

ANALYSIS OF DRAFT COASTAL FORESHORE MANAGEMENT PLAN 2014-2024 — ONLINE SURVEY

The following provides an analysis of the qualitative data gathered from the Draft Coastal Foreshore Management Plan 2014-2024 — Online Survey conducted with residents, ratepayers and key stakeholders between 23 June 2014 and 11 July 2014.

BACKGROUND

The City consulted the general community with the City of Joondalup along with the following stakeholders:

- Representative(s) from friends groups including City of Joondalup Coastal Friends Groups and Joondalup Community Coast Care Forum.
- Representative(s) from the Department of Parks and Wildlife, Department of Planning (Bush Forever), Department of Fire and Emergency Services, The Marmion Angling and Aquatic Club.
- Local Parliamentarians.
- Representative(s) from City of Joondalup's Community Engagement Network.

The consultation was advertised to the general public via the City's website, which outlined the details of the consultation and the draft document. All stakeholders also received personalised hard-copy letters directing them to the City's website. Members of the public and stakeholders wishing to comment were encouraged to complete a survey form online via the City's website.

RESPONSE RATES

(N.b. unless otherwise stated, “%” refers to the proportion of total survey respondents.)

The City collected a combined total of nine online responses and two qualitative responses (which did not indicate demographic details as shown in Table 1. Of the nine responses outlined in Table 1, there was even spread of ages. It should also be noted that eight of the nine respondents live in Iluka.

Table 1: Responses by age¹

Age groups	Responses	
	N	%
Under 18 years of age	0	0.0%
18–24 years of age	0	0.0%
25–34 years of age	1	11.1%
35–44 years of age	2	22.2%
45–54 years of age	2	22.2%
55–64 years of age	2	22.2%
65–74 years of age	2	22.2%
75–84 years of age	0	0.0%
85+ years of age	0	0.0%
Total (valid) responses	9	100.0%

In addition to the online responses, the City received two written responses from:

- Joondalup Community Coast Care Forum Incorporated
- Friends of North Ocean Reef – Iluka Foreshore

These comments were also incorporated into the survey results.

¹Does not include qualitative responses

QUESTION 1 —**“WHAT DO YOU LIKE ABOUT THE DRAFT COASTAL FORESHORE MANAGEMENT PLAN 2014 - 2024?”**

Respondents were asked to specify what they liked about the Draft Coastal Foreshore Management Plan 2014 – 2024. A total of 11 respondents provided 16 comments. The results have been summarised in Table 2.

Table 2: Summary of the aspects which respondents liked about the Draft Coastal Foreshore Management Plan 2014 – 2024²

Reasons for Opposition	Responses	
	N	%
Support the installation of pathways to avoid pedestrian traffic through bushland	2	12.50%
Support the level of community involvement in developing plan	2	12.50%
Support the level of details describing limestone cliffs	1	6.25%
Support the overall plan (in general)	4	25.00%
Support the proposed conservation zones	1	6.25%
Support the protection of coastline vegetation	2	12.50%
Support the recognition of vandalism and hoon behaviour in the car parks	2	12.50%
Support the recommended management actions	1	6.25%
Support the vegetation being tracked over time	1	6.25%
<i>Total comments received</i>	16	100.0%

² N.b. some respondents provided more than one comment.

QUESTION 2 —**“WHAT CHANGES OR IMPROVEMENTS WOULD YOU RECOMMEND FOR THE PLAN?”**

Respondents were asked to specify what improvements or changes be included in the Draft Coastal Foreshore Management Plan 2014 – 2024. A total of 11 respondents provided 23 comments. The results have been summarised in Table 3.

Table 3: Summary of suggested changes or improvements to the Draft Coastal Foreshore Management Plan 2014 – 2024³

Reasons for Opposition	Responses	
	N	%
Concern for duplication of information within other City documents	1	5.00%
Concern for the methods of weed removal	1	5.00%
Concern with the overall structure of the plan	1	5.00%
No changes required	1	5.00%
Would like a schedule for individualised local management plans	2	10.00%
Would like all maps to be up-to-date and display accurate information	3	15.00%
Would like all photos to be up-to-date and display accurate information	2	10.00%
Would like maps to include more fauna species	2	10.00%
Would like more attention for stativity studies for limestone cliffs	1	5.00%
Would like more developed pathways throughout the dunes	3	15.00%
Would like the inclusion of flora species within mapping	1	5.00%
Would like to see more aspirational targets	1	5.00%
<i>Total comments received</i>	<i>20</i>	<i>100.0%</i>

³ N.b. some respondents provided more than one comment.

