

Appendix A

Consultation Report



Fraser Coast  
REGIONAL COUNCIL

Prepared for Fraser Coast Regional Council

January 2011

## Stakeholder Consultation Report Stage 1 (Gap Analysis)



## Fraser Coast Shoreline Erosion Management Plan



**CPRGROUP**  
connelly project resources

[www.cprgroup.com.au](http://www.cprgroup.com.au)

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....	5
BACKGROUND .....	6
1.0 INTRODUCTION .....	7
2.0 STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT STRATEGIES .....	8
2.1 The Vision for Stakeholder Engagement .....	8
2.2 Stakeholders .....	8
2.3 Stakeholder Identification .....	8
2.3.1 Community of Interest .....	8
2.3.2 Decision-makers.....	8
2.4 Briefing Materials .....	9
2.4.1 Briefing Notes .....	9
2.4.2 Questionnaire.....	9
2.4.3 Contact Mechanisms .....	9
2.4.4 Bookmarks .....	9
2.5 SEMP Database .....	9
2.6 Stakeholder Engagement.....	9
2.6.1 Groups Established to Facilitate Preparation of the SEMP .....	10
<u>Table 1: Project Team</u> .....	10
<u>Table 2: Client Steering Group (CSG)</u> .....	10
<u>Table 3: Extended Steering Group (ESG)</u> .....	11
3.0 ENGAGEMENT AND RESEARCH OUTCOMES .....	12
3.1 RESEARCH.....	12
3.2 ENGAGEMENT.....	12
3.2.1 Burrum Heads .....	14
3.2.2 Urangan .....	16
3.2.3 Poona .....	18

3.2.4	Tuan.....	19
3.2.5	Toogoom .....	20
3.2.6	Dundowran .....	22
3.2.7	Pt Vernon.....	23
3.2.8	Torquay .....	24
3.2.9	Boonooroo.....	25
3.2.10	Booral .....	25
3.2.11	Maaroom .....	25
3.2.12	River Heads .....	25
3.2.13	Tinnanbar.....	25
3.2.14	Specific issues raised for consideration .....	25
4.0	CONCLUSION.....	26

## **COPYRIGHT**

This Stakeholder Consultation Report is a document prepared solely for the benefit of and use by Fraser Coast Regional Council (the Client), in accordance with the terms of the engagement. This Report must not be used for any other purpose, or by any other party, nor is the Report to be made available to any other party without the prior written consent of the Client. No part of this document may be reproduced in part or full without the prior, written permission of the Client.

All intellectual property in the processes and methodology used to create this document, together with the design of graphics, symbols and definitions contained in this document is the property of CPR Group and protected by Australian and international copyright laws. All rights reserved.

No part of the intellectual property of CPR Group may be used, reproduced, sold, transferred, modified, published or made available to any other party without the prior written permission of CPR Group.

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Consultation during the first (Gap Analysis) stage of the Shoreline Erosion Management Plan (SEMP) project concentrated on identifying the values that people place on the shoreline. People were also asked to describe their views on the effectiveness or otherwise of existing erosion defences and ideas for ongoing erosion management. They were invited to contribute historical information regarding the coastline.

This report summarises feedback received and material contributed. To date, residents proximate to the shoreline are the main contributors.

Many residents have been generous with their time and efforts in providing input to the project. The values they place on the shoreline have been clearly articulated. A number have had a keen interest in erosion for a long time. A common thread is a desire to now see erosion protection action rather than more studies. The generally held view is frustration at ongoing erosion over a number of years while a series of studies have been carried out.

Consultation activities have informed the Gap Analysis and identified specific aspects for further investigation.

Engagement with residents identified that they understand the importance of the SEMP. Most responses exhibit a sense of urgency about implementing erosion management actions to safeguard their property. The second significant issue raised is the preservation of beach amenity for the lifestyle people chose by moving to the Fraser Coast region.

A number of residents expressed gratitude for the briefing provided and indicated interest in receiving project updates and/or ongoing participation in the SEMP.

Stakeholders responded favourably to the opportunity to be engaged and provided constructive information in relation to historical erosion effects, possible future impacts and proposed solutions. At their request, further information has been provided to a number of residents.

