

# **Brighton Beach to Ferdinando Gardens Master Plan**

---

## **COMMUNITY CONSULTATION REPORT**

Prepared by

Thompson Berrill Landscape Design Pty Ltd

for

Bayside City Council

January 2017

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<b>PAGE #</b>
<b>1. CONSULTATION PROCESS</b>	<b>3</b>
1.1 Summary of Consultation at the Analysis Phase	
1.2 Summary of Consultation at the Draft Master Plan Phase	
<b>2. RESPONSE TO KEY ISSUES RAISED DURING CONSULTATION ON THE DRAFT MASTER PLAN</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>3. FEEDBACK RECEIVED DURING CONSULTATION ON THE DRAFT MASTER PLAN</b>	<b>18</b>
3.1 Community Information Sessions	18
3.2 “Have Your Say” Website Feedback	19
3.3 Other meetings and correspondence	23

REV	DATE	AMENDMENT
C	25/01/2017	Amended as per meeting with Simon Finlay and Amy Weir 9/12/16
B	8/12/2016	Updated to included Draft Master Plan Consultation responses
A	7/12/2015	Draft for comment

# 1. Consultation Process

There has been extensive consultation completed by Council with the local community, clubs, businesses and other community organisations at Sandringham through the recently completed *Bayside Coastal Management Plan 2014 and Bayside Open Space Strategy 2012*. The Brighton Beach to Ferdinando Gardens Master Plan therefore focused on targeted precinct stakeholder consultation in development of the draft.

## 1.1 Stakeholder consultation during the analysis phase

Community consultation at the analysis phase included:

- **Review of previous consultation**  
Community consultation and Council endorsed recommendations and priorities arising from the *Bayside Coastal Management Plan 2014, Jetty Road Path Improvement Project 2014, Bayside Open Space Strategy 2012 and Sandringham Foreshore Management Plan 2010* were reviewed and reconfirmed with precinct stakeholders.
- **On site meeting with Hampton Life Saving Club**  
Tuesday 1 March 2016 from 4.00pm – 6.00pm at Hampton Life Saving Club.  
On site meeting was held with Hampton Life Saving Club, to discuss key issues and opportunities to be considered in development of the draft master plan.

## 1.2 Community consultation at the Draft Master Plan phase

Community consultation on the draft Master Plan was completed over a three week period from 18 August 2016 to 11 September 2016. This included:

- **Evening Community Beach Renourishment Information Session**  
Thursday 18 August 2016 from 4.00pm - 7.00pm at Sandy by the Bay, Sandringham Football Club. This provided an opportunity for interested people to attend and ask questions, providing feedback to DELWP, Council officers and the Consultant team. Refer to Section 3.
- **Afternoon Community Drop in Information Session**  
Friday 26 August 2016 from 1.00pm – 3.00pm at Sandringham Village. This provided an opportunity for interested people to attend and ask questions, providing feedback to the Consultant team. Refer to Section 3.
- **Morning Community Drop in Information Session**  
Saturday 3 September 2016 from 10.00am – 12.00pm at Hampton Life Saving Club. This provided an opportunity for interested people to attend and ask questions, providing feedback to the Consultant team. Refer to Section 3.
- **Council Website** - <http://yoursaybayside.com.au/brighton-beach-to-ferdinando-gardens-masterplan> The draft Master Plan and full report was displayed on Council's website for community feedback via the 'Have Your Say' online portal. Refer Section 3.1
- **Other consultation** On site meetings, phone and email clarifications were undertaken by Council officers to address specific issues/opportunities raised in consultation. Refer Section 3.3

## 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 and outlines the proposed response for consideration in finalisation of the Master Plan. The number of respondents for each issue, including those received via the website, via e-mail, at the drop in sessions, are noted in brackets where more than one person commented. Refer to Section 3 for further detail on specific issues raised in consultation.

ITEM	COMMENT	RESPONSE
<b>1. BEACH ROAD PARKING</b>		
1.1	<p>Opportunities for indented parking along Beach Road were assessed as recommended in the <i>Beach Road Corridor Strategy – Metropolitan Route 33 Elwood to Mordialloc (2011)</i>. There was extensive community feedback and discussion of options to establish indented parking on the Esplanade. The majority of respondents were opposed to establishment of indented parking both on the foreshore and private property sides of the road. A brief summary of comments includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Do not support indenting parking on the Foreshore side as a reduction in the number of parking spots and would increase the pressure on side streets. This would also reduce the income from the parking meters and again make them even more un-financial, leave the rate payers to continue to subsidise them.</li> <li>• Studies all over the world have shown that congestion and parking problems are not solved but are instead exacerbated by provision of further infrastructure for cars. This proposal will not solve the problem of congestion. (4)</li> <li>• Indented parking could only be support if it improved safety and the environment and increased the number of available parking spaces. These proposals (Option 2, 3 and 4) fail all three requirements.</li> <li>• Proposed changes would increase the risk to the residents, drivers and cyclist pedestrians. As decrease of the nature strips</li> </ul>	<p>Beach Road is managed by VicRoads.</p> <p>There is no parking at Ferdinando Gardens or at Hampton Life Saving Club however on street car parking is provided on both sides of Beach Road outside Clearway and No Stopping periods. Beach Road is the primary parking area for visitors to Hampton Beach. On street parking restricts traffic flow during peak periods and creates pinch points and reduced safety for cyclists and pedestrians using Beach Road. As recommended in the <i>Bayside Coastal Management Plan 2014</i>, the Draft Master Plan completed an investigation into potential options for establishment of indented parking for this section of the Esplanade.</p> <p>Establishment of indented parallel parking requires a parking bay width of 2.1m with 1.0m clearance to cyclists using Beach Road. The Esplanade on the foreshore side a further 1.0m clearance is required for cyclists on the Bay Trail. Parallel parking bays must be a minimum of 6.7m long.</p> <p>The following opportunities were assessed as part of the draft master plan. Refer O'Brien Traffic Report, Appendix 2 for further detail:</p> <p><b>Option 1: Maintain status quo</b></p> <p><b>Option 2: Indented parking on the residential side between New Street and Small Street</b> This can be achieved without loss of on street parking capacity and would improve traffic flow, safety for cyclists, pedestrians and access to parking for residents. This results in a net gain of 6 -11 spaces by establishing parking in areas currently signed as clearways.</p> <p><b>Option 3: Indented parking on the foreshore side without relocation of the Bay Trail.</b></p>

ITEM	COMMENT	RESPONSE
	<p>would reduce the length of the driveways and so reduce people's view of traffic/pedestrians when entering or leaving their homes. (3)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• These changes alter a two lane road to a four lane highway, because of this the speed will increase dramatically, we already experience motorcycle and motor vehicle speeding in excess of the 100km in the area. (2)</li> <li>• Parking spaces are seldom fully utilised. (3)</li> <li>• Relative to demand at the relevant times none of the proposals make enough of a difference to justify the expense or and visual impact. (2)</li> <li>• Many people who have bayside stickers use New Street, Orlando Street and Small Street during hot weather, there is only a problem when there is a well-attended event at HLSC.</li> <li>• What is the cost of these 6 – 11 car spaces?</li> <li>• From a safety viewpoint, how does carving out part or all of the nature strip make it safer for people and animals who walk on the footpaths?</li> <li>• How does this promote public transport, which runs right along Beach Rd?</li> <li>• How does replacing grass with concrete/bitumen help beautify the area?</li> <li>• Why spend significant sums of money to achieve such a small perceived difference. (2)</li> <li>• Indented parking has been raised as benefitting cyclists, but the traffic congestion argument being used is a smokescreen for what is really a traffic flow investment for motorists.</li> <li>• We can use the substantial money needed to deliver these works to greater advantage in other areas of the community.</li> <li>• The number of spaces created (6 – 11) is deliberately vague in order to put a positive spin on this option</li> </ul>	<p>18 indented car parking bays can be established on the foreshore side without removal of vegetation. However, this will reduce the overall existing on road parking capacity in this section by approximately 55 spaces.</p> <p><b>Option 4: Indented parking on the foreshore side increasing capacity by relocating the Bay Trail where possible but without removal of trees or native vegetation.</b></p> <p>A further 29 indented car parking spaces can be established on the foreshore side if 350m of the Bay Trail is relocated and re built. Note the need to protect existing trees will mean the overall existing on road parking capacity in this section is still reduced by 26 spaces. Refer Attachment 2.</p> <p>It is also likely that the Bay Trail may need to be widened to 3.0m in the future to accommodate increasing use and this also needs to be considered in assessing opportunities for establishment of indented parking on the foreshore side.</p> <p>The benefits to indenting parallel parking on the foreshore side are limited by the following constraints:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Establishment of a mix of indented and on street car parking is not preferred as it creates additional pinch points and hazards to both cyclists and vehicles.</li> <li>• The need to avoid existing trees and light poles on the foreshore will reduce overall parking capacity on the beach side of Beach Road.</li> <li>• Existing no stopping zones will remain and it will not be possible to establish indented parking at Hampton Life Saving Club, the major source of congestion, without significant removal of vegetation protected by the existing Vegetation Protection Overlay in the Bayside Planning Scheme.</li> <li>• The cost for completion of works will be significant (approx. \$360,000) and may increase following more detailed assessment of underground services.</li> </ul> <p><u>Recommendation</u>  <i>Consultation completed as part of the Draft Masterplan indicates that none of the options investigated are supported by the local community therefore Option 1, maintain the</i></p>

ITEM	COMMENT	RESPONSE
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What expense and inconvenience to residents is going to be caused by having to relocate all the light and power poles along this strip? (2)</li> <li>• The loss of porous, grassy, surfaces would be regrettable. The grassy nature strip is attractive and adds to the beach feel. The grass helps allay the heat on very hot days. Bitumen and concrete would increase the heat sink.</li> <li>• Motor vehicles frequently perform illegal U-turns which is dangerous for pedestrians who are looking to cross Beach Road in front of the Holyrood Street.</li> <li>• Pedestrians crossing at this location include small children and they are more often than not accompanied by their dogs; they will be unaware of motor vehicles illegally turning back towards the city until it is too late – someone will be badly injured or killed if this initiative is proceeded with.</li> <li>• If the Bay Trail is relocated this may limit the ability to widen it in the future as suggested in the Gardens Masterplan. Moving the path would also impact on the wetlands area, causing a reduction in size. (2)</li> <li>• Although there is parking on this side, most beach goers prefer to use the foreshore side for convenience and more importantly safety. (3)</li> </ul>	<p><i>existing arrangements is the recommended approach.</i></p> <p><i>Refer 1.3.</i></p>
1.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support to the plan of indented parking along Beach Rd. It will solve a huge problem, where commuters take a short cut down Orlando St, because Beach Rd traffic has been reduced to a single lane due to a single parked car.</li> <li>• Recessed parking will ease traffic congestion and provide safer parking for residents who do not have adequate 'on site' parking at their homes.</li> <li>• Recessed parking may help to avoid serious car accidents which</li> </ul>	<p>Refer 1.1</p> <p><u>Recommendation</u> <i>No change to plan.</i></p>

ITEM	COMMENT	RESPONSE
	<p>have occurred in from on numbers 38, 39 and 40, as well as a fatal incident outside number 50.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The recessed parking should be for residents only, so that those with no off street parking can park there rather than Beach Road.</li> </ul>	
1.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Could a Clearway from 4pm – 6pm be used as a way to provide the additional traffic lane, and to reduce the number of cars using Orlando St as a short cut? (6)</li> <li>Clearway from 3pm – 7pm could solve traffic congestion at low cost. (2)</li> <li>Clearway from 4pm – 7pm could stop traffic banking up from New Street during peak hour, and from 6am – 9am in the other direction for morning commuters.</li> <li>Re-instatement of parking along Beach Road on Saturday and Sunday mornings during the summer months. The clearway was put in to improve cyclist safety but it has been at the expense of families wishing to access the beach before it gets too hot.</li> </ul>	<p>The Esplanade Beach Road is managed by VicRoads.</p> <p>The implementation of a clearway could improve traffic flow and potentially improve safety for cyclists however would have a potential conflict on residential amenity.</p> <p>Further investigation of this suggestion is outside the scope of the Draft Masterplan which was only looking at parking arrangements.</p> <p><u>Recommendation</u> <i>No change to plan.</i></p> <p><i>Refer traffic congestion concerns to Vic Roads.</i></p>
1.4	<p>There is an opportunity for the Council to acquire the small parcel of land that once housed the Solo Service Station, and turn it into ticketed parking for people going to the beach. There is already a set of traffic lights and a pedestrian crossing in this area.</p>	<p>The land is not owned by Council and there are no plans to acquire land for parking.</p> <p><u>Recommendation</u> <i>No change to plan</i></p>
1.5	<p>A cheaper more effective option to help reduce congestion would be to have a drive-in and drop-off area for those using the beach or Life Saving Club at the rear or the Life Saving Club.</p>	<p>The Hampton LSC already has restricted vehicle access to the club building and beach for drop off of equipment and other deliveries. Further extension of public vehicle access and parking on the foreshore, even for drop off only, is not recommended due to safety issues associated with increased number of vehicles crossing the Bay Trail and the loss of open space and vegetation required for establishment of this type of facility.</p> <p><u>Recommendation</u> <i>No change to plan</i></p>
<b>2. HAMPTON LIFE SAVING CLUB</b>		
2.1	<p>Agree to the proposed changes suggested for the Hampton Life Saving Club as shown in the Draft Masterplan. (7)</p>	<p>The current two storey building was constructed in 1998 and includes an air-conditioned and centrally heated upstairs function room, kitchen, and office and patrol</p>

