

# Geraldton Coastal Hazard Risk Management and Adptation Planning Project

Schedule of Submissions against 60-day Public Comment Period Tuesday 2 July - Tuesday 3 September

Date: 12 November 2018

Submission Information				Submission and Comment		
ID	Received	Responded	Submitter	Comment Submission	CGG Comment	Recommendation
1	9/07/2018	9/07/2018	Private submission	Thank you for giving me a copy of the USB card of the whole Coastal Hazard and Risk Assessment Report in a USB card yesterday. The potential solutions to erosion of our northern beaches and especially the possible loss of our iconic shores at Rundle Park have concerned me for many years. Being an old student of geomorphology and coastal sedimentation and erosion processes the need for management of longshore sand drift has been very obvious.	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				The tables below (especially public opinion) reflect my own priority concern about the northern beaches, especially Rundle Park. However in the planned solutions tabulated I cannot see any may planning to resume sand supply to the north via longshore drift.	The Port Enhancement Project went through a Public Environment Review as part of the approvals process. The Port has an ongoing commitment to bypass 12,500m3 of sand from Pages Beach to the Northern Beaches between the Beresford Foreshore and the Chapman River annually.	Note the submission
				I have consulted others more specialised in Geraldton Port to clarify that sandfill of the channel is a major complication to shipping management around the tides. Thus it is reasonable logical that channel clearing to place sand on the north side may restore sand to Bluff point and minimise the need for future protection. However, and disappointingly, a search of the docs for "channel", "dredging" or "shipping" finds no mention. Would a simple agitator and a suction pipe drawn behind a vessel regularly working the channel remove trapped sand there at low cost? Presumably a "buddy" vessel would ensure the disposal of sand to the north of the channel to make the process more reliable. The combined value of improved shipping management and reduced protection costs for Bluff Point may be more than the cost of sand removal from the channel, but I have not done the CBA.	A Port dredging operation will need to go through a State EPA assessment. It will also require a Commonwealth permit to 'dump at sea' (if disposing of the dredged material at sea). For multiple dredging operations it will also require a long-term monitoring and management plan. Given these encumbrances, during the last dredging of the Port channel (2013), the Port Authority disposed of the dredged material as infill for the port breakwater (See below).	Note the submission
2	25/07/2018	25/07/2018	Private submission	The report relies on officially accepted climate models which have been proven by long term Australian tide guage records to be a serious exaggeration of global warming causing sea level rise	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report focusses on the consequential impacts of sea level rise - not the causal effects	Note the submission
				See attached published article of 2011 and the advertisement of 2016 which are authored by global records. The Arolhos Islands are not under water as predicted by United Nations models, although there have been tense times such in 1955. Similarly the Pacific Islands where China is building expensive infrastructure near sea level. All residents of Kiribati were offered free relocation by the New Zealand government but none accepted and none have since been dislocated by sea level rise	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				I respectfully suggest that the above be checked at the University of Alabama Huntsville's satellite records. The UAH thoroughly investigates current and recent past history	There are serious concerns over the validity of this data. See <a href="https://www.theguardian.com/environment/climate-consensus-97-per-cent/2017/may/11/more-errors-identified-in-contrarian-climate-scientists-temperature-estimates">https://www.theguardian.com/environment/climate-consensus-97-per-cent/2017/may/11/more-errors-identified-in-contrarian-climate-scientists-temperature-estimates</a> [accessed 26 July 2018]	Note the submission
3	25/07/2018	25/07/2018	Private submission	Article "Sea Level Rise Rate Along Coast So Far Only About One Seventh Of IPCC Alarmist Projections! By P Gosselin on 19 July 2018"	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
4	2/08/2018	2/08/2018	Private submission	I live in Tarcoola Beach and according to this report the Southgate Dunes will help protect the Tarcoola Beach area for another 50 years, so to allow the continued minning of the sand from these dunes is putting houses in this area at greater risk from inundation and should be stopped immediately	If sea-level rise predictions change significantly, then this will be reflected through the State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy	Note the submission
5	6/08/2018	6/08/2018	Private submission	Potential risks arising from hazards in the coastal zone. Loss of life from manmade truncated dune crumbling while children playing or people sitting at base of dune. Isolating beach from public by fencing will deter future tourism	The section of Southgate Dunes that is contributing to the supply of sand feeding the beaches north of the dune system is not being mined, and will not be going into the future.	Note the submission
				Key coastal infrastructure and assets at risk within the coastal zone: sand dunes, car parks, caravan park and housing in Sunset Beach	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				Community and cultural values of the coastal zones: it is a dream of the majority of Australians to own a home and a bigger dream to own one close to a beach, owning a property is the single most important investment in anyone's life so the existing controls for Sunset Beach must change from "Managed Retreat" to "PROTECT". To remove the uncertainty that surrounds the future of the area and promote future investment	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				I attended the community workshop in October 2017 and managed retreat by Sunset Beach residents was NOT an option so why does it appear in this report	The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops were undertaken to provide the opportunity for the community to identify and prioritise assets and values of importance to them in the coastal zone. The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops also explained the Coastal Adaptation Types and provided the opportunity for the community participants to suggest adaptation measures for each adaptation type. This provided information for the consultant to identify the long term adaptation pathway for the assets and values in the coastal zone.	Note the submission
				Erosion is able to be managed and is a "ONE OFF COST" rather than loosing council assets and residential housing with costs extending indefinitely over many years.	There will always be ongoing costs for adaptation measures - including protection. Protection measures can have a significant capital one-off cost and beyond the means of the City to fund alone.	Note the submission
				As mentioned in the Geraldton Guardian newspaper - Geraldton's natural coast has been artificially altered through port works, rock groynes and other structures (Beresford Foreshore works could also affect the coast further downstream). Land reclamation at the port is obviously a major contributing factor in Champion Bay	The Port Enhancement Project went through a Public Environment Review as part of the approvals process. The Port has an ongoing commitment to bypass 12,500m3 of sand from Pages Beach to the Northern Beaches between the Beresford Foreshore and the Chapman River annually.	Note the submission
				The easy and adopted option appears to be do nothing - sit and watch it happen. Sunset Beach needs to [be] reclassified from "Accommodate / Managed Retreat" to "PROTECT" to put in place a mechanism to apply for future funding and avoid ongoing costs for future generations removing the need to place Section 70a notification on house titles	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				Nothing is certain until the recommended geophysical study of the shoreline area is undertaken to examine the presence of rock strata that could reduce erodability of critical sections over a longer term.	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				Re-iterating -- Sunset Beach needs to reclassified from "Accommodate / Managed Retreat" to "PROTECT" to put in place a mechanism to apply for future funding and avoid ongoing costs for future generations removing the need to place Section 70a notification on house titles	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				I feel that this report is very complex as it needs to be, but only a minority will reply as time and complexity of this report will most likely put most off.	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
After speaking with several residents about this report and the future of our properties we feel propoerty values are worthless and no the investment we envisaged, so as a result future renovations and home improvement seem pointless until more certainty is put in place. This will damage future investment on land also purchased for development along teh whole coastline. Removing Geradlton as a desirable place to live on the coast	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission				
Very little sand is being replenished on the beaches at Sunset due to ongoing works to the South, is it possible to have a sand replenishment program to replicate what should be happening naturally?	This is one coastal adaptation option	Note the submission				
NOTE: North Sunset beach had a MASSIVE / MAJOR dune system, it was removed by a Council approved developer in 2008, I am sure this is adding to the impact on the coast. See photos attached	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission				
If the Accommodate / Managed Retreat option is kept in place will the COGG be prepared to purchase our properties at our current asking price?	That is outside the scope of this report	Note the submission				
The shoreline areas in the City centre are highly modified, with coastal structures in place to protect the port and town beaches, which inhibit the natural flow of sediment to the north. The natural shorelines outside the city are highly dynamic with many of the areas north of the City (the northern beaches) experiencing erosion, while coastal areas on the south are generally accreting, fed by the Southgate dunes system. - Therefore sand needs to be moved to areas north of the city!!!!	The Port Enhancement Project went through a Public Environment Review as part of the approvals process. The Port has an ongoing commitment to bypass 12,500m3 of sand from Pages Beach to the Northern Beaches between the Beresford Foreshore and the Chapman River annually.	Note the submission				
Sunset Beach is one of the gateways for tourism in Geraldton and the coatal strip is in need of a major overhaul to make it an attractive place to visit and keep the tourists staying longer	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission				
6	6/08/2018	6/08/2018	Department of Parks, Biodiversity and Attractions	The Department of Biodiversity, Conservation and Attractions support the adaption [sic] options outlined in the draft Coastal Hazard Risk Management and Adaption Plan and commends the City of Greater Geraldton for the development of this detailed planning document. It is anticipated that any environmental impacts associated with future coastal hazard risk management adaption [sic] options will be appropriately managed through the existing planning framework	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
