclists and pedestrian about which path to use to maximise safety. Punitive measures for



ITEM	COMMENT	RESPONSE
		<p>noncompliance are not proposed at this time.</p> <p><i>Recommendation</i> No Change to plan</p>

## 2.2 LIGHTING

### **Have Your Say – How do you use the Bay Trail**

34 Respondents

	Responses	
	%	No.
Walk	47%	16
Walk and Cycle	47%	16
Cycle	6%	2
I don't use the Bay Trail	0%	0

### **Have Your Say – Will the addition of lighting on the Bay Trail increase/improve your use?**

34 Respondents

	Responses	
	%	No.
Yes	62%	21
No	29%	10
Maybe/unsure	9%	3

### **Have Your Say – Will the addition of lighting in the foreshore reserve increase/improve your use?**

34 Respondents

	Responses	
	%	No.
Yes	59%	20
No	24%	8
Maybe/unsure	29%	10

ITEM	COMMENT	RESPONSE
2.2.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Low level lighting is better (if you have to have any lighting). (5 responses)</li> <li>• Overhead lighting is unattractive. (4 responses)</li> <li>• Current lighting in this precinct is adequate. (4 responses)</li> <li>• Need ambient lighting on the trail. (2 responses)</li> <li>• Add lighting for safety reasons. (3 responses)</li> <li>• Lighting in the winter months is great for exercising/improved safety on the trail when it is dark. (2 responses)</li> <li>• Artificial lighting will ruin watching the sunset, walks in the dark to enjoy the stars and city lights and increase glare levels.</li> <li>• Bright lighting is bad for ecology and biodiversity especially bats and insects.</li> <li>• Subtle lighting should be considered if lighting must be added</li> </ul>	<p>The Bay Trail is a major recreational commuter path for cyclists and pedestrians. The rate of usage has increased and is forecast to continue to increase with corresponding demands from the community to increase the level of safety and security which is already enjoyed along the rest of the Bay Trail. Continuous public lighting is provided along the trail through City of Port Philip and extension of lighting along the Bay Trail through the North Road foreshore precinct from Head Street through to Middle Brighton Baths will improve visibility, increase safety and will provide additional sustainable travel choices.</p> <p>The draft plan currently shows a proposed mix of low level bollard</p>

ITEM	COMMENT	RESPONSE
		<p>lighting (approx. 1.2-1.5m high) where the Bay Trail is located close to private property and taller more widely spaced standard pole mounted lighting (approx. 6.0-8.0m high) where the foreshore reserve is wider, and the path is located away from private property. All proposed lighting will use high performance LED technology to minimise power consumption costs and marine grade aluminium fittings with corrosive protection and sealing technology to maximise the service asset life. Installation of new lighting will also enable removal of scattered older energy inefficient pole lighting other areas to minimise glare and impact on evening views.</p> <p><i><u>Recommendation</u></i> Amend plan to remove reference to new pole lighting and use only low level bollard lighting (&lt;1.5m high) along the Bay Trail removing redundant pole mounted fittings in other areas through the precinct where possible.</p>
2.2.2	Low level lighting has been installed before and stolen, do not waste money installing new low level lighting.	<p>Independent low level solar bollard lighting units can be subject to theft.</p> <p><i><u>Recommendation</u></i> Confirm that new low level lighting will be fixed mains power.</p>
2.2.3	The right type of lighting for vision impaired users of the walking path and the cycle trail is important. The lighting at Elwood Canal along the path is an excellent example (low key sodium luminaires)	<p>New lighting where required will meet requirements of AS1158. Use of energy efficient LEDs is preferred to sodium luminaires.</p> <p><i><u>Recommendation</u></i> No change to plan.</p>
2.2.4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Additional lighting will encourage people to be in the area longer and later at night – which will create more noise, and potentially increase anti-social behaviour. (3 responses)</li> <li>• Lighting at night will increase the presence of seagulls – their noise and droppings.</li> </ul>	<p>The plan indicates new lighting is only proposed to the Bay Trail and on local path connections. Lighting will be focused on the path surface to minimise overspill and glare.</p> <p><i><u>Recommendation</u></i> No change to plan.</p>

ITEM	COMMENT	RESPONSE
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No lighting for cyclists on the path given they must have lights on their bike for night time riding.</li> </ul>	