CPR Group has engaged with about 200 people, including residents, members of the Project Team, Client Steering Group (CSG), Extended Steering Group (ESG), the Mayor and Councillors. Questionnaires and correspondence have been distributed to a further 350 people.

Around 400 items of correspondence have been received.

60 people have completed formal questionnaires accompanied by hundreds of photos, maps and pictorial items including CDs of information.

Research identified over 80 relevant historical newspaper articles, two petitions to Council regarding erosion at Toogoom from a total of over 400 people, a petition from more than 400 about erosion at Burrum Heads and a petition from over 200 people regarding erosion on Urangan South Beach.

In summary, this Stakeholder Consultation Report demonstrates extensive community interest in planning for shoreline erosion management.

Issues raised by community members have been reported to the Project Team for consideration in the preparation of the SEMP.

## BACKGROUND

Fraser Coast Regional Council (FCRC) has undertaken to prepare a Shoreline Erosion Management Plan (SEMP) for the Fraser Coast Local Government Area (LGA). The Study Area is along 112km of shoreline from Burrum Heads in the north to Tinnanbar in the south and includes the shoreline within 100m landward of the mean high water mark.

The SEMP process is in three stages:

Stage 1 - Gap Analysis Study

Stage 2 - Management Options and Recommendations Study

Stage 3 - Shoreline Erosion Management Plan

This Stakeholder Consultation Report has been prepared for Fraser Coast Regional Council, as part of the Shoreline Erosion Management Plan project. It reports upon consultation conducted during the Gap Analysis stage of the project.

The Gap Analysis was produced by Cardno Lawson Treloar Pty Ltd. Fraser Coast Regional Council engaged CPR Group to plan for and implement a community consultation program, advertising the intent of the project, encouraging participation and gathering feedback.

CPR Group will continue to engage with Fraser Coast Region stakeholders during Stages 2 and 3 of the study.

The consultation process complies with Council's *'Community Engagement Policy'*, which was adopted on 7 April 2010.

## 1.0 INTRODUCTION

Council is taking a strategic approach to coastal erosion management in a sustainable and transparent manner over the long term. The SEMP project covers technical, social, environmental, economic, legislative and administrative requirements and incorporates formal stakeholder engagement and management.

The SEMP and previous related studies are intended to provide an insight into waves, tides, ocean currents and other factors that have caused coastal recession and other impacts upon particular sections of the shoreline.

Council directed that the project methodology be based upon the UK Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA) Shoreline Management Plan (SMP) guidance documents of 2006, in conjunction with Queensland's Department of Environment and Resource Management (DERM) guidelines.

The DEFRA documents provide guidance as to the elements of a stakeholder engagement strategy. The DERM guideline on preparation of a SEMP suggests consulting the local community, gathering information to assist in estimating economic and social values of coastal localities, obtaining feedback on options and seeking state agency advice as to legislative compliance. Both sets of guidelines helped define the consultation process for this project.

Stakeholder engagement regarding the shoreline focussed on identifying community usage, values, erosion risk, views on coastline management and historical information. Stakeholder feedback covered parts of the study area, which comprise the shoreline identified approximately as (from north to south):

- Burrum Heads
- Toogoom
- Dundowran
- Pt Vernon
- Torquay
- Urangan
- Booral
- River Heads
- Maaroom
- Boonooroo
- Tuan
- Poona
- Tinnanbar

## 2.0 STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT STRATEGIES

### 2.1 The Vision for Stakeholder Engagement

*Consensus through comprehensive and inclusive engagement, regarding the most cost effective erosion management solutions at all levels; community, environment, commerce, government, cultural and others, while meeting appropriate stakeholder aspirations that have been distilled from participative consultation and negotiation*

### 2.2 Stakeholders

A diverse stakeholder mix in the Fraser Coast Region has an interest in the formulation of SEMP policies. Inclusive and varied consultation activities are necessary to ensure that potentially affected stakeholders have the opportunity to provide their input to the project. This helps ensure that a broad range of people, the mix of whom could be considered “representative” of the wider community, influences policy decisions.

### 2.3 Stakeholder Identification

To achieve inclusive and effective consultation that leads to understanding and conceptualisation of a project, it is crucial to identify those people who may have a stake in, or be impacted by, the project.