7	7/08/2018	7/08/2018	Private submission	As the Sunset Beach sand dune from Swan Drive to Triton place is man-made large chunks of the dune collapse. I have seen children digging holes in the dune putting themselves in danger. Walking on top of the dune could be dangerous as it could falls away from under them. Roots of trees are left exposed	This is outside the scope of this project	Note the submission
				Key coastal infrastructure and assets at risk within the coastal zone: Sand Dunes, Car Parks, Caravan Park, Houses. The Triton Place Toilet Block has already been removed leaving many beach goers with no amenities.	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				Community and cultural values of the coastal zones: We bought our home in year 2000 and invested a considerable amount of money on renovations, providing not only a beautiful home for our family, but as security for our future. Coastal properties are sort after and we would expect a good return on our investment.	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				The Sunset Beach community value the lifestyle the beach provides and tourists regularly visit our beaches for windsurfing, surfing, fishing, exercising, sun bathing, etc. Sunset Beach is very popular with windsurfers, kite surfers and surfers. It is imperative that we PROTECT Sunset Beach. On pages iv/v/vi it is stated that the City will need to consider the costs and benefits for taking land through a managed retreat process vs the cost of protecting the vulnerable properties on a case by case basis.	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				It seems that the Geotextile Groyne placed on the Northern End of Rundle Park, St. Georges Beach has been successful in protecting the Park. The City is proposing to do the same at Whitehill Road, Drummonds. The Geraldton Guardian, Tuesday 31 July, 2018 stated that the cost to put in the Geotextile Sand Container Groynes is \$200,000. That seems to be a very reasonable cost, considering the cost the city has already spent on four sand nourishment activities at a cost of \$235,000. Geotextile Sand Container Groynes could be an option for Sunset Beach.	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
The estimated value of properties that are under risk of erosion up to 2100 is up to \$36,000,000. Far more than the cost of protecting the coast and existing housing	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note the submission				

Submission Information				Submission and Comment		
ID	Received	Responded	Submitter	Comment Submission	CGG Comment	Recommendation
				Sand replenishment could be an option to help slow down erosion A Geophysical investigation also be conducted for Sunset Beach At all costs we must PROTECT Sunset Beach. We need to PROTECT our coastline, properties, caravan park and car parks. The cost to PROTECT (financially, economically, emotionally) will outweigh the Managed Retreat option. The value of homes for a coastal suburb will increase (all housing on the coastline should be of a high value for their location). Property owners will have incentive to invest on improvements to their home, benefiting the community. Beaches appealing to the public and visiting tourists. Less stress put on property owners who have invested their life savings into their homes.	Acknowledgement of submission Acknowledgement of submission Acknowledgement of submission Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission Note the submission Note the submission Note the submission
8	7/08/2018	7/08/2018	Private submission	I understand Council are considering options from the Report which include: (A) Do nothing – with consequent acquiring of property without compensation in the most extreme of circumstances; (B) Placing a \$70A notification on the title of properties deemed “at risk” by council; (C) Protection of coastal area including possible rock walls and/or sand bags. I submit that (A) and (B) above are not realistic and will do nothing to ease any future problems this Report foresees. They should not be pursued by council. The CGG should closely examine (C) and do all that is possible to protect those areas deemed at risk in the coming years. Option (C) is what I would ask the City to strenuously examine and implement. This is not something that has to be done in the short term but doing this type of work as it is required over the coming decades and at minimal cost will serve the city residents well.  I also believe that any and all costs involved in such action must be borne by the City. In other words, cost of protecting public assets such as beaches etc should be carried by all ratepayers, ie the City, and certainly not by any particular property that may be impacted by such stabilising work carried out by the City. It is an “all-of-City” responsibility and, as noted, the City is simply the sum of all ratepayers hence the cost should be shared in the same manner we all share infrastructure in any suburb of the city.  By protecting the beaches/dunes the vast majority of houses in Table 7.14 (Page 35) of the Baird Report will not require any assistance. I am led to believe that the work currently underway along Chapman Rd from the marina to Kempton Street is being paid from funds from local, state and national governments/agencies.  I further understand no Chapman Rd property owner in this particular area is contributing to this work which in essence is serving to protect their properties. Please correct me if I am wrong in these assumptions. By extension, because there may some Kempton Street areas, in the next 12, 20, 50 or 100 years, that require some stabilising of the foreshore which in itself will protect houses, those property owners should not have to bear any cost for such work.  Protection of coastal area with rock walls and/or sand bags need not be a hideous cost such as the Chapman Rd project. Such work has been done in other WA towns and in other states so I understand in cost-effective measures. Examples in other places should be examined and utilised as required. I also would like to comment on the lack of transparency in the matter of calling for submissions into this matter. Placing the notice on City social media and on your website does not constitute fair and balanced promotion such an important topic. I truly believe the City has an obligation to better inform residents of such an important matter, particularly when there is the threat of costs to individual property owners for work that needs to be done by council on behalf of all ratepayers. Finally I request council keep me informed of any decisions in this matter and particularly if council hold a special meeting to discuss the matter or even if the matter becomes an agenda item for a general council meeting.	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.  Acknowledgement of submission  The primary driver for the Beresford Foreshore Project was to protect State and Local Government assets and utilities at risk from coastal erosion. The project was funded through the Royalties for Regions funding. The City committed \$1.85M to improvement of the amenity to address a deficiency in POS amenity for the Beresford locality.  In line with State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy, the Beresford Foreshore Project, as new coastal protection works has progressed only after all other options for avoiding and adapting to coastal hazards had been fully explored, as part of a comprehensive coastal hazard risk management process.  Acknowledgement of submission  The development of the Geraldton CHRMAP report has had extensive community consultation. Community consultation will continue throughout the CHRMAP process.  Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission     Note the submission  Note the submission  Note the submission  Note the submission  Note the submission
9	7/08/2018	7/08/2018	Anonymous	3.1.2 Community Coastal Planning Survey and Workshops Page 7. The attached report (Appendix A.2) does not reflect what was reported in "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report,October 2017". The beach and residential properties in Sunset Beach are highly valued by the community. In the "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report,October 2017", it was identified that the loss of residential property and community areas would have a catastrophic impact. The results of the workshop were to "Protect" Sunset Beach properties and many of the other properties and beaches that the CHRMAP has changed to "managed retreat." Solution: The requirements of the CHRMAP process, state that community valuing and feedback is required in order to be successful. The CHRMAP needs to be updated to reflect what is important to the community by adhering to the Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report. Changing valuable assets to the community, such as properties and beaches, to "PROTECT".  See attached Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report October 2017 Summary Page 2- Section 2.1 Purpose. "The severity of erosion and inundation impact along Geraldton's coastal areas is determined by a range of factors, and over the next 100-years the coastal region is projected to experience adverse effects from coastal hazard impact at some time." The factors used in this calculation need to be defined. Does it take into account sand replenishing, man made modifications ect. Responsibility for increased erosion has been admitted by the ports. The Geraldton Guardian has also claimed the city is also responsible for the increased erosion due to the works at the foreshore. Is this part of the calculation?  There is sufficient justification to have the properties and community areas classified as "PROTECT" rather than the proposed "Accomodate/Managed Retreat" in Sunset Beach. The costs of managed retreat would amount to \$35,760,000 = (149 homes x \$240,000 (median reported house price per this report) This is the lowest cost as homes located next to the ocean are valued higher. The Adaptation recommendation "Section 70a notification on Title" would devalue 149 residential properties within Sunset Beach, effecting the resale value. "PROTECT" Adaptation options have been provided at a significantly lower cost to other Coastal Management Units. Not exceeding 4 million dollars. This would also remove the need to add "Section 70a notification on Title" saving millions to home owners. Refer to Technical Appendices- Table 3-2 "Cost estimates for adaptation options" The Adaptation plans per the report ("Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017") were as follows: Sunset Beach houses - Protect- Seawall, artificial reef, sand nourishment, dune rehabilitation, Geotextile containers. Page 105 - 15.1.3 Managed Retreat Pathway. Out of the three pathways for managed retreat, in all cases, protect is the least costly and damaging to the city. The First Option "Do Nothing" will incur reputation damage and legal costs to the city. This will detour tourism and investors from coming to Geraldton. Without a legal precedent, legal counsel will need to be sought out, incurring more costs without any benefit to the community. The Second Option "Planned Retreat" the City would be required to reserve funds to acquire the properties before or at the time of the erosion trigger. Costing over \$35,760,000 for Sunset Beach alone. The Third Option "Protect" has been identified to have the least cost, risk and the biggest reward to the community and stakeholders. The community has recommended a proactive approach to protect the properties and beaches. This would ensure the best benefit to the City of Greater Geraldton, encouraging tourism, investments and showing everyone in WA that Geraldton cares about it's residents.	The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops were undertaken to provide the opportunity for the community to identify and prioritise assets and values of importance to them in the coastal zone. The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops also explained the Coastal Adaptation Types and provided the opportunity for the community participants to suggest adaptation measures for each adaptation type. This provided information for the consultant to identify the long term adaptation pathway for the assets and values in the coastal zone.  The factors used in the calculation are for coastal erosion and coastal inundation are identified in State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. In additional the Geraldton CHRMAP Report takes into account existing treatments such as the Northern Beaches Stabilisation Programme (NBSP) sand by-passing works undertaken each year by the Port Authority. The Beresford Foreshore project coastal protection structures have been designed not to interrupt the sediment flow northwards from Beresford.  The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.  Noted. These, and other adaptation options were assessed by the consultant to identify sustainable long term adaptation pathways for the assets and values in the coastal zone.  The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note the submission  Note the submission  Note the submission  Note the submission