### 2.3 PARKING AND VEHICLE ACCESS

#### ***Have Your Say – The improvements will make it safer for pedestrians***

26 Respondents

	Responses	
	%	No.
Yes	85%	22
No	2%	2
Maybe	2%	2

#### ***Have Your Say – The improvements will make it easier for vehicle movement and parking***

26 Respondents

	Responses	
	%	No.
Yes	73%	19
No	12%	3
Maybe	15%	4

ITEM	COMMENT	RESPONSE
2.3.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Improve pedestrian access/safety to the car park, café, playground and toilets (4 responses)</li> <li>Changes to parking bays is unnecessary (2 responses).</li> <li>Aim for a more equitable distribution of parking types.</li> <li>Agree – reduce boat/trailer parking.</li> <li>Are boat/trailer bays for exclusive use of boat/trailer vehicles? If so, why don't BCC officers patrol the car park regularly and fine people for parking in the boat/trailer bays.</li> <li>Introduce a system that gives priority to boat/trailer drivers to access the long bays to avoid them coming up with creative parking solutions – such as parking illegally on the grass, or onto the local streets.</li> <li>Don't reduce boat/trailer parking bays it will drive traffic onto residential streets putting pressure on street parking and making it more difficult for residents to enter and exit their property.</li> </ul>	<p>The master plan recommends a trial change to the line markings on the long spaces along the southern side to indicate that there are no further restrictions on standard parking to increase availability for cars, especially mid week where the popularity of the recently upgraded playground is impacting on capacity.</p> <p>This will be subject to further traffic engineering evaluation.</p> <p><u>Recommendation</u>  <i>Trial increasing available spaces for car parking by reducing boat trailer only parking mid-week to accommodate high levels of use of the playground and café subject to further traffic counts and assessment.</i></p>
2.3.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increase all ability access parking closer to the café.</li> <li>Ensure all kerbs in the car park are constructed to DDA standard – very difficult with wheelchairs and wheelie-walkers to move between car park and café area.</li> </ul>	<p>Accessible parking bays are to be provided closer to the café and a new accessible parking bay on North Road in accordance with AS1428. Future redevelopment of the B1 car park will also enable provision of more direct accessible pedestrian</p>

ITEM	COMMENT	RESPONSE
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provide a drop off bay on North Road adjacent to the café to reduce traffic movement and congestion in the car park.</li> </ul>	<p>paths to and from the car park to the café and playground.</p> <p><u>Recommendation</u> Add another accessible parking bays (2) on North Road and add a 5 minute drop off zone out front of the café to reduce congestion on the entry road within the B1 car park.</p>
2.3.3	Reduce vegetation to increase parking.	<p>Foreshore vegetation including tree planting within the car park is protected by a Vegetation Protection Overlay (VPO) in the Bayside Planning Scheme. Removal of trees to expand car parking is not proposed or supported in this plan.</p> <p><u>Recommendation</u> No change to plan.</p>
2.3.4	Car park needs re-surfacing (2 responses)	<p>Asphalt surfaces subject to salt water inundation after boats are removed from the bay are subject to higher levels of wear. Existing surface will be managed/maintained with reactive maintenance until the full car park redevelopment is undertaken. This is currently a longer-term priority.</p> <p><u>Recommendation</u> No change to plan.</p>