QUESTION 3 —**“DO YOU HAVE ANY FURTHER COMMENTS ABOUT THE DRAFT COASTAL FORESHORE MANAGEMENT PLAN 2014 - 2024?”**

Respondents were asked if they had any further comments on the draft Coastal Foreshore Management Plan. A total of 11 respondents provided 13 comments. The results have been summarised in Table 4 below.

Table 4: Summary of further comments on the Draft Coastal Foreshore Management Plan 2014 – 2024⁴

Comments	Responses	
	N	%
Concern for potential cyclists using the paths	1	7.7%
Concern for proposed additional conservation areas	1	7.7%
Concern for the effect of an increased population on dunes	1	7.7%
Concern of the impact of feral cats on natural fauna	1	7.7%
Looking forward to future partnerships with the City	2	15.4%
No additional comments	1	7.7%
Would like an increase in ranger patrols along the coast	1	7.7%
Would like the installation of additional pathways along the foreshore	2	15.4%
Would like to formalise sand paths through dunes into developed paths	2	15.4%
Would like to outline the importance of access to the foreshore	1	7.7%
Total (valid) responses	13	100.0%

⁴ N.b. some respondents provided more than one comment.

Detailed Analysis of Community Consultation Comments

ATTACHMENT 3

Summary of Suggested Changes or Improvements to the draft Coastal Foreshore Management Plan 2014 - 2024 (the Plan)

Respondent	Survey Comments	City's Response	Outcome
M.A.	Opening comment from respondent, regarding the veracity of the management plan " <i>In my opinion this is not a management plan. It resembles a generalised text, as such as might be written for an introductory tertiary course in management issues in coastal environments</i> ".	The environmental consultants that produced the management plan are highly experienced (particularly in the local government arena). The document is written for use by the managers of the coastal natural areas. The content and layout may not meet the needs and expectations of individual bushland volunteers.	No change.
M.A.	Concern for duplication of information within the other City documents.	The respondent was concerned that information relating to the descriptions of infrastructure was not required in the document as the same information appears in the Beach Management Plan. Infrastructure information is useful in the Plan as it provides context to the reader, who may not have a copy of the <i>Beach Management Plan</i> at hand.	No change.
M.A.	Concern for the methods of weed removal.	<p>The respondent had concerns that the use of specific herbicides in the foreshore reserve can result in the herbicides breaking down and creating compounds that can cause toxic effects on native plant species.</p> <p>All herbicides used in the City have been approved for use by State authorities. They are applied by competent and trained operatives. The use of these chemicals is crucial in the control of introduced weed species.</p>	No changes.
M.A.	Concern with the overall structure of the plan. That the document will not give guidance for the future management of the foreshore reserve.	The respondent felt that the document should " <i>guide month by month activities in the coastal foreshore</i> ". The document is designed as an overarching document. The document informs readers that is its purpose. It also states that management plans with the emphasis on smaller discrete sections of the foreshore will be produced by the City to guide operational activities at individual locations on the coast.	No change.
M.A.	The general recommendations appear to be based on out of date, poor quality vegetation mapping.	The mapping used base information collected by professional botanists with many years experience and was correct at the time of collection.	No change.