10	9/08/2018	9/08/2018	Private submission	3.1.2 Community Coastal Planning Survey and Workshops Page 7. The attached report (Appendix A.2) does not reflect what was reported in Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report,October 2017. The beach and residential properties in Sunset Beach are highly valued by the community. In the Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report,October 2017, it was identified that the loss of residential property and community areas would have a catastrophic impact. The results of the workshop were to "Protect" Sunset Beach properties and many of the other properties and beaches that the CHRMAP has changed to "managed retreat." Solution: The requirements of the CHRMAP process, state that community valuing and feedback is required in order to be successful. The CHRMAP needs to be updated to reflect what is important to the community by adhering to the Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report. Changing valuable assets to the community, such as properties and beaches, to "PROTECT".  See attached Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report October 2017 Summary Page 2- Section 2.1 Purpose. "The severity of erosion and inundation impact along Geraldton's coastal areas is determined by a range of factors, and over the next 100-years the coastal region is projected to experience adverse effects from coastal hazard impact at some time." The factors used in this calculation need to be defined. Does it take into account sand replenishing, man made modifications ect. Responsibility for increased erosion has been admitted by the ports. The Geraldton Guardian has also claimed the city is also responsible for the increased erosion due to the works at the foreshore. Is this part of the calculation?  There is sufficient justification to have the properties and community areas classified as "PROTECT" rather than the proposed "Accomodate/Managed Retreat" in Sunset Beach. The costs of managed retreat would amount to \$35,760,000 = (149 homes x \$240,000 (median reported house price per this report) This is the lowest cost as homes located next to the ocean are valued higher. The Adaptation recommendation "Section 70a notification on Title" would devalue 149 residential properties within Sunset Beach, effecting the resale value. "PROTECT" Adaptation options have been provided at a significantly lower cost to other Coastal Management Units. Not exceeding 4 million dollars. This would also remove the need to add "Section 70a notification on Title" saving millions to home owners. Refer to Technical Appendices- Table 3-2 "Cost estimates for adaptation options" The Adaptation plans per the report ("Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017") were as follows: Sunset Beach houses - Protect- Seawall, artificial reef, sand nourishment, dune rehabilitation, Geotextile containers. Page 105 - 15.1.3 Managed Retreat Pathway. Out of the three pathways for managed retreat, in all cases, protect is the least costly and damaging to the city. The First Option "Do Nothing" will incur reputation damage and legal costs to the city. This will detour tourism and investors from coming to Geraldton. Without a legal precedent, legal counsel will need to be sought out, incurring more costs without any benefit to the community. The Second Option "Planned Retreat" the City would be required to reserve funds to acquire the properties before or at the time of the erosion trigger. Costing over \$35,760,000 for Sunset Beach alone. The Third Option "Protect" has been identified to have the least cost, risk and the biggest reward to the community and stakeholders. The community has recommended a proactive approach to protect the properties and beaches. This would ensure the best benefit to the City of Greater Geraldton, encouraging tourism, investments and showing everyone in WA that Geraldton cares about it's residents	The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops were undertaken to provide the opportunity for the community to identify and prioritise assets and values of importance to them in the coastal zone. The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops also explained the Coastal Adaptation Types and provided the opportunity for the community participants to suggest adaptation measures for each adaptation type. This provided information for the consultant to identify the long term adaptation pathway for the assets and values in the coastal zone.  The factors used in the calculation are for coastal erosion and coastal inundation are identified in State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. In additional the Geraldton CHRMAP Report takes into account existing treatments such as the Northern Beaches Stabilisation Programme (NBSP) sand by-passing works undertaken each year by the Port Authority. The Beresford Foreshore project coastal protection structures have been designed not to interrupt the sediment flow northwards from Beresford.  The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.  Noted. These, and other adaptation options were assessed by the consultant to identify sustainable long term adaptation pathways for the assets and values in the coastal zone.  The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note the submission  Note the submission  Note the submission  Note the submission
11	13/08/2018	13/08/2018	Private submission	1) The Council must understand that the name City of Greater Geraldton should be exactly that, The City of Greater Geraldton. Not just the City of Geraldton and it's closest suburb Beresford! The council should be there to protect the Greater Community not just those in the purple circle. 2) The public consultation awareness for this campaign is manifestly inadequate. Notification should be divided into 2 distinct categories. i. Official written notification to any Title Holder that is identified as at risk and has the potential of attracting a Section 70A notification. ii. A Public Awareness campaign proportionate to the consequences effecting not only the houses listed in the reports but relevant to the impact to City of Greater Geraldton. This includes reputational damage, not only to the Council (which seems to attract repeated awareness in the report), but to the reputational damage to the Geraldton community. The whole of City of Greater Geraldton is likely to be tarred with the same brush if nothing is done to protect the coastline. An advertisement in the local newspaper is simply not sufficient.  3) The effects of Coastal erosion and Sea Level rising, whilst connected, they have very different outcomes, for example in terms of inundation from sea level rising, Marine Tce would be well under water before the majority of houses that are outlined in the report, yet if Coastal erosion is not properly managed, the houses may well eroded into the sea.	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report covers the City of Greater Geraldton between Cape Burney and Drummond Cove  The development of the Geraldton CHRMAP report has had extensive community consultation. Community consultation will continue throughout the CHRMAP process.  Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission  Note the submission  Note the submission

Submission Information				Submission and Comment		
ID	Received	Responded	Submitter	Comment Submission	CGG Comment	Recommendation
				4) The council must protect the beaches from coastal erosion and NOT proceed down the path of managed retreat. This would be a cop out blaming Sea Level Rising. 5) Precedence has been set by the protection of the recent Beresford foreshore.	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				6) Surely the council was aware of the report being completed on inundation and coastal erosion before it decided to spend an enormous amount of funds and resources in the beautification of the Beresford foreshore, knowing that vulnerable communities were going to be exposed. Whilst the foreshore at Beresford deserved to be protected from erosion as do other suburbs within the City of Greater Geraldton, how could the council place a higher value on establishing new gardens, building new footpaths and carparks when there was already a functioning foreshore with a bike path that linked the northern beaches to the CBD. The money spent 'beautifying' Beresford could have been better allocated to protecting existing suburbs, beaches, infrastructure and homes from future coastal erosion	The primary driver for the Beresford Foreshore Project was to protect State and Local Government assets and utilities at risk from coastal erosion. The project was funded through the Royalties for Regions funding. The City committed \$1.85M to improvement of the amenity to address a deficiency in POS amenity for the Beresford locality.	Note the submission
				7) The port has clearly had an impact on the natural replenishment of sand into Champion Bay. Beach sand comes and beach sand goes, this is cyclical and evident in a number of beaches. However it would seem that in Champion Bay, the sand goes without natural replenishment. A significant part of the cause is clear, the phenomenal amount of visible sand accretion at Pages beach and the not so visible amount of sand accretion below sea level in the Port Channel and behind other rock walls at the port. Why is the port providing a token amount of sand replenishment to the Beresford foreshore and neglecting other beaches in Champion Bay.	The Port Enhancement Project went through a Public Environment Review as part of the approvals process. The Port has an ongoing commitment to bypass 12,500m3 of sand from Pages Beach to the Northern Beaches between the Beresford Foreshore and the Chapman River annually.	Note the submission
				8) In terms of cost recouping, the residents near to areas of future coastal erosion protection should pay the same amount of additional funds to protect the coastline near their properties as the residents and businesses at Beresford, the Marina, the CBD and adjacent suburbs as per the existing precedence that has been set in recent works in the CBD and Beresford.	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				9) There should be NO 70A Notification placed on any title. Coastal erosion in existing suburbs should be properly managed. Once protection of the coast from Coastal erosion has been achieved, a re-evaluation of the coastline should be conducted 5, 10 and 20 years into the future to consider what effects Sea Level Rising is having to a stabilised coastline.	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