ITEM	COMMENT	RESPONSE
		room with views out over Port Phillip Bay. Downstairs are the boat and board storage areas, kiosk, gym, first aid room, and change rooms. There club currently has over nine hundred members and a lack of storage space, access to beach showers and change room space have been identified as issues by the club.
2.2	It depends on the size of the proposed extension. If the footprint of the extension cannibalised an extensive area, it may be more appropriate to add an extra storey to the clubhouse instead.	The proposed Hampton Life Saving Club extension, if required, could occupy the path area at the rear of the existing building. Refer Map page 13 and Photo 31. The extension is subject to club funding and any redevelopment will be subject to standard Council review and approval procedures as outlined in the Bayside Planning Scheme.  <i>Recommendation</i> <i>No change to plan</i>
2.3	The extension must consider the relocation of the existing public toilets. The increase in building capacity to the zone behind the club is supported this will require the relocation of the public toilets to Ferdinando Gardens, it is appropriate to have a public toilet facility adjacent to the facilities in these gardens.	The two accessible toilets at Hampton Life Saving Club will be retained. There is no intent to provide additional buildings in Ferdinando Gardens.  <i>Recommendation</i> <i>No change to plan</i>
2.4	Along with showers on the beach, would need taps so that hoses can be attached for washing equipment on new enforced mesh area and not having to have hoses across path.	The proposed relocation of beach showers to the Bay side of the foreshore path is outlined at page 13 point B3 and B5.  <i>Recommendation</i> <i>Add note regarding the importance of a tap fitting for wash down purposes.</i>
2.5	I would like to be assured that any offsets required in relation to the removal of native vegetation would be met in the Bayside foreshore. Measures to block informal tracks should not be done so as to block access to some areas where one could sit quietly amongst the vegetation.	There is no intent to remove native vegetation on the foreshore. Council pruning to maintain sightlines and safe access along paths will continue in accordance with current best practice.  <i>Recommendation</i> <i>Add note to install bollards to prevent parking on lawn areas.</i>
2.6	Is it possible to install solar panels above the showers to provide warm water during winter?	Solar panels will only work where water is stored. Outdoor showers do not have this capacity, however, there are warm showers available for the public at Hampton Life Saving Club.  <i>Recommendation</i> <i>No change to plan</i>
2.7	A carpark off road beside the LSC would facilitate easier access for nippers. Young children are at risk of accident leaving their parent's cars to attend nippers.	Traffic Engineering assessment by O'Brien Traffic completed as part of the Draft Master Plan indicated off road car parking could not be provided at Hampton Life Saving Club without significant loss of native vegetation. Refer also 1.5

ITEM	COMMENT	RESPONSE
		<p><u>Recommendation</u> No change to plan</p>
<b>3. FERDINANDO GARDENS FORESHORE PICNIC AREA</b>		
3.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Don't agree with the splash pad replacing the Octopus garden play area. (4)</li> <li>• It's an expensive exercise in area that is not that vast to accommodate it adjacent to the beach?</li> <li>• The cost of pumping salt water and maintenance could be problematic with a constant flow of water over the path. Why not create picnic settings to watch sunsets?</li> <li>• \$750,000 for a sea water play space in this spot with no BBQ, adequate car parking or toilets, would be considered poor planning.</li> <li>• Concerned that electricity power will be required for salt water to be piped up to the pools which require ongoing maintenance (more expenses for Council and our rates).</li> <li>• Sits uncomfortably with the principle of man-made pools beside a natural beach.</li> <li>• Man-made pools may be a legal risk to Council for potential drownings, slips and injuries. (2)</li> <li>• I can't imagine the Council keeping the seawater reticulation system in perfect working order, when they can't keep the pump at any of our inland lakes consistently working e.g. Landcox and Basterfield Park.</li> </ul>	<p>The current Octopus Playground area has an informal climbing wall and rubber surfaced play space at beach level below Ferdinando Gardens. The play area has limited equipment and is not well used.</p> <p>The sea wall path is wider in this area and the protected beach and proximity to water and the graded access ramp make this area popular for visitors with small children and prams.</p> <p>There is no seating or functional shade/shelter and the existing seawall and path are in need of replacement.</p> <p>DELWP are planning to replace the timber groyne and undertake further beach renourishment in the near future.</p> <p>The Draft Master Plan recommended an investigation and redevelopment of the Octopus Garden Playground as a salt water play/splash pad area with additional shade and picnic/seating facilities. Refer Detail Plan C</p> <p><u>Recommendation</u> <i>The potential establishment of a saltwater/splash pool area below Ferdinando Gardens has not generated sufficient interest or support to proceed any further. The option was originally suggested as a new play experience opportunity however, given the feedback received regarding costs and lack of parking, this proposal has been scaled back. The establishment of extensive planting is not considered practical due to the extremely harsh growing conditions and concrete slab/retaining wall upon which the existing play area is built.</i></p> <p><i>Amend Detail Plan C to remove the rubber surface as identified and replace with low level indigenous planting and provision of shelter with new picnic and seating facilities with improved access to the beach. Retain climbing wall and soft fall surface as required and investigate new mural for the wall.</i></p>
3.2	I love the idea of a water playground like the one at Royal Children's Playground, but this is	Refer to Item 3.1 in this report.

ITEM	COMMENT	RESPONSE
	<p>not the right place for it. It is also inconsistent with the Bayside Playground Strategy.</p> <p>Would a much smaller version of the pool at Bondi below Iceberg's restaurant be possible?</p>	<p>Refer to Item 3.1 in this report.</p> <p><i>Recommendation</i> <i>No change to plan.</i></p>
3.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This area should be for seating and shade. (5)</li> <li>• Existing rubber surface should go as it releases chemicals in the heat.</li> <li>• It is hot in summer and unattractive – it could be removed and upgraded to a native garden and seat with indigenous trees to provide shade. (2)</li> </ul>	
<b>4. SHADE SHELTERS</b>		
4.1	Agree with installation of shade shelters. Let's start with two, and we might need more in the future.	There is very limited shade on Brighton and Hampton Beaches.
4.2	We are concerned about the durability of the proposed shade shelters. They will need extreme anchoring to maintain their position in storms.	The Draft Master Plan recommended establishment of low profile skillion roof shade shelter with integrated timber seating to improve sun protection for beach users in areas where the foreshore promenade is wide enough to allow through traffic to pass unimpeded. They will be set below the level of the primary dune and will not impact on views from the coastal walking path or the Esplanade.
4.3	The proposed shelter is over a pedestrian path way, this does not allow the space to be used for sitting in the shade when the shade is on the path used by pedestrians. I suggest the location of the shade shelter is inappropriate. If a space is available off the path this option should then be considered.	<p><i>Recommendation</i> <i>No change to plan.</i></p>
4.4	I support these structures – maybe there should be a discrete “Please give up your seat...” notice.	
	This is a great idea for families. (3)	
4.5	More shade MUST be provided nearer to Beach Road using trees to retain vistas from houses. Nothing in the Coast Management Plan that I remember says that views from houses must not be affected by change.	
<b>5. FERDINANDO GARDENS</b>		
5.1	Do not restrict the use by groups wanting to undertake fitness activities in the open. This community use is to be encouraged. The only damage I have noticed is from vandals – there's constantly a need not only to repaint but to repair due to vandalism.	The historic Ferdinando Gardens are used by a range of visitors to the foreshore. Overuse is an issue that creates difficulty in maintaining the lawn areas and other facilities in the gardens due to increasing use by a range of commercial operators. There has also been some issues associated with bench seating within the picnic shelter and gardens being used for 'step- 'ups' and other activities which

ITEM	COMMENT	RESPONSE
		<p>leave them in an unfit state for use as seating by other visitors.</p> <p><i>Recommendation</i> No change to plan.</p>
5.2	<p>The facilities are there for all ratepayers to use as well as others and see absolutely no reason to stop groups exercising. I have only noticed damage after Ferdinando Gardens has been used by overly large groups who have paid to hire out the shelter shed.</p> <p>Exercise and fresh air are quintessential with our Bayside living – do not make this difficult for the community.</p>	<p>The Draft Masterplan recommended monitoring use levels, especially by personal trainers and fitness groups to protect the existing lawn areas to enable enjoyment by all visitors.</p> <p><i>Recommendation</i> Add note to page 11 Note (1) to also include monitoring of other events and ceremonies booked to the gardens.</p>
5.3	<p>You wish to stop people exercising on the lawn area whether it be large or small groups of people to prevent damage to the lawn and garden areas. I don't think they are the ones destroying the area but the triathlons and weddings that are constantly using the area, hammering in poles and marquees, cars driven on the lawn, blocking off access to rate payers and the annoyance of Beach Road being closed. Why do you allow this? Is it because you get a lot of money for these events and it outweighs the damage it does? (2)</p>	
<b>6. PROPOSED NEW STREET TOILETS</b>		
6.1	<p>Don't need a toilet at New Street. It is only six minutes on foot to the public toilet at Hampton Lifesaving Club, and about the same to the railway station. But it might be useful to install signs at regular intervals along the foreshore giving the direction and distance to the nearest public toilet. (2)</p>	<p>Brighton Beach public toilet facilities are located at the end of South Road. Recently upgraded they are accessible from both the beach and Bay Trail. Hampton Beach public toilets are Exeloo facilities located on the ground and upper floor of the Life Saving Club. Public toilets along the foreshore provide for disabled access, are co-located with beach showers and are in generally good condition.</p>
6.2	<p>There should be no new toilet at New Street for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Graffiti – currently we have it on fences and the level crossing at New Street gates.</li> <li>• People with undesirable sexual activities and illegal drug habits.</li> <li>• The smell in summer.</li> <li>• Has potential to spoil the view and reduce the appeal of the foreshore.</li> </ul>	<p>Assessment completed as part of the <i>Bayside Public Toilet Strategy 2012</i>, recommended the establishment of a new public toilet facility on the foreshore in the vicinity of New Street.</p> <p>It is just under 1km between the two existing toile facilities both of which are fully accessible and provide service to the most popular and well used sections of both Brighton and Hampton Beaches. There is limited parking in the vicinity of New Street and establishment of a new facility in this area is considered a very</p>

ITEM	COMMENT	RESPONSE
6.3	Could the proposed toilets be automatically locked between 10pm and 5am to discourage people from using them inappropriately?	low priority. It is likely that the existing facility at Brighton Beach will require additional works before a new facility is considered in this area.
6.4	The proposed toilet block at the end of New Street is not a popular one. Could we have a drinking fountain/dog bowl instead? Suggest locating it close to the path and to the New St stairs, with signage on the bike path to point people to the water station.	<u>Recommendation</u> <i>Remove recommendation for establishment of a new public toilet facility at New Street.</i>  <i>Add note for upgrade of signage to provide directions for visitors to the existing toilet facilities at Brighton Beach and Hampton LSC as a high priority.</i>
6.5	Oppose the toilet block at New St that is being flagged. With the new intersection at Beach Road and New St there is no parking for people to stop to use the toilet facilities, if people did stop it would be very dangerous and increase the chance of an accident.	
	Using Council funds for widening the shared pedestrian and cyclist path along Beach Road from Green Point to Dendy Beach would be better than spending it on toilets.	
	New toilet facility in vicinity of New St is desperately needed.	
6.6	Building a toilet block on the foreshore would be an eyesore. If another toilet block was essential maybe it could be on the other side of Beach Road, where the Holyrood St playground and the railway crossing is. There is vacant overgrown land there (used to be a petrol station) that could be used for a toilet block and car parking.	This land is not owned by Council and establishment of toilet facilities on the away from the foreshore would not service beach visitors or others using the Bay Trail or Coast Walking Path.  <u>Recommendation</u> <i>No change to plan</i>
<b>7. VEGETATION MANAGEMENT</b>		
7.1	Do more on the foreshore reserve to remove weeds and replace with native vegetation. Perhaps replanting to mimic the vegetation which existing at the commencement of settlement could be attempted.	The majority of vegetation within the study area has been modified by historic land stabilisation and erosion control associated with Beach Road and the foreshore sea wall and paths. There has been extensive planting using non indigenous species many of which provide a significant contribution to landscape character.  Ongoing Council management of the foreshore aims to maintain and enhance existing vegetation including foreshore planted native (not indigenous trees such as Norfolk Island Pines and palms., undertaking staged removal of weed species and revegetation using low growing indigenous species to improve habitat values while maintaining existing views from Beach Road and the path network. All new planting is undertaken using