Respondent	Survey Comments	City's Response	Outcome
M.A.	That the Plan criticised 'Friends' Groups' for the localities they choose to work in.	There is no criticism of 'Friends' Groups' in the Plan. Section 5.6.2 Social Value states the following " <i>While the work of individuals and groups often goes unrecognised, their input contributes significantly to positive environmental outcomes for a particular location</i> ".	No change.
M.A.	That on ground fauna surveys were not undertaken	There was no intention to undertake a detailed fauna survey for the Plan. Detailed fauna surveys, including trapping will be part of the individual coastal plans. This is stated in paragraph one of the executive summary.	No change.
M.A.	Comments that some plant species recorded in the Bush Forever surveys were not recorded in the maps.	Because of the large areas mapped, it is not feasible to include all of the small plant communities. The individual coastal plans will include large scale maps indicating the latest flora survey information.	No change.
M.A.	Comment that the information pertaining to the lack of reef structures at Marmion is inaccurate.	The document does not state there are no reefs at this location only that the area is a high energy coast with waves coming into contact with the rocky coastline. Unlike more protected beaches in the northern parts of the City.	No change.
M.A.	That the location of threatened flora species was not mapped.	The Plan is a public document, if the location of the City's threatened and priority protected flora species were mapped unscrupulous plant collectors may then choose to remove them for sale or for their own plant collections.	No change.
M.A.	That COJ staff have removed many significant plant species from the foreshore.	The City has removed plants that were not native to that location from coastal reserves. Removals have been undertaken after Clearing Permits were obtained from the Department from Parks and Wildlife (DPaW). Follow up inspections were undertaken by DPAW. The City was found to be fully compliant with the conditions contained within the permits.	No change.
M.A.	The catalogue of poor quality pictures of weeds on A3 pages is a waste of paper.	Photographs of weeds in the Plan would be of great assistance to readers who do not have a botanical knowledge of coastal plants and would like to identify them.	No change.
M.A.	Concerned about key performance indicators contained within the Plan. Of particular concern reference to the KPI of a 90% weed kill.	The 90% weed kill is a performance measure contained within the City's contract agreements with bushland regeneration contractors and is a KPI used throughout Australia to measure weeds control performance.	No change.

Respondent	Survey Comments	City's Response	Outcome
M.A.	Access to beaches via stairs on limestone cliffs.	The City has constructed formal access ways to numerous beaches. Access ways have not been constructed where the destination is considered unsafe. This is the case in areas where there are beaches at the base of cliffs at low tide. The beach may disappear at high tide leaving beach users (especially children) very vulnerable.	No change.
M.A.	The respondent was concerned that climate change had not been given due consideration within the plan particularly the placement of residential structures close to the shoreline.	The Plan brief considered Parks and Recreational Reserves; it did not include land that was held in private hands for commercial or residential purposes.	No change.
M.A.	Scientific research and Monitoring. The respondent doubted the credibility and transparency of survey quadrates. The respondent added that data can be manipulated by the management (City) to produce any outcome the City is seeking.	<p>The design of the flora survey was aligned with methodology outlined in EPA Guidance Statement No. 51: Terrestrial Flora and Vegetation Surveys for Environmental Impact Assessment in Western Australia. The methodology undertaken in conducting the survey included the use of 10m x 10m quadrates and opportunistic sampling of species not recorded within the quadrates. A minimum of two quadrates were established per vegetation community.</p> <p>Comments are unfounded, inappropriate and unsubstantiated. The Plan was written by highly qualified, independent consultants.</p>	No change.
M.N.	Concern that the vegetation condition mapping carried in 2010 is now out of date.	<p>Vegetation condition mapping was undertaken in 2010. In 2012, this mapping was ground-truthed by the consultancy that has produced the current draft foreshore plan. Both consultancies utilised qualified botanists to produce the vegetation mapping. New surveys and associated mapping has been produced in 2013.</p> <p>These maps will inform the baseline botanical information for the management plans for discrete sections of the coastline, namely the <i>Marmion</i> and <i>Sorrento Foreshore Management Plans</i>.</p>	No change.
M.N.	The respondent would like to have seen more aspirational targets over the 10 year timeframe of the plan.	Aspirational targets form a component the <i>Joondalup Strategic Community Plan 2012 – 2022</i> . The Plan assists the City in achieving the goals contained within that document.	No change.

Respondent	Survey Comments	City's Response	Outcome
M.N.	There is no schedule for the preparation of individual management plans.	The City is preparing natural area management plans (both bushland and coastal) continually. Their completion is dictated by changing priorities, for example, Central Park following devastating bushland fires. A draft plan has been completed for Marmion Foreshore and a plan for Sorrento Foreshore is in progress.	No change.
M.N.	The plan does not recognise the work of 'Friends' Groups.'	The executive summary contains very positive comment regarding the work 'Friends' Groups' undertake on the coast. Section 5.6.2 Social Value states the following " <i>While the work of individuals and groups often goes unrecognised, their input contributes significantly to positive environmental outcomes for a particular location</i> ".	No change.
M.N.	Respondent noted that comment made in Section 1.4.1 Local Government needs to be updated in regard to the City's District Planning Scheme protections of natural areas, under Schedule 5 of the plan.	The comment by the respondent is incorrect in respect to planning regulations and will not require a change.	No change.
M.N.	Concerns that not all plant species are indicated on maps.	Because of the large areas mapped it is not feasible to indicate the location of all of the smaller plant communities. The individual coastal plans (being developed) will include, large scale maps indicating the latest and more detailed flora survey information.	No change.
M.N.	Respondent feels that information about pathways and community facilities appear in the City's Beach Management Plan and should be removed from this plan.	The respondent was concerned that information relating to the descriptions of infrastructure and community facilities was not required in the document as the same information appears in the Beach Management Plan. This information is useful in the Plan as it provides context to the reader, who may not have a copy of the <i>Beach Management Plan</i> at hand.	No change.
M.N.	Respondent concerned that a number of weed species not mentioned in Plan.	Not all weed species are visible for all parts of the year (bulbs – corms). When the survey was done some species may not have been visible.	No change.