## 2.4 VEGETATION MANAGEMENT

### ***Have Your Say – Do you support the planting of shade trees?***

72 Respondents

	Responses	
	%	No.
Yes	22%	16
No	72%	52
Probably	4%	3
No response/blanks	1%	1

### ***Have Your Say – Do you support the replanting of garden beds with appropriate species?***

72 Respondents

	Responses	
	%	No.
Yes	51%	37
No	21%	15
Probably	21%	15
No response/blanks	7%	5

ITEM	COMMENT	RESPONSE
2.4.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Planting of trees along walking path will take away the sense of openness of the area and diminish the 180° views across the bay (for residents and visitors alike). (18 responses)</li> <li>• Don't need shade trees in this area. (9 responses).</li> <li>• The number and distance apart of the proposed tree planting cannot physically allow for maximising bay views for adjacent residents. (7 responses)</li> <li>• Paid high property price for to live directly opposite the water – planting trees will block the bay view. (6 responses)</li> <li>• Existing levels of shade are sufficient for the area. (3 responses)</li> <li>• Planting of trees will diminish the value of my property. (3 responses)</li> <li>• Nominated tree species are not going to provide much shade.</li> <li>• Nominated tree species in the plan do not provide an attractive option for planting in area. (3 responses)</li> <li>• What information is available to explain why more shade is needed. (2 responses)</li> <li>• Don't want big trees to cast shadows over houses/deprive home owners of sunlight. (2 responses)</li> <li>• Any new planting should not impede any current views. (2 responses)</li> <li>• Planting of trees in the proposed locations shown in the plan to provide shade is incorrect - the path travels in a north/south direction and the sun rises and sets in the east/west so during the hottest parts of the day mid afternoon (generally) there will be no shade on the path anyway. (2 responses)</li> <li>• We need a plan to see how these huge trees will be integrated into the existing landscape. (2 responses)</li> <li>• Visitors to the area do not come to sit under shaded trees. (2 responses)</li> <li>• Inadequate space for large trees to be planted as shown next to the cycle path.</li> <li>• Trees will be hazard next to the cycle path – and Council will be liable if the plantings lead to an accident.</li> <li>• Inadequate space for planting trees next to the cycle path</li> <li>• Do not plant Plane trees.</li> <li>• Plant only indigenous trees no palms.</li> </ul>	<p>The Draft Masterplan proposed planting of 59 new trees on the foreshore. The trees were to be planted along the coast walking path to improve shade, air quality, habitat and to offset the impacts of urban heat island effect. The trees were to be evenly spaced 30m apart to retain views through to the bay and city from adjoining private property.</p> <p>Extensive community feedback during the consultation process confirmed that the majority of respondents are opposed to new tree planting suggesting that the existing level of tree cover and shade on the foreshore is sufficient and that the impacts on views far outweighed the benefits of new tree planting.</p> <p><u>Recommendation</u>  Remove proposed new tree planting from the master plan and amend Vegetation Management Pg 12 as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Retain the existing mix of garden beds and open grass areas. Protect existing trees and replace only as needed within existing garden bed areas using similar indigenous species</li> </ul>

ITEM	COMMENT	RESPONSE
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The risk of falling limbs will become an issue in the future.</li> <li>• Additional trees will require more maintenance (and cleaning up after strong winds) this will cost more money.</li> <li>• It would be great to have the tree planting open to the community</li> <li>• This (tree planting) is a ridiculous proposal and not supported by any “community feedback” that I am aware of.</li> <li>• Ratepayers money would be better spent by investing in more cleaning of beaches, emptying of bins than on trees.</li> <li>• Council should be spending money on facilities for rate payers, not shade for visitors.</li> <li>• Money for tree planting should be re-directed to restoring the beach between Sandown Street and RBYC where the Council has failed to maintain.</li> </ul>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Please keep existing shrubs and planting they are in important habitat for birds. (3 responses)</li> <li>• Happy for planting of low shrub trees consistent with what already exists. (2 responses)</li> <li>• Existing low-lying shrubs and garden beds need to be cleared as they are a trap for rubbish and provide a place for people to hide – reduces sightlines for women and children. (2 responses)</li> <li>• Additional native vegetation planting will improve cooling through shade, protect wind-blown loss of sand/soil and improve aesthetics. (2 responses)</li> <li>• If you have to plant a tree at least a Banksia is good for the birds.</li> <li>• Removal of existing planting will mean loss of habitat for birds</li> </ul>	<p>Native Vegetation on the foreshore is protected by a Vegetation Protection Overlay (VPO) in the Bayside Planning Scheme.</p> <p><i><u>Recommendation</u></i>  <i>Council will continue to protect and manage foreshore vegetation in accordance with the requirements of the Vegetation Protection Overlay (VPO). New and replacement revegetation will be completed using local indigenous species.</i></p>
2.4.3	<p>Leave area in its current natural appearance, do not create an homogenous urban landscape</p>	<p>The North Road foreshore is a highly modified landscape built largely on reclaimed land. The existing landscape has been developed over many years and includes a mix of older exotic planting and grass areas associated with early development of the area and more recent natural regeneration of coastal species. Refer 2.4.1 Proposed Master Plan recommendations will retain existing landscape character.</p>