ITEM	COMMENT	RESPONSE
		<p>indigenous species consistent with the Pre 1750 Ecological Vegetation Class. (EVC)</p> <p>Council will continue to remove high threat woody weeds including African Boxthorn and infill garden beds with low indigenous coastal species consistent with the EVC.</p> <p><i>Recommendation</i> <i>No change to plan</i></p>
7.2	<p>Ensure foreshore foliage adjacent to the 'The Swimmer' is kept to a height below the sight line of the statue to ensure the appearance of the horizon as a water level.</p>	<p>Council will continue to clip planted indigenous vegetation as part of the sculptural display. Refer Masterplan Photo 4.</p> <p><i>Recommendation</i> <i>No change to plan</i></p>
7.3	<p>Between New St and the 'swimmer' ramp there are tracks through the vegetation that have been made by kite surfers wanting direct access. I know the Council doesn't want fencing along this section. Erosion is starting in some places. Signs?? Please use the path.</p>	<p>Council monitors the establishment of informal tracks which can cause damage sensitive coastal vegetation and present safety risks for users. Temporary fencing is a last resort but can sometimes be required if signage and brush matting prove ineffective.</p> <p><i>Recommendation</i> <i>Include note regarding temporary vegetation protection measures and signage.</i></p>
7.4	<p>The ongoing vegetation issue is another misleading one as all vegetation planted between New St and Small St is or recent planting and not remnant and indigenous. Many of the new plantings are not indigenous anyway e.g. the Auracarias and Gazania sp.</p>	<p>Refer Item 7.1</p> <p><i>Recommendation</i> <i>No change to plan</i></p>
7.5	<p>The great added advantage of the sparser plantings that exist now, is to create a more open space that is safer from lewd behaviour and sexual predators (that actually exist) but also offers a spectacular view for beach users, passing cars and those lucky local residents.</p> <p>There should be better visibility from the road or shared path toward the coastal path. The path is not safe for women walking alone as it is screened by vegetation. The areas of bushy foliage could be thinned out to provide this better visibility.</p>	<p>A planning permit is required to remove vegetation other than as part of weed control, fire prevention, public safety and road safety management actions.</p> <p>Infill planting is typically undertaken using low indigenous planting to maintain views in this section of the foreshore.</p> <p><i>Recommendation</i> <i>No change to plan</i></p>
7.7	<p>Most urgent attention should be given to the shared path and adjoining trees and foliage. Maintenance works continually fail to prune or trim the foliage parallel to the shared path sufficiently – and</p>	<p>The requirements for the unsealed coastal walking path are consistent with recommendation confirmed in the Bayside Foreshore Management Plan 2014. This is intended to maintain the unique natural feel of the coastal walk while sustainably and safely</p>

ITEM	COMMENT	RESPONSE
	<p>form a hazard to people using the shared path (tree trunks and branches mean that people cannot move off the shared path and out of harm's way).</p> <p>The strip of land parallel to the shared path should be widened to 1500mm to provide a safe incident avoidance barrier to both pedestrians and cyclists.</p> <p>The widened "safety strip" should be clear of tree trunks and any overhanging trees that might be tan barked, grassed or planted with ground covering plant species.</p>	<p>managing the increasing volume of walkers and joggers using the track, bikes are not permitted in the track which is intended for walking use only. However retaining and improving equity of access for people with limited mobility is a key objective and requirement of the plan.</p> <p>The majority of the coastal path through the Sandringham Foreshore is already managed in accordance with these requirements. The plan aims to designate the primary through path allowing smaller secondary paths to continue to be maintained less formally and rationalised where possible to minimise ongoing impact on vegetation and habitat values.</p> <p>A maximum pruning clearance width of 2.5m is maintained in accordance with the <i>Bayside Foreshore Management Plan 2014</i>.</p> <p><u>Recommendation</u> <i>No change to plan</i></p>
<b>8.0 STORMWATER</b>		
8.1	<p>Stormwater harvesting – associated with points 2 and 4 would all help with the major problem of this section of foreshore – the Orlando St outfall of the Grenville St drain. (2)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stormwater harvesting – this is an excellent idea.</li> </ul>	<p>The Draft Master Plan recommends liaising with Melbourne Water investigate options to mitigate flooding and establish a Gross Pollutant Trap and storm water harvesting system for the New Street drain outfall. Works to include installation of large underground storage tank in the open grass area between New Street and Mair Street to improve sustainability of irrigation at Brighton Beach Oval.</p> <p><u>Recommendation</u> <i>No change to plan</i></p>
8.2	<p>In extreme cases the pressure of the stormwater in the drain dislodges the heavy lid of the inspection point on Beach Road, and both Beach Road and Orlando Street flood. I understand this is the responsibility of Melbourne Water (Reported Case Ref. S-18129).</p> <p>The drain opposite Edgecliff (Beach Rd &amp; Corner Orlando St), which has often burst its structure and still has temporary fencing around it. Why was this not included like the other two, one north and one south of the Edgecliff one.</p>	<p>Note these are Melbourne Water assets and maintenance enquiries should be sent directly to Melbourne Water.</p> <p><u>Recommendation</u> <i>No change to plan</i></p>
8.3	<p>Wetland soak area – a possible solution to the drying out of the ponds could be to enlarge the low lying base for greater capacity of</p>	<p>Draft Masterplan page 10 item 3 recommends investigation of opportunities to use these areas to treat stormwater runoff from The Esplanade to improve water quality discharge</p>

ITEM	COMMENT	RESPONSE
	<p>water, and lining the base and lower sides with clay-rich soil.</p> <p>The ponds could be connected to the adjacent stormwater drains on the beach side of Beach Road and water quality improved with a simple course sand filter.</p>	<p>to the bay and enhance biodiversity and habitat values.</p> <p><i>Recommendation</i> <i>No change to plan</i></p>
8.4	<p>Bayside Council to concentrate pollution management efforts upstream not via the installation of a GPT within the open space of the beach, these structures demand constant maintenance and large access areas for vehicles.</p> <p>The construction of underground tanks will compromise future use of this area, it is far more likely that the provision of a third pipe providing recycled water will be made available from areas such as from the top of South Road near Warrigal Road.</p>	<p>Council fully supports at source stormwater pollution management however in a fully developed catchment opportunities are limited. The opportunities for stormwater harvesting and water quality improvements on the foreshore have been carefully located to minimise impacts on existing use and landscape amenity.</p> <p>Investigation of 'third pipe' recycled water opportunities is outside the scope of the foreshore master plan.</p> <p><i>Recommendation</i> <i>No change to plan</i></p>
<b>9. ACCESS</b>		
9.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider reinstating the railway tunnel under Beach Road. This would be both an historic curio, but more importantly provide a safe pedestrian path for people who come to visit via the train.</li> <li>The old tramway tunnel opposite Brighton Beach Station – I have often wondered why it cannot be opened and used as safe pedestrian access from station to beach. With the bike path being relocated at street level this could be done now.</li> </ul>	<p>Council does not own or manage the former tramway tunnel at South Road. It is heritage listed and managed by VicRoads.</p> <p><i>Recommendation</i> <i>Seek further clarification from VicRoads and Heritage Victoria on pedestrian access improvement options associated with the former tramway tunnel and future possible connection to Brighton Station.</i></p>
9.2	<p>Maybe a bathing wheelchair could be accommodated in a larger LSC, the historic tunnel.</p>	<p>Vehicle access to the beach at Brighton and Hampton Beaches is limited.</p> <p>Sandringham has better opportunities for assisted vehicle access to the beach.</p> <p><i>Recommendation</i> <i>No change to plan</i></p>
9.3	<p>Surprised by the number of ramp, stair changes marked as a high priority. All ability access should be developed on the basis of evidence of usage over time, and it would be better to concentrate on facilities for people with disabilities at identified places.</p>	<p>Many of the existing ramps do not have handrails. Establishment of handrails, especially on steeper ramps which may not be able to be otherwise improved due to the site topography will significantly improve accessibility.</p> <p><i>Recommendation</i> <i>No change to plan</i></p>
9.4	<p>There are a number of areas on the promenade where puddles remain</p>	<p>Refer issue to Parks maintenance.</p>

ITEM	COMMENT	RESPONSE
	for some time after rain. You have to walk on the rock retaining wall to avoid getting wet. I fell doing this (I am 71). I think better drainage and the restoration of the retained wall along the length is top priority.	<u>Recommendation</u> Add note for review drainage on the promenade path as a high priority.
9.5	Council should have a reference group of people with disabilities to consult on such issues. I support the proposal about a ramp to replace the series of steps on the Coastal Path a bit south of Ferdinando Gardens.	<u>Recommendation</u> No change to plan
9.6	Rock revetment and concrete path – text in the implementation schedule 5.1/D1 & D2 states the rock revetment and concrete path are to be extended to Linacre Rd stairs and Dog Beach. The Plan D drawing seems to show the path and revetment continue past Linacre Rd stairs seemingly for quite a long way. Please clarify the proposed works.	The aim is to extend the path and stabilise the toe of the embankment to enable all ability high tide access through to the Linacre Road stairs and onto the dog beach.  <u>Recommendation</u> No change to plan
9.7	Extension of the path south of the LSC to the harbour is beneficial for access at high tide.	Refer 9.6  <u>Recommendation</u> No change to plan
9.8	We are uncomfortable about the change from natural paths to hard flat paths in the Ferdinando Gardens. It takes away from the feeling of being in natural beach environment.	Only the short link from the pedestrian crossing to the existing sealed beach access ramp will be sealed. Refer page 14 C8. This will significantly enhance access for visitors with limited mobility. Use of sand coloured concrete will assist in blending this path and all other exit points are to remain unsealed.  <u>Recommendation</u> No change to plan
<b>10. BAY TRAIL</b>		
10.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree there is room to improve this part of the Bay Trail. (5)</li> <li>• I find the road is safer for both cyclists and pedestrians.</li> <li>• Use of the Bay Trail by fast-riding commuter cyclists is increasing. Many pedestrians and some recreational cyclists (illegally) are using the gravel path instead and is sometimes a danger.</li> </ul>	The Draft Master Plan page 12 illustrates the sketch concept design for realignment of the Bay Trail closer to the Esplanade at South Road to provide a separated access for cyclists. The works are noted as a high priority and will require VicRoads support and funding.  <u>Recommendation</u> No change to plan
10.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The shared path may need widening, re-aligning, and possibly separating in the future. (2)</li> <li>• Is it possible to separate pedestrians and cyclists and to force cyclists to use a better bike path during peak hour? Cyclists</li> </ul>	

ITEM	COMMENT	RESPONSE
	<p>come off Beach Road and use the footpath at speed during evening peak hour. The current bike path would need designated crossing points and a speed limit to prevent accidents. Pedestrians could be restricted to the beach path during peak times.</p>	
10.3	<p>Don't impact on the open space in the Green Point Gardens.</p>	<p>There is no change to open space within Green Point proposed as part of the Draft Master Plan.</p> <p><u>Recommendation</u> No change to plan</p>
10.4	<p>I can't see bike racks near the tunnel entrance adding to value as long as there are enough at Green Point. Who wants to push their bikes up the slopes?</p>	<p>The plan includes the provision of bike racks at beach level as an important initiative to encourage beach visitors to reduce car use and promote other forms of transport. Cyclists prefer to maintain visual contact with their sometimes very expensive bikes and the provision of bike racks in the wider section of the foreshore promenade will encourage more visitors to visit the beach by bike.</p> <p><u>Recommendation</u> No change to plan</p>
<b>11. GENERAL</b>		
11.1	<p>I would like to see drinking fountains with dog bowls urbanff.com.au model PF600, these are similar to the one that Glen Eira Council install in their parks.</p> 	<p>These models include powder coated sections and is not suitable for coastal use due to potential corrosion issues. Council now only installs stainless steel models in coastal areas.</p> <p><u>Recommendation</u> No change to plan</p>
11.2	<p>Signage is important, but should be kept to a minimum to avoid visual clutter on the foreshore.</p> <p>Additional signage to the bathing boxes would be helpful to tourists, as there is nothing at the moment. (5)</p>	<p>There are recommendations for risk/regulatory and directional signage relating to specific actions but not an overall recommendation for a review of foreshore signage.</p> <p><u>Recommendation</u> Add additional signage recommendations to the Master Plan for improvement to directional signage as a high priority.</p>