CPR Group identified stakeholder categories that have a significant interest in the SEMP; it is acknowledged that stakeholder categories may interrelate and overlap in complex ways. It is also acknowledged that within each category, organisations and individuals may have differing and/or competing perspectives, attitudes and values. Also, a range of ethnicities, socio-economic position and other demographics will be represented within the categories. Planning for and effectively implementing consultation activities that recognise diversity of opinion is therefore critical.

#### 2.3.1 Community of Interest

The community of interest in this project is self-selected, as they are respondents to an information campaign which incorporated methods for opting in. This is true of both the formal stakeholder committees and the wider community.

Stakeholders include those who live, work or participate in recreation in the study area.

#### 2.3.2 Decision-makers

Decision-makers are identified stakeholders to the SEMP project.

CPR Group spoke with Councillors who opted in to an invitation to a briefing on the Stakeholder Consultation Program and with those who attended a formal briefing session. We requested and were given their advice as to other stakeholders with whom we should engage.

## 2.4 Briefing Materials

### 2.4.1 Briefing Notes

Briefing Notes were developed from research into local historical erosion issues and were used for reference during stakeholder engagement.

### 2.4.2 Questionnaire

Qualitative data provided by stakeholders can be a useful input to the study in terms of understanding existing issues and identifying preferred options. The success of an engagement program relies upon accurate interpretation of stakeholder feedback to the project team. Wide distribution of the Questionnaire allowed stakeholders to provide input about the project in a consistent format.

### 2.4.3 Contact Mechanisms

A public notice advertising the SEMP project and inviting input was published twice in the Fraser Coast Chronicle.

Articles have appeared in the quarterly Fraser Coast Living newsletter which is sent to all residents in the region.

Information about the SEMP, including an interactive Questionnaire, appears on Council's Website.

A FreeCall phone number, 1800 100 204, has been widely advertised.

A dedicated email address, [SEMP@cprgroup.com.au](mailto:SEMP@cprgroup.com.au), has been widely advertised.

### 2.4.4 Bookmarks

Bookmarks are given to all stakeholders at the conclusion of meetings. They are a durable reminder about the SEMP and include the CPR Group FreeCall phone number and email address.

## 2.5 SEMP Database

All stakeholder engagements are recorded in a consultation database.

## 2.6 Stakeholder Engagement

The Client Steering Group (CSG) (see Table 2) is a management group which oversees the project and includes state agency representatives and technical experts. The CSG provides a two-way forum for exchange of information and ideas.

The Extended Steering Group (ESG) (see Table 3) is a liaison group which includes the CSG members, community representatives, a wider group of state agency representatives and special interest groups. The ESG encourages information sharing between Council, its technical specialists and the SEMP stakeholders. It facilitates ongoing dialogue and is the forum within which Council's objectives are communicated, relevant reports or documents are presented and community issues are aired.

The CSG and ESG centralise correspondence on aspects raised by residents or authorities, ensure that the appropriate people are made aware of those issues, track the process of resolution and provide a forum for feedback.

These groups were convened and meet regularly throughout the SEMP process.

Representatives of government, Council and community organisations have been invited to sit on reference groups. Introductory telephone calls were made to key stakeholders including Qld Souths Native Title Representative Body. Meetings were offered to groups who expressed an interest in providing input.

### 2.6.1 Groups Established to Facilitate Preparation of the SEMP

**TABLE 1: PROJECT TEAM**

Responsibility	Membership
<p>Responsible for project tasks and coordination of the SEMP.</p> <p>Its role is to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Provide deliverables to the Client Steering Group</li> </ul>	<p><b>FCRC</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Senior staff (3)</li> </ul> <p><b>Cardno Lawson Treloar</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Consultant</li> </ul> <p><b>CPR Group</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Consultant</li> </ul>