ITEM	COMMENT	RESPONSE
		<p><i>Recommendation</i> No change to plan.</p>
2.4.5	Significant areas of underused grassy areas around the foreshore that could be utilised for planting of native vegetation – especially in Zone 1 between Sandown Street and the dog beach.	<p>The high volumes of cycle and pedestrian traffic in this area limit opportunities for additional revegetation. However, some areas of low coastal planting could be considered given new tree planting will not proceed.</p> <p><i>Recommendation</i> Add note to indicate investigation of opportunities for additional low Coastal revegetation between Sandown Street and the dog beach.</p>
2.4.6	Improve weed management in the area – looks to be weeds growing in fenced off areas from discarded grass clippings post mowing.	<p>Temporary foreshore storage areas utilised by Melbourne Water during recent sewer upgrade works will be rehabilitated.</p> <p><i>Recommendation</i> No change to plan.</p>
2.4.7	Ensure tea-tree is protected	<p>Please refer to page 11 and Figure 10 of the North Road Foreshore Masterplan regarding the Coast Tea tree. Council already monitors the ongoing health of these old trees and efforts are aimed at promoting natural regeneration and enhanced habitat value.</p> <p><i>Recommendation</i> No change to plan.</p>
2.4.8	Put shade structures over seating if you want shade – not trees.	<p>A new picnic shelter is proposed adjacent to the playground.</p> <p><i>Recommendation</i> Refer to item 2.4.1</p>

ITEM	COMMENT	RESPONSE
------	---------	----------

## 2.5 WATER ACCESS AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT

### NORTH ROAD STEPPED TERRACE DESIGN

#### *Have Your Say – Do you think introducing steps to the water is a good idea?*

53 Respondents	Responses	
	%	No.
Yes	87%	46
No	9%	5
Maybe	4%	2
No response	0%	0

ITEM	COMMENT	RESPONSE
2.5.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The stepped terrace at the end of North Road is an excellent idea and improved water/Bay access is much needed in this area. (11 responses)</li> <li>Unnecessary waste of money.</li> <li>People can go and swim elsewhere. (2 responses)</li> <li>This will just end up with an increase in littering as it will provide an inviting place to sit/stop. (2 responses)</li> <li>The steps serve no useful purpose.</li> </ul>	<p>The master plan recommends removing the existing rocks which are already subject to wash out and replace with a precast concrete terrace. The terrace will both minimise erosion from wave action and erosion from stormwater flows.</p> <p><u>Recommendation</u> No change to plan.</p>
2.5.2	<p>Please consider all ability access here (for elderly and disabled). (3 responses)</p>	<p>The proposed stepped terrace at the end of North Road will include ramp between terraces to provide all ability access.</p> <p><u>Recommendation</u> No change to plan.</p>
2.5.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stepped terrace needs to be natural looking/in keeping with its environment.</li> <li>The steps are another unnecessary intrusion on the natural environment.</li> </ul>	<p>The proposed stepped terrace at the end of North Road will be subject to both stormwater and tidal inundation and wave action. Unfortunately, only concrete will be durable enough to provide long term sustainability in this situation as existing rockwork will continue to fail.</p> <p><u>Recommendation</u> No change to plan.</p>
2.5.4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerned about combining a structure to manage stormwater overland flows and provides people access to the water – can stormwater be captured and treated elsewhere for irrigation in the precinct?</li> </ul>	<p>The foreshore at North Road is low lying and the depth of the underground drainage system makes it difficult to bring it to the surface for treatment and/or reuse for irrigation.</p>



ITEM	COMMENT	RESPONSE
		<p>There are no drains directly outfalling to the bay at North Road and the terrace will only be activated when water is flowing overland down North Road. This only happens during heavy rainfall and is no different to what happens now with flows over the rockwork and path.</p> <p><i><u>Recommendation</u></i> <i>No change to plan.</i></p>
2.5.5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Location is a poor choice due to proximity to existing paths/crossovers – there will be accidents (2 responses)</li> <li>• Design must take into consideration the long-term plan/management of the area – protection for planting, stormwater rubbish, “people” rubbish.</li> </ul>	<p>The stepped terrace is planned for the end of North Road to address the existing erosion problems created by both stormwater overland flow and high tide wave action.</p> <p><i><u>Recommendation</u></i> <i>No change to plan</i></p>
2.5.6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will it be possible to introduce sand to this section as the seafloor is very rocky in this area? (4 responses)</li> </ul>	<p>The placement and retention of a sand beach at North Road could only potentially be achieved through construction of a rock groyne. This has not been investigated or proposed by Council and is a State Government responsibility.</p> <p><i><u>Recommendation</u></i> <i>No change to plan</i></p>
<b>SEAWALL AND PROMENADE REPAIRS AND UPGRADE</b>		
2.5.7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree sea wall and promenade repair/upgrade works – much needed (9 responses)</li> </ul>	<p>In areas where the path is close to the shoreline and rockwork is already subject to regular over-topping causing a loss of coastal vegetation, establishment of a concrete block work seawall along the edge of the existing path is recommended.</p> <p><i><u>Recommendation</u></i> <i>No change to plan</i></p>
2.5.8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would be good to maximise revegetation opportunities between the sea wall and the rock erosion barrier – needs more green and less hard surfaces. (2 responses)</li> </ul>	<p>In the section south of North Road boat ramp coastal revegetation between the path and rock sea wall will be reinstated. Refer Figure 8 from the master plan.</p> <p>Between Head Street and North Road, it will not be possible to revegetate on the Bay side of the path. A higher wall will be needed to</p>