ITEM	COMMENT	RESPONSE
11.3.	I'd like to see a café somewhere between Green Point and Sandringham Beach. (4).	<p>There are existing Café facilities at the popular Sandy Beach Café at the end of Jetty Road. Further provision of commercial facilities in this section of foreshore is not supported due to the lack of car parking and potential impacts on environmental values and landscape amenity.</p> <p><i>Recommendation</i> <i>No change to plan</i></p>
11.4	Would it be possible to have a public shower somewhere between Orlando Street groyne and New Street groyne?	<p>There is no existing water supply to this area and there are existing beach showers within 400m at Hampton Life Saving Club.</p> <p><i>Recommendation</i> <i>No change to plan</i></p>
11.5	Construction of the beach groynes has damaged the grass at location 20. Please improve the management of the grass at this location and encourage the responsible authority, Parks/Melbourne Water are to repair damage to the areas impacted by groyne construction.	<p>The groyne construction walls were completed by the Department of Environment Land Water and Planning (DELWP), grass is recovering slowly and is expected to be recovered by Summer 2017.</p> <p>The establishment of an underground stormwater harvesting system as outlined in the Draft Master Plan would evaluate sustainable irrigation of grass areas along the foreshore and at Green Point and Ferdinando Gardens.</p> <p><i>Recommendation</i> <i>No change to plan</i></p>
11.6	The document presented to all local residents via the post was inaccurate and misleading by showing photo 16 being adjacent to Seaview Ave. which is close to 1km away. One would expect that the Consultants used had the ability to produce accurate documents.	<p>This was an error and will be rectified in the Final Master Plan.</p> <p><i>Recommendation</i> <i>Photo 16 reference has been amended.</i></p>
11.7	<p>Care should be taken with any works in this area near the heritage sites, especially:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Brighton Beach railway tunnel portal and adjacent area, particularly the original brick parapet above the tunnel on Beach Road footpath.</li> <li>• The stones in the seawall bearing the initials and dates of prisoners hanged at the Old Melbourne Gaol. (Especially those near the New Street groyne).</li> <li>• The remnant Norfolk Island Pines in the nature strip, near HLSC and in the Ferdinando Gardens. These are from the Avenue of Honour planted by Sandringham City Council after World War One.</li> </ul>	<p>The extensive heritage values along the foreshore between Brighton Beach to Ferdinando Gardens are briefly summaries in the Draft Master Plan page 3.</p> <p>These features are protected in the Bayside Planning Scheme Heritage Overlays and in some instances as part of the Victorian Heritage Register.</p> <p>Any proposed works within the vicinity of heritage listed assets \must be undertaken to ensure protection in accordance with current planning controls.</p> <p><i>Recommendation</i> <i>No change to plan</i></p>

### 3. Feedback received during consultation on the Draft Master Plan

Community consultation on the Draft Master Plan was completed over a three week period from 18 August 2016 to 11 September 2016. Comments and feedback were received as follows.

#### 3.1 Community Information Sessions

Below is a summary of general comments recorded during the community information sessions.

##### 3.1.1 Evening Community Beach Renourishment Information Session

Thursday 18 August 2016 from 4.00pm - 7.00pm at Sandy by the Bay, Sandringham Football Club.

- Indented parking in the residential nature strip would destroy the visual aesthetic of Beach Road. A clearway during peak hour would achieve the same improvement of traffic flow at far less cost.
- Vehicles backing out of new proposed parking bays with restricted vision, could create a safety hazard particularly for cyclists.
- It is hazardous for pedestrians to cross Beach Road at Small Street
- For residents indented parking diminishes the nature of their property, making departure more hazardous
- Disadvantages of indented parking out way the advantages.
- The main problem is the Beach Road traffic bottle neck, not parking.
- Beach Road should be a clearway on both sides of the road from 4-6pm, Monday-Friday.
- The parking does not address the major problem on Beach Road which is the traffic chaos. A bottle neck effect is created by the parked cars reducing Beach Road to one lane between South Road and Small Street. Beach road should be a South bound clearway between 4.00pm – 6.00pm consistent with the clearway parking restrictions in other areas.
- The overall proposed options for parking appear to be a very expensive way to solve a problem which occurs for only a few days of the year.
- Road congestion on Beach Road hasn't been addressed, separate bikes and pedestrians.
- Bike speed limit on Bay Trail.
- Water play at Octopus Gardens was thought to be silly when it's located next to an existing water body, the beach.
- Need increased shade along Brighton Foreshore, more trees.
- Consider vandalism, maintenance of water play at Octopus Garden.
- Signage to Brighton Beach should be in a range of languages (Beach Road intersection across from Bright train station).
- Detail Plan D, no sealed paths along promenade to the Dog beach to wooden steps to maintain the natural beach character, unsealed is okay.
- Increased storage at Brighton Life Saving Club is thought to increase the use of the club, leading to events and nose problems for residents.

##### 3.1.2 Evening Community Drop in Information Session

Friday 26 August 2016 from 1.00pm – 3.00pm at Sandringham Village.

- New Street toilet is a bad idea. It would be an eyesore.

- Water play at Octopus garden is a great idea, providing a safe environment for children and their families.
- Removal of power poles on Beach Road would create more space.
- Bike racks shouldn't be installed at the front of the closed train tunnel, due to it being a heritage listed site.
- Kerb and channel on Beach Road to be 'SM' to allow cyclists to easily transition from the road to the shared path.
- Can the heritage listed tunnel be reopened?
- Hampton Life Saving Club should extend up one level, rather than extending the back of the building, providing the site with better observation for a patrol room.
- Correct the alignment of the existing coast trail, the unsealed path behind the HLSC was not indicated on the plan.
- Shower facilities on the beach foreshore.

### 3.1.3

#### Morning Community Drop in Information Session

Saturday 3 September 2016 from 10.00am – 12.00pm at Hampton Life Saving Club.

- Blocks occur mostly toward Orlando Street, visitors can get parking especially in summer.
- Rail visitors block parking in Orlando Street.
- Consider use of rail land along Orlando Street.
- Traffic speed in Orlando Street needs to be reduced.
- More parking for rail users/consider use of VicTrack land.
- Indented parking can create issues as well.
- Light poles and water mains would need to be relocated.
- Removal of vegetation at Hampton LSC – could enable off street parking to be provided and/or a drop off zone. Importance for safety of LSC users – reducing the need to cross the road.
- Planting of non-native trees.
- Consider shifting the traffic lights back to Orlando Street would solve two problems. This would allow residents to exit and then turn back via Small Street – creates a break in the traffic.
- Speed and use of footpath by cyclists widening the bike path would improve this – transferring.
- Concern about Council sometimes being involved in decisions about Beach Road and then putting it back on VicRoads when it suits.
- Hampton Station needs another pedestrian crossing near Thomas Street.
- Condition of rock walls is poor and failing sections need repair or they will be very expensive to fix.
- Extend the all-weather/dirt track 100m south of Linacre Road to the Anglers Club providing walking and wheelchair access to the Jetty Road kiosk.
- Exercise stations along the foreshore – just 1 – 2.
- End of the rock groyne at Orlando Street appears to have feathered out and moved in the last month – is that normal or part of the new works?
- There used to be toilets at Orlando Street.
- The set at New Street should be for beach users but I don't think it is that necessary.
- Railway line attracts a lot of after hours' activity.
- Signage should address other languages.
- Orlando Street outfall – the grates broke free after a storm event, could trap people, track rack needs to be repaired/replaced.
- Ferdinando Gardens – control the broadleaf weeds in the grassy areas.
- Ferdinando Octopus Garden – prefer it to be a natural area

- Unnecessary infrastructure given that it is beach child friendly and the 'play' space
- Would prefer it transferred back to a natural environment.
- Concerned that the New Street toilets won't be used, or accessible to the general public also council puts in toilets and then removes them.
- Hampton LSC – car parking on site for nippers and removes car parking on Beach Road
- Protected by large scale trees
- Drop off zone – for users of LSC at peak times
- Totally opposed to indented car parking, can't see that it is going to increase capacity
- Puddles of water
- Degradation of walls need drainage systems (New Street drain) and (Male Street)
- Pedestrian path from Green Point to bathing boxes has that been considered
- Toilets at New Street ok
- Octopus Play area – concerned about litter gathering, particularly in windy days after storm
- Veg not around garden sites – in plan
- Great production
- 19-20 Beach Road parking request restriction cyclists mounting footpath to avoid Beach Road congestion
- Prefer indented parking
- Can cyclists also have a no ride zone or ride slower
- Beach Road 50kms?

### 3.2 Council Website

**<http://yoursaybayside.com.au/brighton-beach-to-ferdinando-gardens-masterplan>**

The draft Master Plan and full report was displayed on Council's website for community feedback via the 'Have Your Say' online portal. Comments and feedback were provided via the online forum as follows:

#### **Forum Topic 1 – Car parking along Beach Road.**

(17 responses and 105 views)

- Can you please add in the other two options included in the brochure that was delivered to residents? What are the pros and cons of these?
- Agree to the plan of parallel parking along beach Rd, where it seems a very wide nature strip may have been allocated for future road widening which I would not want). I wholeheartedly agree to this proposal, as it will solve a huge (and rapidly growing) problem, where evening commuters take a short cut down Orlando St, because beach Rd traffic has to reduce to a single lane because of a car parked in Beach Rd. My only query is that I thought there would be more than 6-11 spots.
- I am totally opposed to the addition of parallel parking along Beach Road. There are already car parks at Brighton Beach Gardens and opposite Brighton Beach Oval; time and again studies all over the world have shown that congestion and parking problems are not solved but are instead exacerbated by the provision of further infrastructure for cars. The more you provide the worse it gets. This proposal will not solve the problem of congestion, and is yet another step towards the concreting over of the beachside precinct. Finally, the proposed spaces will

be unsafe to access due to the presence of fast moving traffic on Beach Road. There will be accidents and/or fatalities. They should not be built.

- I presume we are talking only about Option 2 (in orange) on page 6 of the Brighton Beach to Fernando Gardens Masterplan.

My wife and I are against this proposal and agree with Jonathan Nightingale. There is plenty of room for car parking in side streets (e.g. Orlando St), where spots are largely available most of the time. Our beach precinct is lovely and to apparently cut out most of the nature strip for car parking can only make it ugly. The peak hours are not long anyway and with only a maximum of 11 net new cars this proposal will not solve any peak hour traffic problem anyway.

We have a number of queries:

1. What is the cost of these 6 - 11 car spaces? How much per net new space?
2. From a safety viewpoint, how does carving out part or all of the nature strip make it safer for people and animals who walk on the footpaths?
3. How does this promote public transport, which runs right along Beach Rd?
4. How does replacing grass with concrete/bitumen help beautify the area?

We agree with all your "cons" and see little benefit in the "pros". There's just not enough benefit just for 6-11 net new spots.

Beach Rd is a jewel in Bayside's crown. People don't want to see ugly parked cars. They want to see the beach. Cars should park in already marked spots.

- Your observation is ridiculous. There is a wide nature strip for about 500 metres interrupted by the large development on the corner of Orlando Street where, if you look at the plan no indent is proposed. Strike one for the Big Developers. In reality when you drive past this section you'll see they've put the bus stop at the point and then planted so much vegetation that it kind of impossible to use. Also if you drive along this section you'll be hard pressed to find anywhere near as many 'new' spots as Council claim would be created. One assumes that they will be putting in a separation so that residents along here can still get into their remaining driveway crossover without having cars parked halfway across them which would create an additional hazard to entering or leaving the Beach Road to those we already face. I also think the number of spaces created (6 -11) is deliberately vague in order to put a positive spin on this option. When it was convenient to pander to the cyclists on a Saturday and Sunday morning we got no standing between 6 and 10am, now they are proposing taking away part of the buffer between us and the traffic and tell us they are giving us back parking which never needed to be removed as all it provides is a facility for too many cyclists to use as a race track each weekend. The additional traffic lane can be accomplished by making this section of the road a Clearway between 4 -6pm on weekdays without the disruption and expense entailed in exercising the proposed works. Another thing to note is that apparently indenting the parking on one side of the road and not the other makes for less congestion. What about the same amount of traffic that flows in the other direction? Not that council proposals have to make any sense, they have to spend our exorbitant rates on something otherwise how can they justify them.
- Said I was in favour of recessed parallel parking, but think maybe this should be for residents only, so that those with no off street parking can park there rather than on beach Rd, so there can be an evening clear way which would stop traffic taking a short cut through Orlando St, (which is an ongoing hazard)
- I already commented on Lindy Fagan's post but would like to ask council about the two measurements of what they would be reducing nature strip by. Is it in fact 3.1 metres?  
Also what expense and inconvenience to residents is going to be caused by

having to relocate all the light and power poles along this strip? It might go some way to affected residents reconciling to what seems inevitable, given the terms in which it is couched, if the council were to spend some of our rates to put the power underground when the poles are being moved at least some of them could then be removed and another potential traffic hazard reduced. Who knows, maybe a cyclist might ride into one?