**TABLE 2: CLIENT STEERING GROUP (CSG)**

Responsibility	Membership
<p>Responsible for decision-making and direction of the SEMP.</p> <p>Its role is to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Confirm the scope and extent of the SEMP</li> <li>▪ Manage the direction and development of the SEMP through guidance, decision-making and review of the work undertaken</li> <li>▪ Oversee implementation of the SEMP, with regular meetings continuing after completion of the SEMP</li> </ul>	<p><b>FCRC</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Senior staff (3)</li> </ul> <p><b>DERM</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Representatives from former EPA (2)</li> <li>▪ Representative from QPWS</li> <li>▪ Representative from Natural Resources and Water (NRW)</li> </ul> <p><b>DEEDI</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Representative from DPI&amp;F</li> </ul> <p><b>Cardno Lawson Treloar</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Consultant</li> </ul> <p><b>CPR Group</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Consultant</li> </ul> <p><b>Independent representatives</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Relevant key technical specialists (3)</li> </ul>

**TABLE 3: EXTENDED STEERING GROUP (ESG)**

Responsibility	Membership
<p>Responsible for consideration of wide ranging erosion-related issues and provision of input into development of the SEMP.</p> <p>Its role is to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Act as a focal point for consultation/discussion of proposed concepts, options and recommendations</li> <li>▪ Relate values, expectations and issues through meetings/workshops, questionnaires, written correspondence and other forms of input</li> <li>▪ Disseminate relevant information</li> <li>▪ Review milestone documents</li> <li>▪ Provide major data-sets</li> </ul>	<p><b>CSG members plus -</b></p> <p><b>FCRC</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Relevant portfolio Councillors (up to 4)</li> <li>▪ Departmental representatives (up to 9)</li> </ul> <p><b>DEWHA</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Representative from Climate Change</li> <li>▪ Representative from Environment</li> </ul> <p><b>DERM</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Representative from Office of Climate Change</li> <li>▪ Representative from Qld Trust for Nature</li> <li>▪ Representative from Biodiversity</li> </ul> <p><b>DEEDI</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Representative from Regional Development</li> </ul> <p><b>Other Organisations</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Department of Infrastructure &amp; Planning</li> <li>▪ Department of Transport &amp; Main Roads</li> <li>▪ Maritime Safety Queensland</li> <li>▪ Emergency Management Queensland</li> <li>▪ Tourism Queensland</li> <li>▪ Queensland Tourism Industry Council</li> <li>▪ State Development</li> <li>▪ Heritage</li> <li>▪ Queensland Spatial Information Council</li> <li>▪ Traditional Owners</li> <li>▪ Community / Progress Associations</li> <li>▪ Burnett Mary Regional Group (Coastal)</li> <li>▪ Burnett Mary Regional Group (Biodiversity)</li> <li>▪ Local Government Association of Qld</li> <li>▪ Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority</li> <li>▪ Wide Bay Regional Planning Advisory Committee</li> <li>▪ Fraser Coast, South Burnett Regional Tourism Board Ltd</li> <li>▪ University of Southern Queensland (Sustainability)</li> <li>▪ Port of Maryborough</li> </ul> <p>* Membership from organisations is dependent on confirmation by the organisation</p>

## **3.0 ENGAGEMENT AND RESEARCH OUTCOMES**

### **3.1 RESEARCH**

Results of CPR Group research into Council records and historical media, by beach location, is incorporated in these outcomes.

Previous surveys and reports, including the Coastal Protection Strategy 2004 and the Foreshore Management Plan 2007, were analysed to identify the outcomes of prior consultation. This research demonstrated extensive prior consultation, leading to the development of proposed erosion management measures, many of which have not eventuated. This may be part of the cause of the frustration we observed in the community.

### **3.2 ENGAGEMENT**

Consultation demonstrated that residents understand the importance of the SEMP. A number requested and were provided with further information.

Most responses exhibited a sense of urgency about implementing erosion management actions. A generally expressed view is frustration at ongoing erosion over a number of years while a series of studies have been carried out.

A number of residents expressed gratitude for the briefing provided and indicated interest in receiving project updates and/or ongoing participation in the SEMP.

Stakeholders responded favourably to the opportunity to be engaged and provided constructive information in relation to historical erosion effects, possible future impacts and proposed solutions.

CPR Group attended a meeting of the Burrum Heads Progress Association to provide a briefing and obtain feedback.

A database of around 800 people was constructed, representing residents living along the Fraser Coast foreshore. Around 400 items of correspondence have been received.

CPR Group has engaged, often on multiple occasions, with about 200 people. Of those, 60 completed the questionnaire and a number have provided hundreds of photos and schematics illustrating long term erosion.