ITEM	COMMENT	RESPONSE
		<p>protect the path from existing and future sea level rise.</p> <p><i><u>Recommendation</u></i> <i>No change to plan</i></p>
2.5.10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Design must include a protective fence for the planting areas</li> </ul>	<p>Temporary fencing will be used to protect new planting areas until established.</p> <p><i><u>Recommendation</u></i> <i>No change to plan</i></p>
2.5.11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prioritise the sea wall repair works over the stepped terrace – this is what our rates should be used for.</li> </ul>	<p>Foreshore protection measures including the sea wall are a State Government, (DELWP) responsibility while Council is responsible for managing the path.</p> <p><i><u>Recommendation</u></i> <i>No change to plan</i></p>
2.5.12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Additional/new signage to explain the native plants and animals in this area to help people understand how the environment works even in an urban zone.</li> </ul>	<p>Rakali habitat will be protected as part of future seawall reconstruction works.</p> <p><i><u>Recommendation</u></i> <i>Install interpretative signage to improve community understanding and appreciation of the difference between indigenous Rakali and Black Rats and other vermin.</i></p>
2.5.13	Address volume of waste that pours out of Head Street drain during a rain event.	<p>The Head Street drain is a Melbourne Water asset and there are no works proposed by Council within the North Road Foreshore Masterplan area.</p> <p><i><u>Recommendation</u></i> <i>No change to plan</i></p>

ITEM	COMMENT	RESPONSE
------	---------	----------

## 2.6 SANDOWN STREET DOG BEACH

WHAT DO YOU LIKE ABOUT THE SANDOWN STREET DOG BEACH

### **Have Your Say – How do you use Sandown Street dog beach?**

38 Respondents	Responses	
	%	No.
At least once a week	34%	13
Less than once a week	34%	13
Don't use dog beach	18%	7
Don't have a dog but use dog beach	13%	5

### **Have Your Say – How do get to Sandown Street dog beach?**

38 Respondents	Responses	
	%	No.
Walk	53%	20
Drive	39%	15
Cycle	8%	3
Other	3%	1

### **Have Your Say – Do you support the introduction of fencing in some areas to protect plants?**

38 Respondents	Responses	
	%	No.
Yes	53%	20
No	21%	8
Maybe/unsure	26%	10

ITEM	COMMENT	RESPONSE
2.6.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Safe area for dogs due to being fenced in. (8 responses).</li> <li>• Great community space. (5 responses)</li> <li>• Good fun/good exercise for dogs. (4 responses).</li> <li>• Accessible (24hrs a day, 7 days a week, 365). (4 responses)</li> <li>• Large area. (2 responses)</li> <li>• Well looked after by users. (2 responses)</li> <li>• Off lead. (2 responses).</li> <li>• Free of kids and organised sports. (2 responses)</li> <li>• Get to really interact with my dog. (2 responses)</li> <li>• Great location.</li> <li>• Good for all sizes of dogs.</li> <li>• Keeps dogs away from other beaches and foreshore users.</li> <li>• Close to home.</li> <li>• Like the natural environment.</li> <li>• Access to the wildlife in the marina.</li> <li>• Increase off lead areas on the foreshore.</li> <li>• No change, it is fine as it is. (2 responses)</li> </ul>	<p>The Sandown Street Dog friendly beach provides an all year round off-leash dog area. The dog beach is popular with Bayside residents as well as other dog owners from all over Melbourne. The area is fenced along the beach and rubbish bins and 'poo' bag dispenser's area maintained by Council. The current facility and amenity are sufficient for the area.</p> <p><u>Recommendation</u> No change to plan</p>
<b>WHAT COULD BE BETTER/DIFFERENT</b>		
2.6.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Removal of seaweed build up (and smell). (5 responses)</li> <li>• Poor water quality at this beach.</li> </ul>	<p>The boat harbour and breakwater can trap seaweed on the beach under normal tidal conditions and very little</p>