So, needless to say, I'm not really in favour of the proposal but assume that all those residents not affected by it will either not care less or be in favour, so the thirty or so residents you will ride roughshod over will be outvoted.

- I don't think it's inevitable that this proposal will be implemented. The council are giving us the chance to have our say, here, by telephone and public meeting. Speak to Simon at the council for more info. He's pretty helpful, Chris.
- Ok. So in view of the short distance covered by this and the confusion of message it will create when the road becomes a clearway on either side of this, why not canvas simply creating a clearway between 4pm and 6pm Monday to Friday as they have done in other areas of their jurisdiction at the same time as this proposal. Answer: Because council don't want to do this. They want to experiment with the indent and further erode the amenity of the residents. Another interesting aspect of this proposal is that they have been so antsy to date about the trees they insisted in planting and nurturing outside our houses. Suddenly it's ok to move everything back 3.1 metres so this precious shrubbery is no longer important to the neighbourhood. I would, by the way, actually like clarification by someone from council about whether the 2.1 metre recess for the car park plus 1 metre for separation for cyclists does, in fact, mean they are proposing removing 3.1 meters from the nature strip along the effected section.
- It seems to me the Council should keep the status quo ante - why - because the cost to local residents and the disruption caused by adding a few extra parking spaces is not worth it. Why not create a Clearway from (say) South Road to Bay Road from 4.00 - 6.00 p.m. every day? Sooner or later, one of the 'rat-runners' using Orlando Street to get ahead of peak time queues will cause a serious incident.
- My wife and I would also support the idea of a clearway at the relevant times instead of "eroding resident's' amenities".
- Option 4 would seem the most logical if indenting has to be done at all. People park on the beach side of Beach road on most days. It would be safer and easier for the fishermen, wind/kite surfers, and people with children if the car parking was indented on the beach side of the road for when they are enter/exiting their cars or unloading/loading them. If it was to be placed on the residents' side of the road, Bayside council should put the power underground thus increasing the number of car parking spaces and improve the safety and visibility for cars parking or pulling out.
- If the indenting of car parking on Beach road is to go ahead, then the council also needs to put in pedestrian safety zones in the middle of the road to enable adults and children parked on Beach road, wishing to access the beach, to cross four lanes of fast moving traffic plus cyclists. Having four lanes of traffic will seriously increase the chances of a pedestrian being run over.
- The loss of porous, grassy, surfaces would be regrettable. If Option 2 is taken, then surely (in this day and age) porous surfaces rather than bitumen and concrete could be used. The grassy nature strip is attractive and adds to the beachy feeling of the area. The grass helps to allay the heat on very hot days. Bitumen and concrete would increase the heat sink. This option should only be taken up if the residents of those areas are happy with it.

- Option 1 No change makes it too dangerous for pedestrians and cyclist and lawn is much better than bitumen and concrete.
- As a Beach Rd resident I am opposed to the parking idea and agree with option 1, that the current status quo remains.  
Issues with option 2 to 4  
Option 2: Indent parking on residential side of the Beach Rd.

Issues:

Increase of 6-11 parking spots,

I am not sure as to the validity of increasing the parking spots as stated to an increase of 6 to 11 spots along Beach Rd, from New St to Small St. The length of road is still the same and with the proposal it would need to include an angled shoulder, as part of the indented parking, so reducing the actual area available for parking.

Change to current road structure,

The current power poles, parking metres and trees, along this section of the road are close to the road way and would need to be set back to allow the indented parking, if they were not then the indent parks would need to be set to avoid these and would actually decrease current number of spaces.

If the Power poles and the parking metres were to be moved then there would be further inconvenience to the resident, as to loss of power. I assume other changes would include moving of storm water drains, changes/replacement of driveways, replacement of footpaths while it was occurring and cost to the local residents (via rates) for a possible gain of hand full of extra parking spots.

Safety,

The proposed changes would increase the risk to the residents, drivers and cyclist pedestrians. As decrease of the nature strips would reduce the length of the driveways and so reduce people's view of traffic/pedestrians when entering or leaving their homes.

I have concerns that these changes may encourage vehicles to use this area as a drag strip. By changing the parking to indented, there would now be two clear lanes for "Hoons" to race with each other.

Option 3 and 4:

Issues,

Both option 3 and 4 actually causes a reduction in the number of parking spots and would increase the pressure on side streets. This would also reduce the income from the parking metres and again make them even more un-financial, leave the rate payers to continue to subsidise them.

I was also under the impression that the current traffic management plans for Beach Rd was to not have it be seen as an alternative route for Nepean Highway. The proposal would actual encourage and increase of vehicles using this part of the road.

General concerns as resident Beach Rd:

In the last few years we have seen numerous changes introduced by the council and so far, have seen these changes create very little, if any improvement to the area or for the local residents.

We have had the time restrictions and clearways introduced, causing increased vehicular traffic in the side streets and stopping us from parking our vehicles outside our homes, all to cater for cyclists on the weekends.

There appears to have been an increase in the number of road closures each year for events, causing inconvenience to residents or visitors.

There has been the introduction of paid parking, so anyone wishing to visit us have to pay and then we have the eyesore of parking meters being built outside our homes, which I am still not sure if they are costing more than they raise.

Now there is the proposal of removing the nature strips and replacing them with

bitumen and changing the traditional look of the area.

Overall:

The current proposals appear to be very expensive, which there is no costing shown for any of options 2 to 4, and will also not greatly help the parking issues in the area, possibly making it more unsafe. Also the impacts of the changes will be mostly by felt by the residents in the area. The changes also may impact the value of the resident's homes, as some of the options will change the appearance of the front of their houses.

- Relative to demand at the relevant times I don't see any of the proposals making enough of a difference to justify the expense and visual impact.
- We oppose the options Item 6 and 19 to increase parking bays in place of nature strips. Cars backing onto Beach road are a risk to moving vehicles and cyclists. With the increasing and growing population, a few extra parking bays will not make any difference and will not address the need to bring cars to the beach. People should be encouraged to catch public transport and this area is privileged to have the Brighton train station in close proximity. Nature strips along Beach Rd are being replaced with native grasses which should be encouraged in place of bitumen and concrete.

### **Forum Topic 2 – Proposed Extension – Hampton Life Saving Club**

(8 responses and 43 views)

- Agree to the proposed changes outlined, I see the club is really active and well supported, a great community group
- The proposal as stated seems a good one. However, the devil is in the detail; it all depends on the size of the proposed extension. If the footprint of the extension cannibalises an extensive area, then it may be more appropriate to add an extra storey to the existing clubhouse footprint instead. Accordingly, it will only be possible for people to provide substantive feedback once more detail of the proposal has been given. Can you advise when and how this will be available, please?
- Yes, the expansion is supported this is an appropriate use of the foreshore area. Public transport options from Hampton Station are available. The impact on views from Beach Road is less of a consideration for this public building, the building mass is already well screened behind coastal vegetation
- The extension of the HLSC must consider the relocation of the existing public toilets. The increase in building capacity to the zone behind the club is supported this will require the relocation of the public toilets to the Ferdinand Gardens, it is appropriate to have a public toilet facility adjacent to the facilities in these gardens.
- I support initial concept for HLSC. Along with showers on the beach, would need taps so that hoses can be attached for washing equipment on new enforced mesh area and not having to have hoses across path.
- I support looking more closely at this idea although most LSC activities should be in the open air. I would like to be assured that any offsets required in relation to the removal of native vegetation would be met in the Bayside foreshore. Measures to block informal tracks should not be done so as to block access to some areas where one could sit quietly amongst the vegetation.

### **Forum Topic 3 – Upgrade of Octopus Play Area**

(11 responses and 45 views)

- I don't agree with the splash pad replacing the Octopus garden play area. Firstly, its and expensive exercise in an area that is that is not that vast to accommodate it adjacent to the beach? The cost of pumping salt water and maintenance could be problematic along with a constant over flow of water on the path too. Create picnic settings to watch sunsets?
- This would be a great idea! I love the concept of creating more water play areas in bayside. The Children's' Hospital has created a wonderful water play area which is worth a look for inspiration.
- Great plan, fully supported, the existing area is awful, and we are so short of children's playgrounds in this area of Hampton, generally. Very creative, can't wait!
- I totally agree something needs to be done to rectify this unsightly "play space" for children. It is an eyesore. But to agree to a \$750,000 sea water play space in this spot, with no BBQ, adequate car parking or toilets, would be considered poor planning. Not only that, but I cannot imagine Council keeping the seawater reticulation system in perfect working order, when they can't keep the pump equipment at any of our inland lakes consistently working. E.g. Landcox and Basterfield Park. I love the idea of a water playground, like the one at Royal Children's Playground, but this is not the right place for it. It also is inconsistent with the Bayside Playground Strategy.
- A \$750 000 water play area in this exposed coastal location would not be as well used as a water play space in more protected park location. The water play space at Royal Children's is used all year round and we would want this used all year round too.
- I'm not in favour of this idea.  
The maintenance of any water based public space is fraught with ongoing maintenance issues, as has been demonstrated in many public places in the past. There is a beach there - that's where water play can happen. By all means create some shade and a useable area, but really, at the moment that particular spot is in fairly good condition. Money can be better utilised elsewhere
- I have spoken with a few local residents who walk the Hampton beach whilst I was there Thursday and we do have concerns about the upgrade of the Octopus Garden Play Area proposed for a salt water play area and splash pad. We do agree for this area to be for seating and shade.

We are concerned that electricity power will be required for salt water to be piped up to the pools which require ongoing maintenance [more expenses for Council and our rates], and sits uncomfortably with the principle of man-made pools beside a natural beach. Toddlers and mothers are better to be learning and interacting with the natural beach. Man-made pools may be a legal risk to Council for potential drownings, slips and injuries.

We agree the rubber in this area should go as it releases chemicals in the heat. [I can actually smell the rubber emitting chemicals on hot days!] We would suggest after removing the rubber and any concrete in the area, to plant native gardens suited to the environment e.g. salt bushes, native grasses etc. with a nice seat and a dwarf banksia tree for shade. This will help enhance the natural environment, provide respite from the hot sun and a place to rest.

Also we feel uncomfortable about the change from natural paths to hard flat paths in the Ferdinando gardens. This takes away much from the feeling of being in a natural beach environment.

- The Octopus Garden is hot in summer and unattractive. It could be removed and upgraded to a native garden and seat with indigenous trees to provide shade. People bring their toddlers to the beach to enjoy the sand, sea, open space and natural environment. It is important for toddlers to learn about a beautiful natural environment. The introduction of man-made pools in such a beautiful beach is

unnecessary and a waste of ratepayers' money. I am concerned that the introduction of man-made pools introduces an unnecessary risk for accidents including drownings. Also, there is increased on-going maintenance.

- I suspect the current playground is not well used because there are plenty of play activities on the beach/in the sea. I support the idea of a space shaded with trees and perhaps more shade cloth as a refuge with increased heat waves etc. Maybe there could be a playground to "activate" Ferdinando Gardens

#### **Forum Topic 4 – Improvements to Bay Trail at South Road**

(7 responses and 47 views)

- I cycle, run, and walk this section several times a week. I agree, there is room to improve this part of Bay Trail, I've seen several near misses between cyclists and pedestrians, especially as pedestrians enter or exit the stairs across from South Road.
- Yes, I think this is necessary, as I trust there has been many incidents where the bike trail and walking trail join on this hill.
- Excellent idea, much safer for both cyclists and pedestrians.
- I find the road is a safer option for riding through this section. Realigning the path is a good idea
- Do not compromise or impact on the open space in the Green Point Gardens
- I support this as others do because of my experiences as a cyclist and as a pedestrian. Not only would it remove current points where pedestrians and cyclists cross each other's paths, it would also prevent cyclists encountering the layer of sand blown from the beach across the shared path at its lowest point. That can cause skidding or just stop a bike when you need to change up to climb out of the dip.
- I can't see bike racks near the tunnel entrance adding to value as long as there are enough at Green Point. Who wants to push their bikes up the slopes?

#### **Forum Topic 5 - Installation of shade shelters along the foreshore**

(3 responses and 26 views)

- Yes let's start with 2, and we might need more in the future. There is really nowhere to be shaded from the westerly sun on a hot summer afternoon/evening, or in fact at most times of the day
- Page 12 Figure 9, the proposed shelter location is over a pedestrian pathway, this does not allow the space to be used for sitting in the shade when the shade is on the path used by pedestrians. I suggest that the location of the shade shelter is inappropriate. If a space is available off the path this option should then be considered
- I support these structures as a refuge for people who need to get out of the sun. Maybe there should be discrete "Please give up your seat...." notices. My support is because the risks from sun are increasing and not because of the statement about this precinct lacking opportunities for shade. Shade is difficult to find close to the beach along most of the Bayside foreshore. That said, more shade MUST be provided nearer to Beach Road using trees to retain vistas from houses. Nothing in the Coastal Management Plan that I remember says that views from houses must not be affected by change.