12	13/08/2018	13/08/2018	Private submission (x2)	3.1.2 Community Coastal Planning Survey and Workshops Page 7. The attached report (Appendix A2) does not reflect what was reported in Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report October 2017. The beach and residential properties in Sunset Beach are highly valued by the community. In the "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report October 2017", it was identified that the loss of residential property and community areas would have a catastrophic impact. The results of the workshop were to "Protect" Sunset Beach properties and many of the other properties and beaches that the CHRMAP has changed to "managed retreat." Solution: The requirements of the CHRMAP process, state that community valuing and feedback is required in order to be successful. The CHRMAP needs to be updated to reflect what is important to the community by adhering to the Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report. Changing valuable assets to the community, such as properties and beaches, to "PROTECT".	The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops were undertaken to provide the opportunity for the community to identify and prioritise assets and values of importance to them in the coastal zone. The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops also explained the Coastal Adaptation Types and provided the opportunity for the community participants to suggest adaptation measures for each adaptation type. This provided information for the consultant to identify the long term adaptation pathway for the assets and values in the coastal zone.	Note the submission
				See attached Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report October 2017 Summary Page 2- Section 2.1 Purpose "The severity of erosion and inundation impact along Geraldton's coastal areas is determined by a range of factors, and over the next 100-years the coastal region is projected to experience adverse effects from coastal hazard impact at some time." The factors used in this calculation need to be defined. Does it take into account sand replenishing, man made modifications ect. Responsibility for increased erosion has been admitted by the ports. The Geraldton Guardian has also claimed the city is also responsible for the increased erosion due to the works at the foreshore. Is this part of the calculation?	The factors used in the calculation are for coastal erosion and coastal inundation are identified in State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. In addition the Geraldton CHRMAP Report takes into account existing treatments such as the Northern Beaches Stabilisation Programme (NBSP) sand by-passing works undertaken each year by the Port Authority. The Beresford Foreshore project coastal protection structures have been designed not to interrupt the sediment flow northwards from Beresford.	Note the submission
				There is sufficient justification to have the properties and community areas classified as "PROTECT" rather than the proposed "Accomodate/Managed Retreat" in Sunset Beach. The costs of managed retreat would amount to \$35,760,000 = (149 homes x \$240,000 (median reported house price per this report) This is the lowest cost as homes located next to the ocean are valued higher. The Adaptation recommendation "Section 70a notification on Title" would devalue 149 residential properties within Sunset Beach, effecting the resale value. "PROTECT" Adaptation options have been provided at a significantly lower cost to other Coastal Management Units. Not exceeding 4 million dollars. This would also remove the need to add "Section 70a notification on Title" saving millions to home owners. Refer to Technical Appendices- Table 3-2 "Cost estimates for adaptation options"	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note the submission
				The Adaptation plans per the report ("Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017") were as follows: Sunset Beach houses - Protect- Seawall, artificial reef, sand nourishment, dune rehabilitation, Geotextile containers.	Noted. These, and other adaptation options were assessed by the consultant to identify sustainable long term adaptation pathways for the assets and values in the coastal zone.	Note the submission
				Page 105 - 15.1.3 Managed Retreat Pathway. Out of the three pathways for managed retreat, in all cases, protect is the least costly and damaging to the city. The First Option "Do Nothing" will incur reputation damage and legal costs to the city. This will detour tourism and investors from coming to Geraldton. Without a legal precedent, legal counsel will need to be sought out, incurring more costs without any benefit to the community. The Second Option 'Planned Retreat' the City would be required to reserve funds to acquire the properties before or at the time of the erosion trigger. Costing over \$35,760,000 for Sunset Beach alone. The Third Option "Protect" has been identified to have the least cost, risk and the biggest reward to the community and stakeholders. The community has recommended a proactive approach to protect the properties and beaches. This would ensure the best benefit to the City of Greater Geraldton, encouraging tourism, investments and showing everyone in WA that Geraldton cares about it's residents	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note the submission
				In 2017 we attended a Coastal Panning Community Workshop in Geraldton and the consensus reached at this meeting was to "Protect" the Sunset Beach properties and beaches. However, the CHRMAP suggests a "Managed Retreat" approach. The views of the community are not reflected in the CHRMAP.	Noted. These, and other adaptation options were assessed by the consultant to identify sustainable long term adaptation pathways for the assets and values in the coastal zone.	Note the submission
				Due to the uniqueness of the twelve coastal management areas they should each have their own plans developed by coastal engineers who are the experts in such coastal planning. Funding will be available for this under a "Protect" strategy but no funding will be accessible under a "Managed Retreat" strategy.	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years. The Report has been produced by a coastal engineering and planning expert	Note the submission
				There is still time to reduce and protect the Sunset Beach area from coastal erosion. Currently a reactive approach is being used to manage this coastal area. More success would come from a proactive approach that includes long term coastal management strategies.	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				It has been recognised that changes to the port and coastal development closer to the city centre have impacted on the coastline to the north of the city. Using a "Managed Retreat" approach will result in the council taking no responsibility to make amends for limited coastal management planning.	The Port Enhancement Project went through a Public Environment Review as part of the approvals process. The Port has an ongoing commitment to bypass 12,500m3 of sand from Pages Beach to the Northern Beaches between the Beresford Foreshore and the Chapman River annually.	Note the submission
				A "Protect" approach would offer some compensation to the Sunset Beach residents who have invested their savings in this area. If "Managed Retreat" goes ahead the affected properties will have a Section 70A Notification on titles which will immediately devalue coastal properties resulting in downgrade of the coastal precinct. There will be no further investment by residents, resulting in reduced property rates to the city.	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				Our beautiful Geraldton coastline is an extremely valuable asset for the community and recreational activities attract tourists from all over the world. We should be doing everything within our power to protect our coastline for future generations and sustain the growth of our City.	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
13	14/08/2018	14/08/2018	Private submission	3.1.2 Community Coastal Planning Strategy. The attached report (Appendix A.2) does not reflect what was reported in 'Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017'. The beach and residential properties in Sunset Beach are highly valued by the community. In the 'Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017', it was identified that the loss of residential property and community areas would have a catastrophic impact. The results of the workshop were to 'Protect' Drummond Cove properties and many of the other properties and beaches that the CHRMAP has changed to 'managed retreat.' Solution: The requirements of the CHRMAP process, state that community valuing and feedback is required in order to be successful. The CHRMAP needs to be updated to reflect what is important to the community by adhering to the Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report. Changing valuable assets to the community, such as properties and beaches, to "PROTECT".	The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops were undertaken to provide the opportunity for the community to identify and prioritise assets and values of importance to them in the coastal zone. The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops also explained the Coastal Adaptation Types and provided the opportunity for the community participants to suggest adaptation measures for each adaptation type. This provided information for the consultant to identify the long term adaptation pathway for the assets and values in the coastal zone.	Note the submission
				See attached Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report October 2017 Summary Page 2- Section 2.1 Purpose "The severity of erosion and inundation impact along Geraldton's coastal areas is determined by a range of factors, and over the next 100-years the coastal region is projected to experience adverse effects from coastal hazard impact at some time." The factors used in this calculation need to be defined. Does it take into account sand replenishing, man made modifications ect. Responsibility for increased erosion has been admitted by the ports. The Geraldton Guardian has also claimed the city is also responsible for the increased erosion due to the works at the foreshore. Is this part of the calculation?	The factors used in the calculation are for coastal erosion and coastal inundation are identified in State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. In addition the Geraldton CHRMAP Report takes into account existing treatments such as the Northern Beaches Stabilisation Programme (NBSP) sand by-passing works undertaken each year by the Port Authority. The Beresford Foreshore project coastal protection structures have been designed not to interrupt the sediment flow northwards from Beresford.	Note the submission
				There is sufficient justification to have the properties and community areas classified as "PROTECT" rather than the proposed "Accomodate/Managed Retreat" in Drummond Cove. The costs of managed retreat would amount to \$85,556,000 = (293 homes x \$292,000 (median reported house price per this report) This is the lowest cost as homes located next to the ocean are valued higher. The Adaptation recommendation "Section 70a notification on Title" would devalue 293 residential properties within Drummond Cove, effecting the resale value. "PROTECT" Adaptation options have been provided at a significantly lower cost to other Coastal Management Units. Not exceeding 4 million dollars. This would also remove the need to add "Section 70a notification on Title" saving millions to home owners. Refer to Technical Appendices- Table 3-2 "Cost estimates for adaptation options"	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note the submission
				The Adaptation plans per the report ("Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017") were as follows: Drummond Cove houses - Protect- Seawall, artificial reef, sand nourishment, dune rehabilitation, Geotextile containers.	Noted. These, and other adaptation options were assessed by the consultant to identify sustainable long term adaptation pathways for the assets and values in the coastal zone.	Note the submission