ITEM	COMMENT	RESPONSE
		<p>can be done to address this without removing the boat harbour.</p> <p><u>Recommendation</u> No change to plan</p>
2.6.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The area needs lights and CCTV along the path</li> </ul>	<p>Additional low-level bollard lighting is proposed. CCTV is not proposed for this area.</p> <p><u>Recommendation</u> No change to plan</p>
2.6.4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Return Sandown Street Dog beach to a beach for residents to use, and not dogs. (4 responses)</li> <li>Move dog beach to Green Point. (3 responses)</li> <li>Older residents and children could enjoy the area if there were no dogs/no fear of getting knocked over.</li> <li>People need to look out for their children while at the dog beach.</li> <li>Concerned about volume of 'visitors' to the area who come to see dog beach, bathing</li> <li>boxes houses on the golden mile – and spend no money in the area.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Investigation of additional Dog off lead areas at Green Point is outside the scope of this project.</li> <li>The Sandown Street Dog Beach is a popular local facility providing facilities for both dogs and beach use. There are no changes proposed as part of the North Road Foreshore Masterplan.</li> </ul> <p><u>Recommendation</u> No change to plan</p>
2.6.5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Enforce dog regulations – dogs off lead on paths/picking up after dog. (3 responses)</li> </ul>	<p>Complaints have been referred to Bayside Local Laws.</p> <p><u>Recommendation</u> No change to plan</p>
2.6.7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policing of illegal parking by non-ratepayers. (3 responses)</li> <li>Littering by non-ratepayers on local streets. (3 responses)</li> <li>Non-ratepayers use the local amenity but don't spend any money in the area – there is no benefit to council. (2 responses)</li> </ul>	<p>Complaints have been referred to Bayside Local Laws.</p> <p><u>Recommendation</u> No change to plan</p>
2.6.8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Replenish 'poo-bags' more frequently.</li> <li>Council should apply DNA regulations used in Elwood to ensure owners are responsible for removing dog droppings.</li> <li>Provide more bins.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There are bin facilities at both north and south end of the dog beach. The current provision is adequate for this area and does not require additional bins.</li> <li>Poo bag dispensers are provided a both north and southern end of the dog beach. The current provision is adequate for this area and does not require additional dispensers.</li> </ul> <p><u>Recommendation</u></p>

ITEM	COMMENT	RESPONSE
		<i>No change to plan</i>
2.6.9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Include a shower and/or hose to rinse off humans and dogs. (2 responses)</li> <li>• Improve signage for dog drinking stations.</li> <li>• More drinking fountains spaced at regular intervals are needed.</li> </ul>	<p>There are two drinking fountains with dog drinking stations along the Bay trail at both north and south end of the dog beach. The drinking stations are located on the coastal edge of the path which are visible along the Bay Trail.</p> <p>There are 6 drinking fountains along the foreshore located throughout Head Street, Dawson Avenue, North Point Café, Bay Street, Sandown Street and at the Middle Brighton Baths. The current provision of drinking facilities is sufficient for the area.</p> <p><u>Recommendation</u> <i>No change to plan</i></p>
2.6.10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There should be wheelchair access to beach.</li> </ul>	<p>The Sandown Street dog beach is soft sand which restricts access by wheelchair off the path. Accessible beach facilities are provided at Half Moon Bay and Hampton Beach.</p> <p><u>Recommendation</u> <i>No change to plan</i></p>
2.6.11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Congestion on paths near dog beach gates needs to be improved.</li> </ul>	<p>Separation of the cycle paths away from the coastal path and the Bay Trail will improve a safe access into the dog beach.</p> <p><u>Recommendation</u> <i>No change to plan</i></p>
2.6.12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provision of some seating for older people around dog beach so they can enjoy comfortably.</li> </ul>	<p>Noted.</p> <p><u>Recommendation</u> <i>Add note regarding establishment of two new bench seats within the Sandown Street Dog Beach Area.</i></p>
2.6.13	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Big gap under the middle gate easy for small dogs to escape.</li> </ul>	<p>Build-up of sand means that a larger clearance is needed for the gate.</p>