Respondent	Survey Comments	City's Response	Outcome
M.N.	Concern about feral cats in the foreshore reserve.	<p>Additional information concerning the <i>Cat Act 2011</i> has now been included in the document.</p> <p>The following is an additional inclusion. It can be found under the heading Biodiversity Conservation, 5.4.5 Management Strategies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The City continues to control feral animals, including the removal of cats, under the provision of the <i>Cat Act 2011</i> (WA). 	Changes made to Plan.
M.N.	Concern that the Marmion Foreshore proposed conservation zone is an offset for the bushland that will be lost when the Ocean Reef Marina site is developed.	A conservation zone at Marmion Foreshore does not form part of any offset for any development the City plans to undertake or is currently undertaking.	No change.
D.B.	Respondent would like pathway from O'Mara Boulevard, Iluka through to the coastal dual use pathway.	<p>Plan adjusted to allow consideration of new pathways. Table 15: Performance Objectives, Standards and Criteria now states:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "assessing tracks created through dunes, and making a decision to either close and rehabilitate them, or formalise them as appropriate" 	Change made to plan.
S.D.	Respondent would like pathway from O'Mara Boulevard, Iluka through to the coastal dual use pathway.	<p>Plan adjusted to allow consideration of new pathways. Table 15: Performance Objectives, Standards and Criteria now states:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "assessing tracks created through dunes, and making a decision to either close and rehabilitate them, or formalise them as appropriate" 	Change made to plan.
S.McA.	Respondent felt that densities of some weed species are under estimated in plan, would like to see weed maps updated.	Because of the large areas mapped, it is not feasible to indicate the location all of the smaller plant communities. The individual coastal plans (being developed) will include large scale maps indicating the latest and more detailed flora survey information.	No change.

Respondent	Survey Comments	City's Response	Outcome
S.S.	Would like to see a path constructed from Pattaya Park to the coastal dual use path.	Plan adjusted to allow consideration of new pathways. Table 15: Performance Objectives, Standards and Criteria now states: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “assessing tracks created through dunes, and making a decision to either close and rehabilitate them, or formalise them as appropriate” 	Change made to plan.
L.S.	Respondent would like pathway from O'Mara Boulevard, Iluka through to the coastal dual use pathway.	Plan adjusted to allow consideration of new pathways. Table 15: Performance Objectives, Standards and Criteria now states: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “assessing tracks created through dunes, and making a decision to either close and rehabilitate them, or formalise them as appropriate” 	Change made to plan.
B.C.	Respondent would like pathway from O'Mara Boulevard, Iluka through to the coastal dual use pathway.	Plan adjusted to allow consideration of new pathways. Table 15: Performance Objectives, Standards and Criteria now states: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “assessing tracks created through dunes, and making a decision to either close and rehabilitate them, or formalise them as appropriate” 	Change made to plan.
B.J.	Respondent would like pathway from O'Mara Boulevard, Iluka through to the coastal dual use pathway.	Plan adjusted to allow consideration of new pathways. Table 15: Performance Objectives, Standards and Criteria now states: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “assessing tracks created through dunes, and making a decision to either close and rehabilitate them, or formalise them as appropriate” 	Change made to plan.
I.B.	Respondent would like pathway from O'Mara Boulevard, Iluka through to the coastal dual use pathway.	Plan adjusted to allow consideration of new pathways. Table 15: Performance Objectives, Standards and Criteria now states: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “assessing tracks created through dunes, and making a decision to either close and rehabilitate them, or formalise them as appropriate” 	Change made to plan.