In addition to the interactive questionnaire on Council's website, 350 printed copies were posted to Progress Associations, community groups, a neighbourhood centre and individuals. Those submitted, by location, were:

Burrum Heads	17
Urangan	14
Poona	12
Tuan	6
Toogoom	5
Dundowran	3
Pt Vernon	2
Torquay	1
Boonooroo, Booral, Maaroom, River Heads, Tinnanbar	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>60</b>

Correspondence with individuals generally centred on the same issues as those raised in the questionnaires.

All responses exhibit a sense of urgency about implementing erosion management actions.

The following is a summary of key responses provided to the questionnaire along with other submissions and the research findings, by beach location.

### 3.2.1 Burrum Heads

#### Questionnaires

17 submitted. Responses confirmed comments made by people in discussions, which is that the shoreline is an integral part of life for many Burrum Heads residents and visitors.

Most respondents visit the beach almost daily.

People value the clean sandy beach for recreational pursuits – walking, family gatherings, swimming, dog off-leash area, canoeing and fishing. The natural environmental attributes of the beach are highly regarded.

The protracted erosion of sand is of concern to residents for two key reasons. Primarily, they are worried about the long term risk to their property. Secondly, they are worried about the short term loss of lifestyle attributes.

The dumped rock retaining wall and constructed concrete block retaining wall are seen as both an asset and a threat - they limit incursion into the dunes but strip the beach of white sand. The walls are regarded as being in need of regular maintenance.

The boat ramp is considered to cause sand stripping immediately adjacent to the upstream side.

The main issues are seen as:

- Lack of erosion control measures over recent years
- Need for an erosion management plan, allocating Council/State Government responsibilities and defined activities
- Beach protection action instead of ongoing studies
- Sand pushes have worked in the past
- Erosion affects lifestyle, fishing, safety, tourism and the economy

Future coastline management objectives:

- Safety of people and property
- Protection of developed areas
- Buffer zone management
- Sand replenishment where feasible
- Minimise environmental impact

Existing defences:

- About half the respondents do not recognise any existing defences
- Rock wall is not secure
- The beach is being depleted due to lack of constructive defences

Suggested changes:

- Create protective buffer zone only along developed areas
- Options including sand pushes and groynes
- Remove dead trees, restore sand, denser coastal planting

### **Burrum Heads – Petitions**

A Burrum Heads Progress Association petition was sent to Council in June 2009 from more than 400 signatories, urging Council to save threatened trees, the foreshore and the park.

### **Burrum Heads – Photos and other historical information**

A significant amount of information was provided.

### 3.2.2 Urangan

#### Questionnaires

14 submitted. Many respondents visit the beach almost daily.

People value the wildlife, vegetation and views. Recreational activities include walking, walking the dog, swimming, fishing and bird watching.

A common concern is tidal flooding and encroachment into dunes placing property at risk. Sea water has reached streets via storm water drains. Historical building approvals are seen as an issue. There are suggestions that Council should consider sea level rise and erosion risk to properties when approving foreshore developments.

The rock wall near the pier is acknowledged as having been effective in protecting the esplanade and properties. One resident has built his own retaining walls to stop erosion.

The main issues are seen as:

- Need for a retaining wall rather than vegetation to prevent further erosion
- Where vegetation is used on dunes, use native varieties
- Have well defined and limited beach access tracks to minimise erosion
- If sand replenishment is used, it needs to be regular since it is a short term solution

Future coastline management objectives:

- The Esplanade is 18 km long. It should be protected by an aesthetically pleasing solid barrier
- Maintain and vegetate the dunes for aesthetics, wildlife and birds
- Mixture of natural and public use foreshore
- Allow natural processes and only intervene where continuous dune loss occurs

Existing defences:

- Rock walls seem to be working well, comparing the north (walled) and south sections of the Urangan foreshore
- Rock wall and concrete steps north of the pier have stopped erosion but not encouraged sand build up
- Dumping of sand is only a short term fix

Suggested changes:

- Apply coastal defences at Urangan south beach to preserve dunes, foreshore and trees and protect residential property
- Install fencing on dunes to define pathways
- Use expenditure on long term solutions, not short term sand replenishment

### **Urangan – Petitions**

A petition containing more than 200 signatures was lodged with Council in March 2010, seeking construction of a permanent rock wall to protect the dunes, vegetation and wildlife.