ITEM	COMMENT	RESPONSE
	.	<u>Recommendation</u> <i>No change to plan</i>
<b>2.7 GENERAL</b>		
2.7.1	The groyne/seaweed issue needs to be addressed. (10 responses)	The boat harbour and breakwater can trap seaweed on the beach under normal tidal conditions and very little can be done to address this without removing the boat harbour.  <u>Recommendation</u> <i>No change to plan</i>
2.7.2	Would like to see additional seating between dog statue and sea wall – provide more rest stops for elderly.	Noted  <u>Recommendation</u> <i>Add note regarding establishment of two new bench seats within the Sandown Street Dog Beach Area.</i>
2.7.3	Maintenance required to memorial seating is required – the seating is used often.	Issue has been referred to Council parks maintenance department.  <u>Recommendation</u> <i>No change to plan</i>
2.7.4	Include more picnic tables and seating so more people can enjoy the grassed areas.	Noted.  <u>Recommendation</u> <i>Add additional beach seat and tables to grassland areas near the carpark.</i>
2.7.5	Outdoor exercise equipment would be a good inclusion for the community.	Council currently focuses the provision of exercise equipment to its park areas and does not currently support provision of exercise as it is not a coastal dependent use.  <u>Recommendation</u> <i>No change to plan</i>
<b>PROCESS</b>		
2.7.6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In your introduction it says, “Council has met with neighbouring property owners and residents to discuss options for replacing some of the plants and possible models for the future management of these garden beds”. We live right on the foreshore and no one contacted us, we only became aware of the proposal via a mail drop from a fellow concerned resident. (2 responses)</li> </ul>	Community consultation on the Draft Master Plan was completed over a fourteen-week period from 3 December 2018 to 17 February 2019. This included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site walkover with adjoining residents of the foreshore notified by letter box drop on Thursday 15 and Saturday 18 November 2018.</li> </ul>

ITEM	COMMENT	RESPONSE
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The only way we got access to the proposed masterplan was via a Google search. This plan could not be found on the Bayside website!</li> <li>• More consultation with residents is needed. (2 responses)</li> <li>•</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Community Drop in session held on 17,19,20 January, and 4 February 2019.</li> <li>• On site displays along the foreshore, Leader advertising between 11 December to 15 January 2019, Postcards letterdrop to 6000 residents in December 2018 and February 2019.</li> <li>• Draft Master Plan and full report was displayed on Council's website via 'Have Your Say' online portal.</li> <li>• Digital screens at the corporate centres.</li> </ul> <p><i>Recommendation</i> <i>No change to plan</i></p>

## 2.8 NORTH POINT CAFÉ REDEVELOPMENT

### *Have Your Say – I support the expansion of the café footprint into the rear car park*

177 Respondents

	Responses	
	%	No.
Yes	80%	141
No	13%	23
Probably	6%	11
No response/blank	1%	2

### *Have Your Say – What is your connection to the North Point Café?*

177 Respondents

	Responses	
	%	No.
Live nearby the café/foreshore	50%	88
Regular customer	42%	75
Occasional customer	33%	59
Visit the foreshore not the café	9%	16
Other	2%	4

### *Have Your Say – I support the extension of operating hours and amendment of the liquor licence*

177 Respondents

	Responses	
	%	No.
Yes	67%	119
No	21%	37
Probably	2%	4
No response/blank	10%	17

**The North Point Café is being considered by Council as a separate process with recommendations to be adopted to the final master plan as follows:**

#### **Recommendations:**

- Provide additional bicycle parking facilities at the Café.

- Investigate redevelopment of the café and public toilet facility in accordance with the Victorian Coastal Strategy and Design Guidelines to reduce flooding and improve visitor facilities. The planning and detailed design for these works will be undertaken via a separate process.
- Reduce vehicle speed and remove the car park access road central median to increase footpath width and improve pedestrian safety and amenity adjacent to the Café and public toilet facilities. Upgrade the existing crossing to pedestrian priority.
- Establish two accessible parking bays (minimum 3.6m wide) and a short term (5mins) drop off/pick up bay in the grass nature strip on North Road at North Point Café.