				Page 105 - 15.1.3 Managed Retreat Pathway. Out of the three pathways for managed retreat, in all cases, protect is the least costly and damaging to the city. The First Option "Do Nothing" will incur reputation damage and legal costs to the city. This will detour tourism and investors from coming to Geraldton. Without a legal precedent, legal counsel will need to be sought out, incurring more costs without any benefit to the community. The Second Option 'Planned Retreat' the City would be required to reserve funds to acquire the properties before or at the time of the erosion trigger. Costing over \$85,556,000 for Drummond Cove alone. The Third Option "Protect" has been identified to have the least cost, risk and the biggest reward to the community and stakeholders. The community has recommended a proactive approach to protect the properties and beaches. This would ensure the best benefit to the City of Greater Geraldton, encouraging tourism, investments and showing everyone in WA that Geraldton cares about it's residents	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note the submission
14	7/08/2018	7/08/2018	Private submission	3.1.2 Community Coastal Planning Strategy. The attached report (Appendix A.2) does not reflect what was reported in 'Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017'. The beach and residential properties in Sunset Beach are highly valued by the community. In the 'Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017', it was identified that the loss of residential property and community areas would have a catastrophic impact. The results of the workshop were to 'Protect' Drummond Cove properties and many of the other properties and beaches that the CHRMAP has changed to 'managed retreat.' Solution: The requirements of the CHRMAP process, state that community valuing and feedback is required in order to be successful. The CHRMAP needs to be updated to reflect what is important to the community by adhering to the Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report. Changing valuable assets to the community, such as properties and beaches, to "PROTECT".	The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops were undertaken to provide the opportunity for the community to identify and prioritise assets and values of importance to them in the coastal zone. The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops also explained the Coastal Adaptation Types and provided the opportunity for the community participants to suggest adaptation measures for each adaptation type. This provided information for the consultant to identify the long term adaptation pathway for the assets and values in the coastal zone.	Note the submission



Submission Information				Submission and Comment		
ID	Received	Responded	Submitter	Comment Submission	CGG Comment	Recommendation
				See attached Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report October 2017 Summary Page 2- Section 2.1 Purpose "The severity of erosion and inundation impact along Geraldton's coastal areas is determined by a range of factors, and over the next 100-years the coastal region is projected to experience adverse effects from coastal hazard impact at some time." The factors used in this calculation need to be defined. Does it take into account sand replenishing, man made modifications ect. Responsibility for increased erosion has been admitted by the ports. The Geraldton Guardian has also claimed the city is also responsible for the increased erosion due to the works at the foreshore. Is this part of the calculation?	The factors used in the calculation are for coastal erosion and coastal inundation are identified in State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. In addition the Geraldton CHRMAP Report takes into account existing treatments such as the Northern Beaches Stabilisation Programme (NBSP) sand by-passing works undertaken each year by the Port Authority. The Beresford Foreshore project coastal protection structures have been designed not to interrupt the sediment flow northwards from Beresford	Note the submission
				There is sufficient justification to have the properties and community areas classified as "PROTECT" rather than the proposed "Accomodate/Managed Retreat" in Drummond Cove. The costs of managed retreat would amount to \$85,556,000 = (293 homes x \$292,000 (median reported house price per this report) This is the lowest cost as homes located next to the ocean are valued higher. The Adaptation recommendation "Section 70a notification on Title" would devalue 293 residential properties within Drummond Cove, effecting the resale value. "PROTECT" Adaptation options have been provided at a significantly lower cost to other Coastal Management Units. Not exceeding 4 million dollars. This would also remove the need to add "Section 70a notification on Title" saving millions to home owners. Refer to Technical Appendices- Table 3-2 "Cost estimates for adaptation options"	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note the submission
				The Adaptation plans per the report ("Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017") were as follows: Drummond Cove houses - Protect- Seawall, artificial reef, sand nourishment, dune rehabilitation, Geotextile containers.	Noted. These, and other adaptation options were assessed by the consultant to identify sustainable long term adaptation pathways for the assets and values in the coastal zone.	Note the submission
				Page 105 - 15.1.3 Managed Retreat Pathway. Out of the three pathways for managed retreat, in all cases, protect is the least costly and damaging to the city. The First Option "Do Nothing" will incur reputation damage and legal costs to the city. This will detour tourism and investors from coming to Geraldton. Without a legal precedent, legal counsel will need to be sought out, incurring more costs without any benefit to the community. The Second Option "Planned Retreat" the City would be required to reserve funds to acquire the properties before or at the time of the erosion trigger. Costing over \$85,556,000 for Drummond Cove alone. The Third Option "Protect" has been identified to have the least cost, risk and the biggest reward to the community and stakeholders. The community has recommended a proactive approach to protect the properties and beaches. This would ensure the best benefit to the City of Greater Geraldton, encouraging tourism, investments and showing everyone in WA that Geraldton cares about it's residents	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note the submission
15	11/08/2018	15/08/2018	Private submission	I am arguing strongly that the above well established homes, facilities and infrastructure be protected from the ocean encroachment by carefully researched construction as soon as practically possible. If this suggestion is neither practical nor possible I submit that consideration be given by Council and Government to recompense for residents in the designated inundation zones. This arrangement could take place over an extended but limited time period.	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				1. Why has Geraldton Council not provided residents with a date for the report on submissions? It is usually 3 months after due date, but could be earlier or later. 2. When will there be a public meeting for residents and Council to discuss the submissions and answers be given to residents queries and concerns?	City officers anticipate that the Geraldton CHRMAP report will be presented to Council at the November Ordinary Meeting of Council	Note the submission
				3. Is the encroachment of the sea increasing exponentially? Has the Council expert opinion on this matter?	The coastal hazards maps are based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy	Note the submission
				4. What are the latest engineers reports regarding the situation on the Bluff Point coast?	The assessment for Bluff Point can be found on pages 38-51 of the Geraldton CHRMAP Report (Part 2: Coastal Adaptation Report). The coastal hazard mapping covering Bluff Point has been publicly available since April 2016 and can be accessed via the following link ( <a href="https://www.cgg.wa.gov.au/profiles/cgg/assets/clientdata/documents/infrastructure/town_beach_to_drummond_cove_inundation/town_beach_to_drummond_cove_full_report.pdf">https://www.cgg.wa.gov.au/profiles/cgg/assets/clientdata/documents/infrastructure/town_beach_to_drummond_cove_inundation/town_beach_to_drummond_cove_full_report.pdf</a> )	Note the submission
				5. If coastal abatement works are to be undertaken along the coast, how will it be funded?	Funding for coastal protection capital works will be a matter for Council to consider	Note the submission
				6. Would it be possible to have 2 or 3 local residents on any Council committees dealing with these very important local issues	The establishment of a Council committee would need to align with Council Policy CP4.4 - Establishment and Operation of Committees the Council the City	Note the submission
16	10/08/2018	10/08/2018	Private submission	Coastal erosion can be caused naturally OR from manmade structures. The problem a lot of government departments in the past have done , every time we get some coastal erosion after some big storms, is to panic and try some quick fix up methods. This can occur 1 or 3 times in 10 years or 20 or more years depending on the area. If you have noticed over the past 20 – 50 yrs in the Geraldton area how many times this seems to happen to the same areas or a new area out of the blue like Greys Beach. It seems to happen to selected areas but not the whole coastline. True not all coastlines are the same but around Geraldton they are similar beach / sandune systems . with a small section of reef . One bad Autumn/Winter a few years ago 2012 - 13 ? Geraldton had some severe coastal erosion from several high seas and winter storms. St Georges Beach Beresford foreshore is washed away , Not much if any effects along Bluff Point beaches and rivermouth but mainly reef coastline. Sunset Beach for 1 klm has sandune erosion , then 5 ks at Glenies beach , no sign of erosion , Drummonds point has no sandune or beach erosion but then for the next 2 ks inside the outer reef system the sandunes and low coastline are heavily eroded. The old Drummonds cove shacks coastline has shown dramatic coastal erosion over the first few years but has slowly settled down. The road that nearly got washed away ( Whitehall Rd ) , shelter quickly dismantled before the ocean took it away. At a similar time but a few years before , 2008 – 2012 Grey Beach started to wash away for no real apparent reason , maybe another group of high seas and winter storms did the damage to this location and similar to Separation Pt. but why no effect on nearby Back beach & Tarcoola beach?	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				I was part of a small group of concerned residents who were pushing the CGG to do something about Grey's beach , we had the coastal knowledge and plan and volunteers to help but the CGG chose to sit on their hands and wait and see what happens . Too scared to do anything in case it was wrong plus didn't want to spend thousands trying to fix a maybe unfixable problem. Well I was very impressed with what the CGG eventually did to fix up Grey's Beach and shows that the CGG found the right answers before starting any coastal rehabilitation programs.	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				I would also like to congratulate the CGG on how well they dealt with the St Georges beach and Whitehall Road coastal problems. And it shows that you don't need to spend millions on manmade structures just replace the lost sand. It shows how easy it was , just by filling the hole in the coast with beach sand , with what came out , put back in. Natural remedy and sure another few winter storms in the future, it will probably do it all over again but by replacing what nature took away will keep it always natural instead of trying to manmade solve the problem which will keep on causing more coastal problems. It is a proven short or long term solution and could last another 10-20 plus years, that is unknown until the next storms wash it away but for now it has lasted up to 5 years which has had several big seas and winter storms already to test it out and survive so far.	