### **Urangan – Media**

Articles refer to the need to maintain the rock wall, beach nourishment as part of Council's regular works program and the tourism value of the iconic pier.

### **Urangan – Correspondence**

There has been regular correspondence relating to the need for a rock wall.

### **Urangan – Photos and other historical information**

Extensive information relating to rock walls has been provided.

### 3.2.3 Poona

#### Questionnaires

12 submitted. Many residents live on or near the beachfront and interact closely and regularly with the foreshore.

People value the natural environment, the outlook and venue for recreational activities including walking, swimming, fishing and bird watching. One respondent has a business and says it would suffer and collapse if it were not for the peace and quiet.

Loss of vegetation, including illegal mangrove removal resulting in erosion, is a concern. There are mixed views on short term erosion risk but broad concern at the longer term loss of sand and ultimate risk to private property on the foreshore.

The main issues are seen as:

- Need for a DERM/Council restoration and maintenance plan to replace ad hoc private sandbag barriers
- Controlling wash by reducing boat speeds
- Need for a vegetation and beach access management plan

Future coastline management objectives:

- Protect shoreline vegetation
- Designated walkways
- Balance between nature, development and human usage
- Maintain but not upgrade boat ramp, so more users are not encouraged
- Retard erosion and replenish sand

Existing defences:

- No erosion management at Poona apart from sandbagging by locals
- Housing development may cause a storm water problem

Suggested changes:

- Council to protect and replace shoreline vegetation
- Address the erosion caused by storm water pipes on shoreline
- Restrict vehicle access
- Retain natural environment but replace sand as well

### 3.2.4 Tuan

#### Questionnaires

6 submitted. Respondents visit the beach occasionally and in two cases regularly, for recreation. They value the natural environment and wildlife.

Residents fear the risk of inundation from the sea. Over 20 years, erosion has caused loss of a path, trees and mangroves.

The main issues are seen as:

- Need to protect mangroves as an erosion reduction mechanism
- Exclude jet skis and maintain speed restrictions to protect people and wildlife
- Keep vehicles off the esplanade
- Erect a retaining wall to prevent further foreshore encroachment

Future coastline management objectives:

- Prevent further shoreline erosion, maintaining natural beach slope and environment
- A plan that is carried out

Existing defences:

- Rocks used to reduce erosion may have made it worse, with loss of fill behind rocks
- One family has owned property at Urangan since 1940. The permanent rock wall has depleted the beach

Suggested changes:

- Replace the dumped rock wall with a constructed wall
- Revegetation; particularly mangroves
- Groynes in addition to breakwaters to stop sand loss

### 3.2.5 Toogoom

#### Questionnaires

4 submitted. Two of the respondents interact daily with the foreshore.

The residents value the unspoilt environment, birds, wildlife and all-tidal access.

The common theme from Toogoom residents is the risk to their property due to severe and rapid erosion.

The main issues are seen as:

- The lack of any erosion management at Toogoom
- Illegal vegetation clearing
- Need to repair revetment structures
- Need for beach nourishment and halting erosion

Future coastline management objectives:

- Property protection and safety
- Foreshore vegetation protection and management for future generations
- An action plan with finance to implement

Existing defences:

- Implementation and enforcement of erosion management plans
- Community education
- The involvement of government agencies is overly complex
- One resident is in favour of the rock wall and the parks at nearby Burrum Heads

Suggested changes:

- A single entity for coastal management
- Possibly build a sea wall from Beelbi Creek estuary to preserve boating channel

#### Toogoom – Petitions

A petition from around 200 Fraser Waters Estate and Toogoom ratepayers to Council in February 2009 asked Council to enforce covenants, review planning permissions and halt erosion that is causing a hazard due to fallen trees.

A petition to Council in March 2009, again with around 200 signatories, sought assistance to address the erosion of the reserve, sand dunes and foreshore to preserve flora and fauna. It suggested that two large sand pushes had created more problems.

### **Toogoom – Media**

Toogoom has been the centre of debate over the foreshore for some time. A series of media articles over the past six years relate to a \$1.1M sea wall at Toogoom, sand bags, sand pushes, residents interfering with foreshore vegetation and a prohibition against residents building structures on public land.