#### **Forum Topic 6 - General feedback on all aspects of the Masterplan**

(15 responses and 58 views)

- I would like to see drinking fountains with dog bowls urbanff.com.au model PF600, these are similar to the ones that Glen Eira council install in all their parks. The dog bowl flips over into a drain to ensure clean water can be hygienically refilled without having to scoop one's hand to remove water. This is still occurring in Dendy Park where the bowls have been cemented in. It's one thing to improve all the areas along the foreshore however maintenance and up keep are crucial. Our Bayside beaches are iconic, for locals and tourists.
- Impressive masterplan to improve this foreshore area. Must have made sure the politicians didn't influence the administration's plans!
- Agreed, a most impressive plan - thank you Bayside!
- I'd like to see a cafe somewhere between Green Point and Sandringham Beach overlooking the water. Many other local beachside suburbs have a cafe but we miss out. Surely we could incorporate this in the foreshore plan. Many overseas places have beachside cafes.
- I see that some stormwater outlets are being reviewed/ altered, which is a good idea, to protect our water from rubbish. I also see that the small foreshore 'ponds' north of the swimmer sculpture are to be enhanced with beach Rd runoff. I wonder about the stormwater drain opposite Edgecliff, which has often burst its structure, and still has temporary fencing around it. I wonder why this was not included like the other two, one north and one south of the Edgecliff one Also, re the old Tramway tunnel opposite Brighton Beach station - I have often wondered why it cannot be opened and used as a safe pedestrian access from station to beach - I can understand why it hasn't been used up 'til now, as it would be dangerous with bikes whizzing by - but now that the bike path is to be relocated at street level, I wonder why it cannot be done. As a pedestrian crossing from the station it is a nightmare, even though I am familiar and do it regularly when commuting. It must be confusing for the many visitors who struggle to cross and then actually find 'the little houses' on Brighton beach....
- I have read right through the Master Plan and I note a statement to restrict the use by groups wanting to undertake fitness activities in the open. For years I have walked along the Hampton and Sandringham beach and gardens areas and I love seeing people out using the space and fresh air. From the walkers, runners, dog walkers, kids, PT groups to the Laughing Group. I would not like to see this discouraged, in fact it should be in the interest of the Bayside community to see this ENCOURAGED. The only damage I have noticed is from vandals - there's constantly a need to not only repaint but repair due to vandalism. The facilities are there for all rate payers to use as well as others and I see absolutely no reason to stop groups from exercising. I have never witnessed any of the fitness groups destroying the gardens, lawns or furniture. I have however noticed damage after Ferdinando Gardens has been used by overly large groups who have paid to hire out the shelter shed! In my opinion, encourage the use of all facilities by all groups and this will foster a community care of the surrounds. If fact, one day, as I walked past the shelter shed, I noticed a woman who had brought her own broom down to sweep up the broken glass left over from the weekend, so she could spread out her yoga mat! Exercise and fresh air are quintessential with our Bayside living - do not are this difficult for the community. Do not force them to go indoors!
- Would it be possible to have a public shower somewhere between Orlando St groyne and New St groyne? This beach is mainly used by all sort of water sport fans almost all year around. Thank you.

- I would like to see a cafe also between Sandringham and Brighton maybe similar to the one in Parkdale. It's now an ideal opportunity while work is being done in the area to enable the public to take advantage of our fabulous location.
- Page 12 Figure 10 Relocation of Light poles, please consider the cost associated with pole relocation. The poles may be considered redundant with minor improvements to public lighting on the east of Beach Road a priority. A lighting study will provide guidance on the available options the lighting levels in this precinct are already very good, I support the investigation of all lighting options before a commitment to the costly relocation of these lights is considered. I do support an improvement to the cycling / pedestrian interface at this location.
- The Implementation plan does not address the management of street tree planting along beach Road in this precinct. The opportunity to include planting along the eastern road reserve must be considered. Improvements to planting, litter management and the condition of paths can be addressed via existing maintenance contracts with beach contractors. The condition and increasing width of the cliff top path must be managed.
- Area 20 Comments.  
Bayside Council to concentrate pollution management efforts upstream not via the installation of GPT within the open space at the beach. These structures demand constant maintenance and large access areas for vehicles.  
This is a beautiful area of open space that is worthy of retention. The construction of underground tanks will compromise future use of this area, it is far more likely that the provision of a third pipe providing recycled water will be made available from areas such as from the top of South Road near Warrigal Road the open space along the foreshore is greatly valued and not for short term temporary solutions.  
In addition the construction of the Beach Groyne's has damaged the grass areas at location 20. Please improve the management of the grass at this location and encourage the responsible authority, PARKS / Melbourne Water are to repair damage to the areas impacted by Groyne construction.
- The natural paths are delightful and add much to the feeling of being in a natural beach environment. I note that some paths in the Ferdinando gardens are going to be changed to hard flat paths and I would prefer to keep the natural paths.
- I read through and noticed you mention in the Ferdinando Garden Section where you wish to stop people exercising on the lawn area whether it be large or small groups of people to prevent damage to the lawn and garden areas. I don't think they are the ones destroying the area but the triathlons and the weddings that are constantly using the area, hammering in poles and marquees, cars driven on lawn, blocking off access to rate payers and the annoyance of beach road being closed. Why do you allow this? Is it because you get a lot of money for these events and it outweighs the damage it does? Isn't that double standards. If you want to ban exercising, it should include all above.  
Dog walkers, small picnics on the lawn, people exercising as long as it is small groups and not using equipment that would harm the lawn or garden furniture is what it should be used for not for big events that harm the area. I also see near the lifesaving club tyre marks on the lawn and cars often parked on the lawn. Shouldn't this be banned? It is double standards.
- Proposed increase in car parking along Beach Road should be rejected. Beach road is already a traffic sewer which reduces the amenity of the residential area along which it runs. Beach road also reduces the amenity of the beach and foreshore. Increasing parking to "reduce congestion" will not reduce congestion, but rather, encourage more traffic onto Beach road, thereby reducing amenity.

2. Don't need a toilet at New Street. It is only six minutes on foot to the public toilet at Hampton lifesaving club (I just timed it), and about the same to the

railway station. But it might be useful to install signs at regular intervals along the foreshore giving the direction of and distance to the nearest public toilet

3. Consider reinstating the railway tunnel under Beach road at Brighton Beach station. This would be both an historic curio, but more importantly provide a safe pedestrian path for the many people who come by train to visit the Brighton bathing boxes. More could be done to make these people feel welcome. The signs directing them to the bathing boxes are poor, many Asian tourists look bewildered when they exit the station. Also, I have been asked on the roadside by Asian motorists where the nearest car parking is located. Perhaps sign posts on Beach road could be installed pointing out bathing box car parking.

4. More could be done on the foreshore reserve to remove weeds and replace with native vegetation. Perhaps replanting to mimic the vegetation which existed at the commencement of settlement could be attempted.

- Re proposed toilets at New St. could they be automatically locked between 10pm and 5:00am to discourage people from using them inappropriately?

- In addition to my responses on your selected topics:  
First, sorry to see so few responses. I think Council should have a more proactive system for alerting folks to issues in their local area or topics of interest like subscriptions to email alerts. Also to encourage the use of pseudonyms by people who would like to be anonymous on "Have Your Say"?

Please avoid signage unless there is a clear need. In the case of tourist arrivals at Brighton Beach Station I think Council should encourage those wanting to see the bathing boxes to use Middle Brighton - and spend in Church St - before crossing Beach Road at Dendy St and, if approved, a new crossing at Normanby St for the Brighton LSC....

Ferdinando Gardens. I couldn't see where there was a proposal to restrict the use of Ferdinando Gardens, rather there is one to "activate" the Gardens all year round in the introduction. So yes to fitness training, a playground, yoga, laughing, and how about a petanque/bocce court (locals did play a few years ago).

Access to the beach. I was surprised by the number of ramp, stair... changes marked as a high priority. All ability access should be developed on the basis of evidence of usage over time, and it would be better to concentrate facilities for people with disabilities at identified places. Maybe a bathing wheelchair could be accommodated in a larger LSC, the historic tunnel.... Council should have a reference group of people with disabilities to consult on such issues. (BTW I support the proposal about a ramp to replace the series of steps on the Coastal Path a bit south of Ferdinando Gardens.)

I am opposed to providing a high-tide access to the Picnic Point area via an extension of the promenade. For people wanting to get there the Coastal Walking Path is fine (I don't think a sign is necessary). I hope DELWP would retain the wooden groyne, along with any necessary rock groyne, to continue to provide a resting place for seabirds (terns, cormorants, gulls) because their perches have been reduced by the wires put on the wave screen (by DELWP or the Sandringham Yacht Club, reduced numbers of moored boats...)

I support the vegetation proposals other than the lack of commitment to planting trees such as the Banksias so attractive to smaller birds. Bayside needs to be congratulated on its successful habitat creation in this precinct since the beach renourishment in the 1990s.

Filtering stormwater using the ephemeral wetlands near Orlando St is fine unless pollutants would inhibit frogs breeding as they do from time to time in wetter years.

The overall cost of the proposals is a concern: some of the issues it seeks to address would be better dealt with by more money going towards the implementation of the recent Sustainability Framework.

**Quick poll 1 - We are proposing to install a new toilet block near the New Street stairs. Do we need another toilet block in this precinct?**

- 51 Responses - No, the toilets near the train station and Hampton Lifesaving Club are close enough
- 11 Responses - Yes, the toilets at the train station and Hampton Lifesaving Club are too far to walk

### **3.3 Other consultation**

Summary of additional comments received via phone and email during the Draft Master Plan Consultation Phase include:

Resident e-mail 22/08/16

- Everyone can agree that recreational activities are a distinct character of the Australian way of life.
- Everyone can also agree that the Hampton Beach precinct is part of the above character with ample open space and a visually appealing view of the bay for all that use the beach, drive past and for those lucky local residents who live there and have knowledge of how that space works.
- What everyone may also agree is that the document presented to all local residents via the post was inaccurate and misleading by showing photo16 being adjacent to Seaview Ave. which is close to 1km away. One would expect that the Consultants used had the ability to produce accurate documents.
- What has amazed me more importantly is that Option 1 will cost an obscene amount of money to achieve so little (i.e. A possible increase of 6 to 11 new car spots.) Where is the common sense in that?
- This option also encourages parking on the resident side with the associated increased risk for families, often with young children having to then cross 2 lanes of traffic whilst carting all their beach luggage.
- Although there is parking on this side, most beach goers prefer to use the foreshore side for convenience and more importantly safety.
- The serious safety concern for residents leaving their homes via their crossovers is created by parking of vehicles on their side, as visibility is greatly reduced. To verify this issue, try and enter Beach Rd safely when road traffic is busy, especially from those properties that are rhomboid in shape and have their crossovers at an angle to the road. eg. Those 5 properties south of Orlando St. Just park your car in the northern crossover outside No.22 (with added obstruction from adjacent lampposts.) to experience the potential danger.
- The ongoing vegetation issue is another misleading one as all vegetation planted between New St. and Small St. is of recent planting and is not remnant and indigenous. Many of the new plantings are not indigenous anyway e.g. The *Auracarias* and *Gazania* sp. The great advantage of the sparser plantings that exist now, is to create a more open space that is safer from lewd behavior and sexual predators (that actually exist) but also offers a spectacular view for beach users, passing cars and those lucky local residents.
- The great added advantage of creating extra car parking in the beachside foreshore precinct (as in options three and four) is related to providing greater safety for children and adults, but also parking for Council vehicles who maintain the foreshore area mid-week. At present council vehicles frequently drive along the bike path and so damage it.
- This has been reported to council many times and this sort of "Council Vandalism" must stop. If you doubt my words, just count the number of replaced concrete panels (at least 3 times) compared to all other sections of bike path where council trucks do not drive over.

- The idea to introduce parallel parking anywhere in this area to ease congestion is also illogical. The volume of traffic on Beach Rd. that enters from The South Rd. end is the same as that which passes Small St. How can more off street parking decrease traffic volume in such a small distance? Why would anyone spend significant sums of money to achieve such a small perceived difference?
- The main issue locally is traffic congestion, which could easily be solved at low cost by placing a few clear way signs from 3.30-7pm each day.
- I do accept the other proposed changes for the master plan assuming they will create some purposeful benefit but I am totally against the waste of money and danger that some landscape architect is trying to hoodwink us all as they did in Church St Brighton by placing benches in a median strip that no one uses and planting shade loving plants in full sun which are also ridiculously close (i.e. the Clivias), which by the way are more expensive than other plants.

Resident e-mail 22/08/16

- 17. The proposed toilet block at end of New St is not a popular one, but it would be great to have a drinking fountain/dog bowl. I suggest locating it close to the path and to the New St stairs, with signage on the bike path to point to the water station. As there is no shower nearby, it could also be used for people to wash sand off their feet before crossing the Beach Road.