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				Over my 25 years living in the Midwest I have taken note of 2 what I call super storms, not just one heavy storm but I have only noticed it happen twice when we get 1-2 weeks of very strong NW winds and heavy driving rain. Usually in the Midwest a front last a few days then it is back to nice weather before another winter front comes through , some years more than others . But these weather systems go on for a week or more and I would guess this was the type of system that hit the Zuytdorp when it got ship wrecked north of Kalbarri in 1711. These weather systems don't happen every year and sometimes might only happen a hand full of times during a whole century.	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				While I was living at Sunset Beach I notice the sandune in front of our house had grown 2.5m in height over 10 years, from when we first brought the block and took levels of the sandune then to see how high we had to build to get over the sandune for a view of ocean . In 2005 it measures 3m above our block , in 2014 it measure 5.5m . What caused so much sand to pile up on one sandune and nowhere else along that stretch of coastline ??? This caused an almost un accessible beach but because a lot of residents and visitors used this stretch of coast , it was hard work to get to and from this beach ( end of Sail Blvd Sunset Beach ) I asked the CGG if the machinery working on the new estate could come and push the top of sandune over to the beach and even out the sand dunes so we could try re vegetate them during winter and try to naturally fix the problem but this suggestion went on deaf ears and still today nothing has happened along any of the Sunset beach sandune problems except the demolition of the Triton place public toilet block. Which in my view was the wrong decision , if the CGG had done the same thing they did to St Georges Beach and Whitehill rd , the toilet block would be safe for another 10 -20 years and still have some public use. The experts advise was that it took 15 yrs to take 3m out so at that rate it will be gone in another 2 years . My estimate was if it took 15 yrs to erode 3m it will take another 30 yrs to take another 6m out which was what was left before the toilet block was close to washing away ? A knee jerk reaction from CGG.	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				Manmade structures along the Geraldton coastline plus the Port Dredging are part if not the total reason behind the random coastal erosion around Geraldton. Manmade structures are part or the whole part of the problem , the Batavia marina seawalls , town beach groynes , port seawalls , Mitchell & Brown island and now the latest seawalls along Beresford will not solve the problem but only make it worse.	The Port Enhancement Project went through a Public Environment Review as part of the approvals process. The Port has an ongoing commitment to bypass 12,500m3 of sand from Pages Beach to the Northern Beaches between the Beresford Foreshore and the Chapman River annually.	Note the submission
				CGG was a partner in a coastal seminar at the Batavia Marine Institute 2005 – 2010. That had a quest speaker from Italy who did a presentation on coastal seawalls in Europe and USA over the past 50 years, he had photographic proof of how straight & square seawalls create erosion further up the coast . They might protect the houses , town or coastline where they are built but sadly do a lot more damage further along the coast . But what he did show was the pass 20 years the use of curved designed sea walls have proven to be a lot better for coastal erosion . They don't hold up or stop coastal currents and natural sand flow up and down the coast like normal straight seawalls do .	Professor Enzo Pranzini highlighted that curved seawalls (in the vertical plane) were more effective than straight seawalls in retaining sand/beach in front of the structures. The concept design for the Beresford Foreshore project which had curved seawalls (in the horizontal plane) was shown not to be effective is stabilising Marina Beach. Sensors were installed on the ocean floor to validate the detailed design for the Beresford Foreshore project. The Beresford Foreshore Project can be found on the City's website: <a href="https://www.cgg.wa.gov.au/your-council/key-projects/beresford-foreshore-project.aspx">https://www.cgg.wa.gov.au/your-council/key-projects/beresford-foreshore-project.aspx</a>	Note the submission
				The latest \$25m coastal project done along Beresford coast to protect shops and houses was a total waste of money and I can't believe the CGG chose this equated design and that the so called experts who designed this out of date system are still in business and even got paid. The city didn't listen to or get advice or even ask any local coastal experts , WHY ?? It is an out dated system and it is going to keep biting the shire on the ass for many decades to come until it is ripped out and taken away. What a waste of \$25m. Look at the recent M&B island which at least allowed sand to flow between it and would have been a good design if it curved out instead of inwards like it used to . And where is the Port going to dump their annual sand migration now?	In line with State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy, the Beresford Foreshore Project, as new coastal protection works has progressed only after all other options for avoiding and adapting to coastal hazards had been fully explored, as part of a comprehensive coastal hazard risk management process	Note the submission
				These are my views and I know other coastal experts agree the CGG made another bad decision effecting the Geraldton coastline		
				I don't expect anyone in the CGG to agree with any of my comments but I have been trying to get the CGG to listen to the right people ( local residents over so called coastal experts from the city ) As I said before the CGG did an excellent job of rehabilitating 3 coastal erosion problem areas around Geraldton , I just wish they would take the same tack on the other problem areas and any future coastal erosion areas around Geraldton in the future. So the so called DRAFT by Baird Consultants was impressive put together and to look at but it really doesn't have any direction or suggestions for tackling coastal erosion. It just makes a list of areas where coastal erosion is likely to happen and how badly? All these reports do are just a what if prediction on their global warming projections which are just possible predictions but there is no fact in their report . I would liked to see an aerial photo taken every 5 – 10 yrs over the past 20-50 yrs and then you have some actual data to work from, not some pie in the sky scientific modelling.	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note the submission
				I would like to see a different approach done on the DRAFT for coastal planning. Sure you need to plan for natural disasters and serve storm activity along our coastline but what about planning for how to manage the coastline best , how to protect it from human usage , pollution, industry and our growing population. Has anyone put up a plan , for if a ship goes down or hits a reef and spills their cargo around Geraldton coastline.	This is outside the scope of this project	Note the submission

Submission Information				Submission and Comment		
ID	Received	Responded	Submitter	Comment Submission	CGG Comment	Recommendation
				<p>There are many ocean users along the Geraldton coastline , lets hope they all can find the time to submit their input and not just from out of town consultants. Geraldton has an amazing coastline and I know the CGG does its best to try to look after it as it can , but advice is to ask the right people . Don't do what State &amp; Federal governments do , get the wrong people to do the job. Ask the fisherman , ask the port , ask the residents , the SLSL etc not the consultants from the big city who really know nothing about your area.</p> <p>The new coastal works at Beresford foreshore started in 2017 was a major coastal project undertaken by the CGG . Sadly in my opinion it was not designed or built properly and I know it is easy for a simple rate payer to make such a claim after it is built. But I don't think you would have listened to me before hand anyway , plus I could never find any detailed plans on this project on your web page before it was built . But I have seen the Beresford foreshore coastal protection and enhancement master plan report by CARDNO after the initial stage of the project was completed 2017. The report has been put together with all the professional visual &amp; information presentation but the designs of the sea wall Groynes are a big disappointment. I was one of 50 people who went to a coastal presentation at Batavia Marine centre ..... were we all learned how square sea walls &amp; groynes haven't worked in Europe &amp; America's and photograph proof over the past 10-20 yrs of how curved sea walls &amp; Groynes have been a lot more successful in creating less change to the local coastline &amp; eco system , and less erosion problems. So I cant understand how the proposed coastal experts who put this impressive report together for the CGG, didn't know this , well documented fact about modern coastal sea wall &amp; groyne design. ??? I understand that this can be seen as a big call from a simple rate payer , and everyone at the CGG might be very happy with the final result . BUT hopefully someone in the CGG staff or councillors will remember this letter in 10 – 20 yrs time after the Beresford sea walls &amp; groynes are proven the result of massive erosion on all beaches north &amp; south of Beresford &amp; Batavia Marina. Some might say it is to late or it would have cost way too much to do it properly ? If by chance some councillors or staff feel it might be a good idea to start budgeting for the improvement extensions to these seawalls &amp; groynes around Geraldton ? It could be done in stages over the next 10 – 20 years to at least limit the amount of erosion that will end up happening to majority of beaches close to Geraldton Harbour &amp; Batavia Marina .</p>	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				<p>I have included a print out of an ariel view of Batavia Marina &amp; the start of Beresford Foreshore coastal project. It has a shaded area hand drawn out front of the northern arm of Batavia Marina and also on the end of the Mitchell &amp; Brown Groyne. The shaded areas represent more sandstone rubble infill to create a lower shelf reef that is designed with gradual curves and rise to eliminate hard impact from ocean swells , currents , coastal sand movements. It has been proven when you create soft curves in coastal sea walls or groynes , it has less effect on the natural ocean movement &amp; eco systems.</p>	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				<p>I was very impressed with how the CGG dealt with the coastal erosion problems at Grey Beach , St Georges Beach and Drummonds Whitehill Rd. The simplest method and most cost effective. It has proven that just replacing the sand , it can last for 5 or 10 or 20 years until the next really big storm takes it away again. It was not a big man made costly attempt at solving a natural problem , just a natural way to solve a natural problem. If you talk to people who have lived in the same coastal location for 20-50 years , they will tell you exactly how many massive storms that have eroded the sandune or beach near them away. And how many years apart they usually are, but never on a regular 5 or ten year pattern , usually 15 to 30 yr cycles. In 2011 Queensland was hit by some really big cyclones plus the figures for water temperatures linked to a La Nina year that haven't been seen for 40 years , approx. the same amount of years it was between the last big floods and cyclones to hit Queensland. They used to build all their houses on stumps or stilts and then it stopped flooding and cyclones stopped wiping them out, so they started building normal suburban homes on concrete slabs and when the floods came back , only a few remember why they use to build on stilts.</p>	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				<p>Sunset Beach is another area where the CGG could be do a similar thing along the eroded cliff areas north of the Chapman river up to Triton place , replacing some sand up against the eroded cliffs to help protect the coastal area for another 5 or 10 or 20 plus years. The beach near Sail Blvd Sunset Beach needs the opposite, it need a dozer to push some of the sand from the top of all the uneven peaks back down to the beach . A test area of 500m can be done and studied for 5 years to see if any good or bad effects have come from this process. I have lots of photos of different coastal areas around Geraldton and I think it would be a good start for the CGG to do a photographic data record of the entire coastal north &amp; south of Geraldton each 1, 2 or 5 yrs. Create a data base for the future generations to work from.</p>	The City helped NACC set up the Geraldton Beach Monitoring Programme: <a href="https://www.nacc.com.au/photomon/">https://www.nacc.com.au/photomon/</a>	Note the submission