### **Toogoom – Correspondence**

Some land owners are in regular contact with Council and CPR Group about progress of the SEMP.

### **Toogoom – Photos and other historical information**

Photos showing progressive coastline recession and fallen trees have been provided.

### 3.2.6 Dundowran

#### Questionnaires

3 submitted. The respondents visit the beach a few times per month.

Residents value the local beach, compared with more populated coastal areas in Hervey Bay.

The risk identified is foreshore erosion rather than risk to property. One resident advocates education about natural processes.

The main issues are seen as:

- Foreshore protection
- Erosion due to storm water runoff
- Predicted sea level rise
- Damage done by dogs
- Need to preserve birdlife habitat
- Objection to Environmental Levy being used to fund this issue

Future coastline management objectives:

- Protect foreshore and provide facilities for the public
- Work with Council and other organisations to provide environmental education
- Remove management from Council and place under DERM

Existing defences:

- Housing development has been allowed too close to the shoreline; change this through education about land owner safety
- Regard the shoreline as community land rather than landowners' backyards
- No rock walls as they are ineffective

Suggested changes:

- Council to hold community open days explaining what it is doing and Council newsletter to all households prior to the cyclone season
- A study to determine erosion and inundation impacts due to global warming. Some inundation is desirable for plants and wildlife

#### Dundowran – Media

Strong winds and high tides eroded the beach where trees had already fallen. It was claimed that the EPA said the sand will return naturally.

### 3.2.7 Pt Vernon

#### Questionnaires

2 submitted. The respondents walk occasionally on the beach and pathway.

The residents value the natural vegetation and its screening effect, cultural interpretation and pathways.

No risks are identified.

The main issues are seen as:

- Maintaining natural values, with no more car parks or commercial development
- Support for the caravan parks for cheaper accommodation

Future coastline management objectives:

- Preservation of natural values for future generations
- Legislative protection of Hervey Bay foreshore against commercial development

Existing defences:

- Focus on infrastructure protection rather than natural area protection
- No mechanism or plan for withdrawal from the coastline due to changing sea levels and natural processes
- The rock walls provide insufficient defence against erosion

Suggested changes:

- Strategic plan for withdrawal of built infrastructure

### 3.2.8 Torquay

#### Questionnaires

1 submitted. The respondent walks on the beach about 10 times per month and values the social and natural environment.

The broad risk to the range of Hervey Bay beaches is identified.

The main issues are seen as:

- The need for sand pushes and a rock wall

Future coastline management objectives:

- State government to allow Council to manage the foreshore

Existing defences:

- Erosion has occurred at a range of Hervey Bay beaches

Suggested changes:

- DERM to cooperate with Council on the foreshore, which is the main asset for locals and tourism

#### Torquay – Media

Torquay beach features in a number of articles, with an emphasis on sand replenishment.

### 3.2.9 Boonooroo

No questionnaires were submitted.

### 3.2.10 Booral

No questionnaires were submitted.

### 3.2.11 Maaroom

No questionnaires were submitted.

### 3.2.12 River Heads

No questionnaires were submitted.

### 3.2.13 Tinnanbar

No questionnaires were submitted.

### 3.2.14 Specific issues raised for consideration

Some residents suggest that ongoing erosion will adversely affect their property values.

While some residents advocate rock walls, others want gradually sloped beaches and prefer to allow natural processes to occur as far as possible.

Whereas most trees fall into the ocean after sand is eroded and cannot generally be removed because they become part of the marine environment, one resident had a tree fall into his property and asked that Council remove it.

One resident suggests that foreshore erosion has now caused the effluent disposal system to fail, requiring an expensive upgrade.

## 4.0 CONCLUSION

CPR Group Stakeholder Engagement facilitated communication with people who opted into the SEMP process, educated stakeholders about the SEMP and provided them with an opportunity to share their opinions and feedback with the Project Team.

This Report has been lodged with Council and summarises findings to the end of Stage 1 (Gap Analysis Study). Ongoing stakeholder engagement is occurring and will be further summarised at the end of Stage 2 (Management Options and Recommendations Study) and Stage 3 (Shoreline Erosion Management Plan).