- Between New St and the 'Swimmer Ramp' there are tracks through the vegetation that have been made by kite surfers wanting direct access. I know Council doesn't want fencing along this section, so I'm not sure what to do here. Erosion is starting in some places. Signs???'Please use the path'??
- 12. Octopus garden to be a water garden. Great idea! I think it'd be really popular with families.
- 3&4: Would this also allow some of this grassed area to have native vegetation beds between New St stairs and Mair St stairs?
- 5. Yes please! Signs to the bathing boxes is desperately needed for overseas visitors here.
- The bike path near the New St stairs needs signage for either cyclists or people coming off the beach at the bluestone driveway - pedestrians need to poke their head around the bushes to see any north travelling bikes which come through there at high speed.
- All other suggestions are great.

Resident e-mail 22/8/2016

- As a walker along the promenade from Green Point to the Sandringham end, we are in support of improvements.
- After rain there are many puddles along the promenade, so people including myself step up onto the rough rock retaining wall so as not to get wet.
- This morning I fell off the rock ledge and landed quite heavily into a puddle of water on the promenade. I grazed by knee and feel a little fragile (I am 71). There are a

number of areas where the puddles remain for a sometime. Therefore, I think better drainage and the restoration of the retained wall along the length is top priority.

- I am happy to be involved in the Masterplan to give our input as we are regular swimmers and walkers.

#### Resident mail 26/8/2016

- It is proposed to provide, new ramps, new rails, new stairs, new toilets, and Item 19 – new parallel parking along beach road nature strip.
- There is an opportunity for the Council to acquire the small parcel of land that once housed the Solo Service Station, and turn this into ticketed parking for people going to the beach. There is already a set of traffic lights and a pedestrian crossing in the area. This would be a good practical addition to the Brighton Beach Ferdinando Gardens Draft Masterplan.
- *Resident supplied typed letter with a diagram showing this suggested parking spot.*

#### Resident e-mail 28/08/2016

- 17. The proposed toilet block at end of New St is not a popular one, but it would be great to have a drinking fountain/dog bowl. I suggest locating it close to the path and to the New St stairs, with signage on the bike path to point to the water station. As there is no shower nearby, it could also be used for people to wash sand off their feet before crossing the Beach Road.
- Between New St and the 'Swimmer Ramp' there are tracks through the vegetation that have been made by kite surfers wanting direct access. I know Council doesn't want fencing along this section, so I'm not sure what to do here. Erosion is starting in some places. Signs??? 'Please use the path'??
- 12. Octopus garden to be a water garden. Great idea! I think it'd be really popular with families.
- 3&4: Would this also allow some of this grassed area to have native vegetation beds between New St stairs and Mair St stairs?
- 5. Yes please! Signs to the bathing boxes is desperately needed for overseas visitors here.
- The bike path near the New St stairs needs signage for either cyclists or people coming off the beach at the bluestone driveway - pedestrians need to poke their head around the bushes to see any north travelling bikes which come through there at high speed.

#### Resident e-mail 01/09/16

- I wish to register my protest as to this plan to indent the parking along the residential side of Beach Road.
- I believe it would be so much more cost effective just to place **CLEARWAY** signs along the road to eliminate traffic banking up back to New St – during peak hours 4-7pm and perhaps 6-9 am on the beach side for early morning commuters.
- Young children are at risk of accident leaving their parent's cars to attend the 'little nippers program' at Hampton Life Savings Club. I have spoken to a few members at the club and they say they are at capacity space wise and would like to extend to perhaps increase their chances of creating income to pay their way.
- Perhaps a carpark off road beside the club would facilitate easier access for the nippers – you wouldn't be affecting special trees just easily replaced shrubbery – a Bobcat and some gravel sound a lot more reasonable – there is already an access point off the road.
- Spend the money on a better, safer bike path set further back from the road.

#### Resident e-mail 05/09/16

- We have looked at the Linacre Road to Ferdinando Gardens Masterplan with interest and attended the community consultation at Hampton LSC on Saturday.
- As long time very happy visitors to the Sandringham Dog Beach we are unsure exactly what changes are proposed. I refer specifically to the continuation of the seawall with a high tide all ability path and new rock revetment.

- The text and drawings are unclear and staff on Sat. morning thought the new work would go right up to the Triathlon/Anglers' Club but were unsure. Text mentioned to Sandringham Boat Harbour. Both of these destinations are a long way.
- Text in the Implementation Schedule 5.1/D1 & D2 states the rock revetment and concrete path are to be extended to Linacre Rd stairs and Dog Beach.
- In the drawing Plan D the path and revetment continue past Linacre Rd stairs seemingly for quite a long way.
- Are you able to clarify exactly the proposed works?

Resident e-mail 08/09/16

SHARED PATH

- On several occasions my wife and I have gone to the aid of various accident/incident victims along the shared walking and bicycle path over the recent years.
- Ambulance and sometimes police have been called to those incidents which generally result from a clash of cyclists with pedestrians, other cyclists or motor vehicles.
- I recognise that the Masterplan is a grand and multi-purpose plan but in my opinion the main and most urgent attention should be given to the shared path and adjoining trees and foliage.
- In my observation the garden / maintenance workers continually fail to prune or trim foliage parallel to the shared path sufficiently.
- There is regular maintenance but it seems to be focussed on a strip of land within approximately 300 mm from the western edge of the concrete path.
- Within that strip of land there are some tree trunks and many tree branches which are not trimmed and are hazards to the safety of the peoples using the shared path.
- That approach does not provide any room for cyclist or pedestrian to move off the path out of harms' way.
- In my opinion that strip of land parallel to the shared path should be widened to 1,500 mm to provide a safe incident avoidance barrier to both pedestrians and cyclists.
- The widened "safety strip" should be clear of tree trunks and any overhanging tree branches and might be tan barked, grassed or planted with ground covering plant species.
- I think that solution would avoid any need to widen the existing shared path as proposed by the draft Masterplan.

UNPAVED PATHWAY

- Parallel to and between the shared path and the paved path along the sand and waters' edge is another walking path which is not paved.
- Through my wife and my daughters experience I am aware that this path is not safe for women walking alone as it is screened from observation by passing traffic along Beach Road and the shared pedestrian / bicycle path.
- There is often reports in the local media of incidents and even attacks involving undesirable people (predominantly males) appearing from the bush adjoining this path to scare or even attack women and children.
- This problem could be minimised by providing more observation of people walking along this path where the adjoining bush presents as screening.
- Those area of bushy foliage could be thinned out and thereby provide better observation and make the route safer to pedestrians.

PARALLEL PARKING.

- I have been in correspondence with various Council officers on this matter over some years.

- By reference to parallel parking I assume that would be “indented “parking spaces similar to Marine Parade and The Boulevarde in the City of Port Phillip.
- Council officers have previously advised, on several occasions that indented parking is/was being considered for Beach Road Hampton. It has never eventuated.
- Not only would such parking ease traffic congestion but would also provide safer parking for residents who do not have adequate “on site “parking at their homes.
- I am aware of 3 separate and serious collisions caused by south bound vehicles crashing into parked vehicles in front of numbers 38, 39 & 40 Beach Road.
- One of these incidents caused my sons vehicle to be “written off “. More recently there was a fatal incident outside No 50 Beach Road which might have been avoided with safer parking.

#### PROMENADE

- The extension of the beachside promenade south of the Life Saving Club to the harbour area would be beneficial in providing a waters’ edge access which is otherwise not available at high tide.

#### BALANCE

- The other initiatives of the Masterplan would also be welcomed by locals and visitors but I think the first 2 matters above are by far the most urgent and essential.
- I would be happy to talk to these matters with you or other nominated officers or Councillors at Bayside Council.

*Resident e-mail 08/09/16*

#### PARKING AND BEACH ACCESS

- We do not agree with the provision of indented parking along the inland side of Beach Road for the following reasons:
- Indented parking will significantly reduce the number of car parking spaces that are currently available as it will only be possible to put in a few parking spaces in between driveways.
- There would be a huge cost particularly if lighting and power poles were also removed.
- It is very challenging to exit a property along Beach Road now but the narrowing of the nature strip would make this more difficult. There are several cheaper and more effective options:
  - The provision of a clearway on the inland side of Beach Road Monday to Friday from 4 pm to 6.30 pm.
  - Having a drive-in, drop-off area for those using the beach or the Life Saving Club at the rear of the Life Saving Club.
  - Re-instatement of parking along Beach Road on Saturday and Sunday mornings during summer months. We appreciate that this clearway was put in to improve cyclist safety but this has been at the expense of families wishing to access the beach before it gets too hot.

#### EXTENSION OF THE HAMPTON LIFESAVING CLUB

- Although the club is very well used and provides an excellent community service we do wonder if there is an excessive amount of equipment, some of which is largely used by older people hooning around in the water in the name of practicing picking up swimmers. That said, this is an opinion coming from uninformed observers.
- Is it possible to install solar panels above the showers to provide warm water during winter?
- We would be concerned about the durability of the proposed shade shelters. Although they are a good idea they will need extreme anchoring to maintain their position in storms.

#### OCTOPUS GARDENS PLAY AREA

- Although there have been comments about the maintenance of this area we think it has some potential to be developed as a children’s play area. Would a much smaller version of the pool at Bondi below the Iceberg’s restaurant be possible? We

do appreciate Council's attention to removing graffiti in this area. Restoration of the seawall and steps and removing the rocks in this area would be a good start.

#### CYCLING PATH

- Is it possible to separate pedestrians and cyclists and to force cyclists to use a better bike path during peak hour? We and several of our neighbours have almost been killed by cyclists who come off Beach Road and use the footpath at speed during the evening peak hour. The current bike path would need designated crossing points and a speed limit to prevent accidents. Pedestrians could be restricted to the beach path during peak times.

#### Resident e-mail 9/09/16

- New toilet facility in vicinity of New St is desperately needed.
- I agree the Octopus playground needs attention however this area needs a large playground. Perhaps this is an opportunity to install a large exciting playground in Bayside. My suggestion would be area 3/4 on the plan. After the stormwater harvesting project is complete. It is a large open space, adjacent to a car park and close to the train station.
- A café/kiosk (if done well) would be a welcome addition to the foreshore. Maybe part of the above mentioned new large playground.
- We need several easy visible signs pointing to the bathing boxes. Almost every day I help tourists who have come by train and have walked a long way in the opposite direction.

#### SFA e-mail 10/09/16

- I am quite comfortable with your proposal as illustrated and described below.
- I have spoken with a few local residents who walk the Hampton beach whilst I was there Thursday and we do have concerns about the upgrade of the Octopus Garden Play Area proposed for a salt water play area and splash pad.
- We do agree for this area to be for seating and shade.
- We are concerned that electricity power will be required for salt water to be piped up to the pools which require ongoing maintenance [more expenses for Council and our rates], and sits uncomfortably with the principle of man-made pools beside a natural beach. Toddlers and mothers are better to be learning and interacting with the natural beach. Man-made pools may be a legal risk to Council for potential drownings, slips and injuries.
- We agree the rubber in this area should go as it releases chemicals in the heat. [I can actually smell the rubber emitting chemicals on hot days!] We would suggest after removing the rubber and any concrete in the area, to plant native gardens suited to the environment e.g. salt bushes, native grasses etc. with a nice seat and a dwarf banksia tree for shade. This will help enhance the natural environment, provide respite from the hot sun and a place to rest.
- Also we feel uncomfortable about the change from natural paths to hard flat paths in the Ferdinando gardens. This takes away much from the feeling of being in a natural beach environment.

#### Resident e-mail 10/09/16

#### AGAINST

- Safety - 1
- You are changing from mostly a two to three lane road to a four lane highway. Because of this, the speed of the traffic will increase dramatically.
- We already experience motorcycle and motor vehicles spending in excess of 100km in the area.
- During the warmer months, cars park on the East side of beach Rd regularly for access to the beach. The idea that families with children would have to unload their cars and then attempt to cross four lanes of traffic is crazy and dangerous.

#### Cost - 2

- It has been suggested the cost is approximately \$360,000. We know from experience that public government council works always exceed the estimated cost, so the true figure is likely to be more than \$500,000 plus.
- SURELY WE CAN USE THIS MONEY TO GREATER ADVANTAGE IN THE NEED COMMUNITY.

#### Money - 3

- Where is the money coming from?
- Who is responsibility is it to pay for any or all the electric power poles?

#### Entering and leaving proprieties - 4

- Cars parking off the proposed four lane highway will cause cars trying to exit their properties, increase the difficulties with line of sight. PROTECTINGLY DANGEROUS.
- We feel it is enormous amount of money for such a small return of 6 to 7 dangerous carparks.

#### Resident e-mail 11/09/16

- Thank you for the opportunity to have an input into our organic foreshore.
- Firstly, I would like to contend that there should be no public toilet at the New Street stairs for the reasons below:
  - Graffiti, currently we have it on fences, the level crossing box at New Street gates
  - People with undesirable sexual activities and illegal drug habits
  - The smell in summer.
  - Has potential to spoil the view and reduce the appeal of the foreshore
- A better alternative would be a sign advising where public toilets are located. Currently the toilets at the railway station and adjacent to Brighton beach are adequate however are in need of restoration. In addition, there are toilets at Hampton beach which service a similar area.
- Surely people can walk or ride their bikes one way or the other to a public toilet, in a coastal setting in regional Victoria many of the busiest beaches lack toilets and it is not an issue, adding a further set here is a waste of council money as they are not needed. A better use of funds is outlined below:
- Widening the shared pedestrian & cyclist path along Beach Road from Green Point to Dendy Beach. It is very dangerous on busy days with heavy traffic on Beach Road. There is a fence stopping pedestrians getting out of the way of cyclists who use the path. One day there will be an accident as cyclists using the path don't slow down or ring bells.

#### Resident e-mail 11/09/16

- We wish to comment on the proposal to introduce parallel parking in the nature strip along Beach Road to reduce traffic congestion.
- Key objectives of the masterplan are to:
  - Improve safety and access along key pedestrian and cyclist's trails
  - Protect the foreshore environment, particularly areas of remnant coastal vegetation and habitats for native wildlife
  - Identify opportunities to enhance Ferdinando Gardens and the foreshore for year round community use
  - Accommodating future needs and improving all ability access to the beach, paths, toilets, parking and picnic areas
- One of the major cost items of the masterplan and an item upon which Council is seeking community feedback is a reduction in "traffic congestion" through the

introduction of parallel parking in the nature strip on Beach Road. However, a reduction in traffic congestion is not one of the key objectives which the masterplan is seeking to address; we suggest that Council focus on developing and implementing initiatives that directly deliver the stated key objectives. Indented parking has also been raised as benefiting cyclists, but the traffic congestion argument highlights that benefits for cyclists is being used as a smokescreen for what is in reality a traffic flow investment for motorists. “Car dooring” is one of the major risks for cyclists along Beach Road and there is no evidence that indented parking leads to a reduction in risk for cyclists; in fact, the evidence from major cities such as London is that full grade separation is the only effective protection for cyclists – this is the policy being pursued by the City of Melbourne.

- We do not consider that a reduction in traffic congestion along Beach Road is desirable. Improved traffic flow is likely to lead to higher motor vehicle speeds and heavier vehicle traffic. This would lead to reduced amenity for both Beach Road residents and pedestrians.
- Parking on Beach Road restricts motor vehicle traffic which is of benefit to cyclists. Two uninterrupted traffic lanes would be more dangerous for cyclists.
- The literature provided by Council in relation to this matter is inconsistent and highly confusing. Indented parking on the consultation document with items 1 to 21 is very different to other information mailed to us as “page 6” of the Masterplan which has “Drawing Keys 1,2, 3 & 4 do not reflect the diagrams in other documents. This makes comment very difficult. Addressing Item “Drawing Key 2” of page 6 of the Masterplan specifically which shows indented parking in front of 6 Beach Road Hampton:
- This area of Beach Road already has adequate parking. Parking is readily available apart from on a few very hot days in the summer. The small number of parking spaces proposed would offer virtually no improvement over the status quo.
- For motorists who miss the South Road turnoff there is nowhere before Orlando Street for them to turn off and turn back towards the city. Motor vehicles frequently perform an illegal U-turn in front of our house which is dangerous for pedestrians who are looking to cross Beach Road in front of the Holyrood Street railway right of way as these pedestrians begin to cross the Road without realising that a motor vehicle is about to turn back at them and the drivers do not look for pedestrians. If indented parking is provided at Drawing Key 2 then the cars that park there, who will have come from the city direction, will illegally turn across Beach Road to return home. Pedestrians crossing at this location include small children and they are more often than not accompanied by their dogs; they will be unaware of motor vehicles illegally turning back towards the city until it is too late – someone will be badly injured or killed if this initiative is proceeded with.
- The slip road for cars entering Beach Road from the New Street rail crossing merges just metres from the proposed location 19 parking. We will have motor vehicles pulling into traffic whilst others are merging – once again a dangerous option.
- Finally, apart from a few very hot days, the car parking in this area is hardly used and I encourage you to study the data from the parking metres opposite this location. I enclose a photo from Sunday 28/8/2016 at 1:25pm taken opposite 6 Beach Road Hampton looking towards the lifesaving club. As you can see from the photo it was a glorious winter’s day and yet there is not one car parked on that section of Beach Road. We would hazard a guess that your parking meter data will demonstrate a median of between about 0 & 3 cars along that stretch of road if every day of the year is considered in your analysis.
- 

*Opposite 6 Beach Road Hampton looking towards the Hampton Lifesaving Club – 28/8/2016 at 1:25pm*



Residential

- Usage of the Bay Trail shared path by fast-riding commuter cyclists is increasing.
- This is causing many pedestrians and some recreational cyclists to use the gravel cliff-top walking path, which copes adequately with walkers, but the (illegal) use by cyclists is sometimes a danger. The shared path may need widening, re-aligning and possibly separating in the near future.
- The wetland soak area (low lying swales) have been a popular focal point on this part of the foreshore since their placement in 1998, particularly when the ducks breed, and ducklings are on display. When full, the wetlands thrive with water birds and other birds, both native and introduced. The wetlands are also home to other wild life including frogs (banjo, spotted marsh and brown tree frogs). In recent years the ponds have dried out during summer, but at present are almost full. A possible solution to the drying could be to enlarge the low lying base for greater capacity of water, and lining the base and lower sides with clay-rich soil. The ponds could be connected to the adjacent storm water drains on the beach side of Beach Road and water quality improved with a simple coarse sand filter.
- Storm Water Harvesting. This is associated with 2 and 4 and all three would help with the major problem of this section of the foreshore – the Orlando Street outfall of the Grenville Street Drain. This groyne-enclosed drain is inadequate and quite regularly – especially after heavy rainfall – during westerly winds and high tides, causes the concrete block in the timber walkway to be dislodged, causing a dangerous situation with the deep, fast flowing drain being open. Even when this does become dislodged, the water pressure forces the metal safety grids away from the sides of the drain, causing an even more dangerous situation. This also results in the scouring of a wide deep channel through the beach sand on either side of the groyne, resulting in sand loss and beach degradation.
- These deep channels often remain until filled during beach cleaning and are a further danger when children are attracted as the holes are often quite deep, with soft edges. In extreme cases the pressure of storm water in the drain dislodges the heavy lid of the inspection point on Beach Road and both Beach Road and Orlando Street flood as the storm water outlets are already at capacity. I understand that this is the responsibility of Melbourne Water (Reported Case Ref. S-18129), but 2, 3 and 4 could surely help lessen these dangers.

- This is an excellent idea, and apart from the benefits listed above, is environmentally sound with reuse of storm water, saving of mains water, and reducing the volume of fresh water entering Port Phillip, as the resultant lowering of the salinity level is believed by many to have a detrimental effect on fish breeding on nearby reefs.
- Signage is important, but should be kept to a minimum to avoid visual clutter on the foreshore.
- This is a good solution to a dangerous section of the bike path.
- An excellent initiative and long overdue
- 9, 10, 11 All good moves.
- 12 - Seating and shade are very much needed. May be a public risk issue with water play area.
- 13 - A good improvement because of the heavy pedestrian usage.
- 14 - A good improvement. Would give dog walkers better access to the dog beach and foreshore walkers access to the pier and stone breakwater.
- 15 - A good move.
- 16 - An excellent plan. Shade, fixed seating and tables would make a great amenity for families. It is close to HLSC, with its patrolled beach and kiosk.
- 17 - Not sure that this is needed, but should perhaps be investigated.
- 18 - This thriving club needs suitable provision for its activities. Should be investigated.
- 19 - Definitely not feasible, practical or realistic. Would be hugely expensive, a threat to the environment and safety and would result in less parking spaces, when more are needed. Would also mean a loss of parking revenue.
- 20 - Would be good.
- 21 - Needed in some areas, but should be standardised and kept to a minimum.
- Heritage
- Care should be taken with any works in this area near heritage sites, especially:
  - The Brighton Beach railway tunnel portal and adjacent area, particularly the original brick parapet above the tunnel on Beach Road footpath.
  - The stones in the seawall bearing the initials and dates of prisoners hanged at the Old Melbourne Gaol. (Especially those near the New Street groyne).
  - The remnant Norfolk Island Pines in the nature strip, near HLSC and in the Ferdinando Gardens. These are from the Avenue of Honour planted by Sandringham City Council after World War One.
- It is also important to ensure foreshore foliage adjacent to 'The Swimmer' is kept to a height below the sight line of the statue to ensure the appearance of the horizon as a water level.
- Thanks for the opportunity to comment on the Draft Masterplan

PAGE 6 AS CIRCULATED

- The introduction to this page states the width and clearance required for indented parking, but does not supply the length required.
- Indented parking could only be supported if it improved safety and the environment and increased the number of available parking spaces. These proposals (Options 2, 3 and 4) fail all three requirements.
- Option 1 Maintain status quo
- This is the only realistic option. Traffic flows reasonably well in this section of Beach Road, even on busy beach days in the summer period, even though all available kerbside parking is often fully utilised. Traffic is then reduced to a single lane each side and self regulates to a slower speed. This is better than the situation where intermittent parking causes frequent lane changing.
- Option 2 Indented parking on the residential side.
- This option would not increase parking and would probably result in a small reduction. The plan shows indented parking for two sections of the road between New Street and Small Street. The longer of these is not available for the length shown, because of existing NO STANDING buffer zones each side of Orlando Street and Little Willis Street. The spaces between driveways of the properties between these two streets are not wide enough to hold an indented parking space. Parking spaces in the section to Small Street are also subject to driveway spacing and this would not change with indenting. Parking would no longer be allowed where the nature strip narrows, resulting in a further loss, as I would estimate an overall loss of 4 to 5 spaces.
- If this scheme was implemented, the removal of some power poles would be necessary, creating a need to underground the power supply to some dwellings and the supply of new light poles where these lights are currently attached to the power poles. I have been informed that these nature strips are a very sensitive 'no dig' area as the main Victoria – Tasmania telephone lines run beneath this section. Environmentally it is unacceptable to replace grass verges with bitumen and concrete, and this plan would result in the loss of a large grassy area. This plan is totally unrealistic, even without the prohibitive cost.
- Option 3 Indented parking foreshore side without relocation of Bay Trail
- This option also fails environmentally, as it replaces grass with bitumen and concrete. It is not a viable option as it drastically reduces parking due to the spacing of existing trees and possibly some light poles. It would also incur a loss of parking revenue. It is not worth considering as an option at all.
- Option 4 Indented parking foreshore side relocating Bay Trail
- This option is similar to Option 3, but has added problems. If the Bay trail is relocated this may limit the ability to widen it in the future as suggested in the Gardens Masterplan. Moving the path would also impact on the wetlands area, causing a reduction in size, when an enlargement is the more desirable outcome. Like Option 3 this is not a viable option as there would still be loss of grassed area, a loss of amenity and a loss of parking spaces and parking revenue. There would also be the added cost of constructing the new section of the Bay Trail. This option is also not worth considering.
- Summary
- Parking spaces in this vicinity are seldom fully utilised. Many people who do not have Bayside stickers use New Street, Orlando Street and Small Street during hot weather and there is only a problem when there is a well-attended event at Hampton LSC, especially at weekends and public holidays. This occurred on approximately five occasions last summer.
- Notes
- Draft Master Plan

- page 2 Land Management
  - photo 3 title: Hampton Beach coast walking path
  - photo 4 title: 'The Swimmer' Hampton
  - page 23 title: REFERENCES
- Thanks for the opportunity to comment on the Draft Masterplan

Resident e-mail via Council Website - 13/09/16

- I missed the cut off date for the beach road upgrade, as I was away on holidays. I was hoping you could pass on my feedback to the appropriate area to include. My feedback is below, thanks.
- I am strongly opposing the toilet block at New St that is being flagged. With the new intersection at Beach Road and New St, there is no parking for people to stop to use the toilet facilities, and if people did stop it would be very dangerous and increase the chance of an accident, especially with all the cyclists around. I think there is adequate toilets at the lifesaving club and near South Rd car park for people to use.
- Also, building a toilet block on the foreshore would be an eyesore. This area is looking great with the landscape, it would be terrible to spoil it. If another toilet block was essential maybe it could be on the other side of beach road, where the Holyrood St playground and the railway crossing is. There is vacant overgrown land there (used to be a petrol station) that could be used for a toilet block and car parking. The pedestrian crossing is close by also. Please don't add a building on the foreshore at New St.