				<p>My comments on the proposed coastal hazard risk report , I would like to add my thoughts on the so called scientific data in the report. It seems to me the people who made up these nicely presented pictures on future rising ocean levels for the next 20 yrs to 100 yrs. Must of done it from their office desk and must not have left their comfy office and gone onsite to see the actual landscape. Most of the plans / pictures of all of Geraldton coast line areas have the same distances between the different lines that represent current sea level to 2030, 2070 &amp; 2110. SO one plan show the north end of Drummonds with the Blue , Red , amber &amp; Yellow lines ( This stretch of coastline is very low lying , almost flat 1-2m above sea level ) But on the south end of Drummonds plan show the top of Whitehall rd. which is approx. 50m high , they show the same sea level predictions. ( NO THEY SHOW IT WORSE , than the flat area ??????? ) The Sunset Beach area near Sail Blvd has a 30m high sandune but again they show the same distance or time frame for sea rising levels compared to Beresford and Bluff point , semi flat areas. How can the CGG take this proposed report seriously at all with this type of scientific modelling , no actual proof from past ariel photographs compared to current day sea levels. Before some supposed experts start predicting future sea level risers , maybe they can come up with some plausible reason why some areas of Geraldton seem to have rising sea levels ( like Beresford , Bluff Pt , Sunset Beach but not Glennies beach or Pt Moore or Tarcoola ) and why central parts of Drummonds seem to have rising sea levels and major erosion but either side north and south of Drummonds on facing open ocean beaches have no sign of either effects on the coastline at Drummonds Pt and beaches north of Drummonds. Why the coast north of Geraldton to Kalbarri and the coastline south of Geraldton to Dongara show no signs of rising sea levels or coastal erosion ? One possibility could be more public use or maybe man made sea walls. Until CGG can find a so called coastal expert to come up with some real answers, you cannot even consider this report done by Baird consultants.</p>	The coastal hazards maps are based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy	Note the submission
17	14/08/2018	14/08/2018	Private submission	<p>Hi I would like to report my absolute dismay at the proposals concerning Bluff point Erosion. Having bought and then built a lovely house at Bluff point and paying substantial council rates I am very concerned with your proposals. With the amount of money you have spent on the foreshore development in front of Mitchell and Brown due to the effects of the port why are you now not prepared to protect our homes? Please allow us more time to challenge this decision and please consider the hard working and rate paying members of Geraldton whose largest and most expensive asset would be greatly effected by this decision.</p>	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note the submission
18	14/08/2018	14/08/2018	Private submission	<p>My Husband and I have spent a large amount of money in Bluff point buying a piece of land and having a lovely house built by Redink homes. We pay considerable rates to the council and both work locally paying our taxes. It is therefore with great dismay we see your proposals for Erosion at Buff point Having spent enormous sums on the coastal redevelopment in front of Mitchell &amp; Brown due to the ports effect on the coastal landscape we do hope you will be protecting our significant and largest asset our beautiful new home in Bluff point The third proposal is the only sensible one to protect people's homes and well being if this coastal erosion is due to the port , why are they not doing more to protect ratepayers homes.? Please allow us more time to argue our case and please think about your ratepayers and their largest assets their homes.</p>	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note the submission
19	14/08/2018	14/08/2018	Private submission	<p>I would go for the option of Protection of coastal areas including possible rock walls or sand bags (mixed with cement such as in Busselton)</p> <p>I believe that your projections are exaggerated. Thus I am not in favour of caveats, compensation etc. That would put too much pressure and expense on rate payers and be very unpopular.</p>	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				<p>We would appreciate a letter drop and more consultation as very few people in Geraldton know about it.</p>	The development of the Geraldton CHRMAP report has had extensive community consultation. Community consultation will continue throughout the CHRMAP process.	Note the submission
				<p>We would like to see now, to every ratepayer and news paper, an A4 sheet with dot information, written in laymans terms.</p>	The CHRMAP report has been divided up into 12 coastal management units each with a summary explanation. Visual tables show and explain the adaptation pathway. Readers can delve into the technical appendices for a more in-depth understanding. A newspaper advert has been included, identifying clearly where the City is in the Coastal Adaptation process.	Note the submission
				<p>We would like a meeting with the full council to have our views heard as there has been minimal representation from our ward member.</p>	City officers anticipate that the Geraldton CHRMAP report will be presented to Council at the November Ordinary Meeting of Council	Note the submission
20	15/08/2018	15/08/2018	Private submission	<p>- Options: do Nothing or Managed retreat equate to the same thing and are NOT options at all. -Managed retreat has already proven to fail in every way. Sunset Beach and Drummond Cove lack of management has proven this with catastrophic results. -Active prevention and conservation globally should be the only course of action to combat erosion. -Private residences and therefore residents have been viewed as expendable and inconsequential disregarding the human factor. -Historical sites and their conservation disregarded and these are irreplaceable. -The option to let the ocean take natural course has long been taken away from us by the extensive construction of the port facilities, deepening of the shipping channel and protective structures built around the CBD beaches. Quote from the report: "The shoreline areas in the city centre are highly modified with coastal structures in place to protect the port and town beaches, which inhibits the natural flow of sediment to the north". - Given the points made above, the option to do nothing would be negligent on the part of the the city and the Port Authority and the proposition to make beneficiaries pay for coastal protection ludicrous.</p>	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				<p>Managed retreat and avoid - these are not acceptable options. Placing of 70a and SCA conditions are not responsible actions. These options jeopardise property values, lifestyles and community involvement. These options leave the City open to certain litigation by the stakeholders that have been left at risk of losing their properties and therefore their life savings. The council will also be losing a great deal in rates, community investment and funds to buy back the many properties worth 1 M + each. Globally, litigation has been the course of action taken when this has arisen in other countries. Is this the best science? It seems CGG is lagging behind the rest of the world in their efforts towards conservation. Sunset Beach has been identified as a growth area, predicted to support future population fluxes. CGG allowing it to fall in to the sea contradicts this very statement. It will no longer continue to form a functioning urban environment when residents choose to live there for the lifestyle afforded by coastal beaches. The local planning survey skips Bluff Point entirely. (Pages 65-66 No plan) There will be a complete loss of prime beach lands and residential properties. CGG has battled for many years to negate negative publicity, so the implementation of the current plans (or lack thereof) for our northern beaches just serves to make Geraldton an undesirable place to live. People do not come to Geraldton for its great shopping or massive employment opportunities, they come here and invest in the community because of the coastal lifestyle it offers and the future of this lifestyle is at serious risk. This lack of proper and scientific planning going forward could well bring about the demise of Geraldton.</p>	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note the submission
				<p>The draft report has many contradictions and is confusing clumpy and difficult to access cohesive information. Being unable to download hard copy has been restrictive and the lack of notification throughout has been dismal. A lack of stakeholder involvement is obvious in the large gaps in areas considered valuable and the effects on the loss of these assets. There has been a complete lack of transparency and communication in the planning process and evaluation of the report.</p>	The development of the Geraldton CHRMAP report has had extensive community consultation. Community consultation will continue throughout the CHRMAP process.	Note the submission
				<p>The studies and consequences for the stakeholders are not considered in relation to the past history of erosion in our city.( 1942 to 1992 minimal erosion). All this prior to the reconstruction of the port and marinas surrounding the city centre and beaches. Now we have massive erosion and the residents or beneficiaries are expected to pay for the protection of their properties which have been put at risk by a lack of planning and expenditure outside the CBD. There has been a gross under calculation relating to the buying back of at risk properties in the CMU1 to CMU4 areas. If the predicted Planning or lack of is implemented the consequences I see for the CGG are these: Loss of faith in the local governing bodies Withdrawal of community support by stakeholders Loss of valuable real estate and prime beaches Loss of rates Conflict and negative values adopted by residents and business owners that have been ignored. Uncertainty amongst the community and prospective investors. Stakeholders will become less active in supporting the City Vision or sponsoring community sporting and charity events. There will be a loss of tourism. People will be unwilling to move to or invest in a town that historically does not protect its residents or properties, both private and public. A falling population will have a domino effect throughout an already struggling town. The city is leaving itself open to massive litigation if the dominant strategy of do nothing, avoid and managed retreat are implemented.</p>	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission

Submission Information				Submission and Comment		
ID	Received	Responded	Submitter	Comment Submission	CGG Comment	Recommendation
21	16/08/2018	16/08/2018	Private submission	<p>3.1.2 Community Coastal Planning Survey and Workshops Page 7. The attached report (Appendix A2) does not reflect what was reported in Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report October 2017'. The beach and residential properties in Sunset Beach are highly valued by the community. In the "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report October 2017", it was identified that the loss of residential property and community areas would have a catastrophic impact. The results of the workshop were to "Protect" Sunset Beach properties and many of the other properties and beaches that the CHRMAP has changed to "managed retreat." Solution: The requirements of the CHRMAP process, state that community valuing and feedback is required in order to be successful. The CHRMAP needs to be updated to reflect what is important to the community by adhering to the Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report. Changing valuable assets to the community, such as properties and beaches, to "PROTECT".</p> <p>See attached Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report October 2017 Summary Page 2- Section 2.1 Purpose "The severity of erosion and inundation impact along Geraldton's coastal areas is determined by a range of factors, and over the next 100-years the coastal region is projected to experience adverse effects from coastal hazard impact at some time." The factors used in this calculation need to be defined. Does it take into account sand replenishing, man made modifications ect. Responsibility for increased erosion has been admitted by the ports. The Geraldton Guardian has also claimed the city is also responsible for the increased erosion due to the works at the foreshore. Is this part of the calculation?</p> <p>There is sufficient justification to have the properties and community areas classified as "PROTECT" rather than the proposed "Accomodate/Managed Retreat" in Sunset Beach. The costs of managed retreat would amount to \$35,760,000 = (149 homes x \$240,000 (median reported house price per this report) This is the lowest cost as homes located next to the ocean are valued higher. The Adaptation recommendation "Section 70a notification on Title" would devalue 149 residential properties within Sunset Beach, effecting the resale value. "PROTECT" Adaptation options have been provided at a significantly lower cost to other Coastal Management Units. Not exceeding 4 million dollars. This would also remove the need to add "Section 70a notification on Title" saving millions to home owners. Refer to Technical Appendices- Table 3-2 "Cost estimates for adaptation options"</p> <p>The Adaptation plans per the report ("Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017") were as follows: Sunset Beach houses - Protect- Seawall, artificial reef, sand nourishment, dune rehabilitation, Geotextile containers.</p> <p>Page 105 - 15.1.3 Managed Retreat Pathway. Out of the three pathways for managed retreat, in all cases, protect is the least costly and damaging to the city. The First Option "Do Nothing" will incur reputation damage and legal costs to the city. This will detour tourism and investors from coming to Geraldton. Without a legal precedent, legal counsel will need to be sought out, incurring more costs without any benefit to the community. The Second Option 'Planned Retreat' the City would be required to reserve funds to acquire the properties before or at the time of the erosion trigger. Costing over \$35,760,000 for Sunset Beach alone. The Third Option "Protect" has been identified to have the least cost, risk and the biggest reward to the community and stakeholders. The community has recommended a proactive approach to protect the properties and beaches. This would ensure the best benefit to the City of Greater Geraldton, encouraging tourism, investments and showing everyone in WA that Geraldton cares about it's residents. ISM008</p> <p>Managed Retreat needs to produce the maximum possible results and the least negative. Causing the area to become a slum during transition is highly undesirable (property values depressed, low value rentals emerging, etc). There is not easy solution.....The location visited by overseas visitors.....Harness the interest ..... in Managed Protection..... Engage the local community.....Draw a broader interest base..... Become a leader with volunteer (international) work. Bring together the workforce. Have clear specific roles for qualified + unqualified. Someone (COGG) would have to manage this together with? Large volunteer workforce? Some org with ability to harness?</p>	<p>The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops were undertaken to provide the opportunity for the community to identify and prioritise assets and values of importance to them in the coastal zone. The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops also explained the Coastal Adaptation Types and provided the opportunity for the community participants to suggest adaptation measures for each adaptation type. This provided information for the consultant to identify the long term adaptation pathway for the assets and values in the coastal zone.</p> <p>The factors used in the calculation are for coastal erosion and coastal inundation are identified in State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. In additional the Geraldton CHRMAP Report takes into account existing treatments such as the Northern Beaches Stabilisation Programme (NBSPP) sand by-passing works undertaken each year by the Port Authority. The Beresford Foreshore project coastal protection structures have been designed not to interrupt the sediment flow northwards from Beresford</p> <p>The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.</p> <p>Noted. These, and other adaptation options were assessed by the consultant to identify sustainable long term adaptation pathways for the assets and values in the coastal zone.</p> <p>The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.</p> <p>Acknowledgement of submission</p>	<p>Note the submission</p> <p>Note the submission</p> <p>Note the submission</p> <p>Note the submission</p> <p>Note the submission</p>
22	15/08/2018	20/08/2018	Private submission	<p>3.1.2 Community Coastal Planning Survey and Workshops Page 7. The attached report (Appendix A.2) does not reflect what was reported in "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report,October 2017. The beach and residential properties in Sunset Beach are highly valued by the community. In the "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report,October 2017", it was identified that the loss of residential property and community areas would have a catastrophic impact. The results of the workshop were to 'Protect' Sunset Beach properties and many of the other properties and beaches that the CHRMAP has changed to 'managed retreat.' Solution: The requirements of the CHRMAP process, state that community valuing and feedback is required in order to be successful. The CHRMAP needs to be updated to reflect what is important to the community by adhering to the Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report. Changing valuable assets to the community, such as properties and beaches, to "PROTECT".</p> <p>See attached Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report October 2017 Summary Page 2-Section 2.1 Purpose "The severity of erosion and inundation impact along Geraldton's coastal areas is determined by a range of factors, and over the next 100-years the coastal region is projected to experience adverse effects from coastal hazard impact at some time." The factors used in this calculation need to be defined. Does it take into account sand replenishing, man made modifications ect. Responsibility for increased erosion has been admitted by the ports. The Geraldton Guardian has also claimed the city is also responsible for the increased erosion due to the works at the foreshore. Is this part of the calculation?</p> <p>There is sufficient justification to have the properties and community areas classified as "PROTECT" rather than the proposed "Accomodate/Managed Retreat" in Sunset Beach. The costs of managed retreat would amount to \$35,760,000 = (149 homes x \$240,000 (median reported house price per this report) This is the lowest cost as homes located next to the ocean are valued higher. The Adaptation recommendation "Section 70a notification on Title" would devalue 149 residential properties within Sunset Beach, effecting the resale value. "PROTECT" Adaptation options have been provided at a significantly lower cost to other Coastal Management Units. Not exceeding 4 million dollars. This would also remove the need to add "Section 70a notification on Title" saving millions to home owners. Refer to Technical Appendices- Table 3-2 "Cost estimates for adaptation options"</p> <p>The Adaptation plans per the report ("Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017") were as follows: Sunset Beach houses - Protect- Seawall, artificial reef, sand nourishment, dune rehabilitation, Geotextile containers.</p> <p>Page 105 - 15.1.3 Managed Retreat Pathway Out of the three pathways for managed retreat, in all cases, protect is the least costly and damaging to the city. The First Option "Do Nothing" will incur reputation damage and legal costs to the city. This will detour tourism and investors from coming to Geraldton. Without a legal precedent, legal counsel will need to be sought out, incurring more costs without any benefit to the community. The Second Option 'Planned Retreat' the City would be required to reserve funds to acquire the properties before or at the time of the erosion trigger. Costing over \$35,760,000 for Sunset Beach alone. The Third Option "Protect" has been identified to have the least cost. risk and the biggest reward to the community and stakeholders. The community has recommended a proactive approach to protect the properties and beaches. This would ensure the best benefit to the City of Greater Geraldton, encouraging tourism, investments and showing everyone in WA that Geraldton cares about it's residents</p> <p>Having lived in Geraldton all my life I moved to Melbourne 10 years ago. Missed G'ton especially the beaches so brought my house across from Sunset Beach. Cost \$500,000. Was shocked when I arrived in March this year. I definitely want an immediate start to restoration and prevention of any more erosion. If I was paid out \$240,000 that wouldn't be a block of land to restart. I am 72 years of age and no longer working so would end life in the soup. Why want it compulsory for selling agents to inform prospective buyers of the coming problems in this area? I live 150m across from the beach car park. Don't forget the longer you leave starting beach protection the worse it will become. HELP</p>	<p>The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops were undertaken to provide the opportunity for the community to identify and prioritise assets and values of importance to them in the coastal zone. The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops also explained the Coastal Adaptation Types and provided the opportunity for the community participants to suggest adaptation measures for each adaptation type. This provided information for the consultant to identify the long term adaptation pathway for the assets and values in the coastal zone.</p> <p>The factors used in the calculation are for coastal erosion and coastal inundation are identified in State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. In additional the Geraldton CHRMAP Report takes into account existing treatments such as the Northern Beaches Stabilisation Programme (NBSPP) sand by-passing works undertaken each year by the Port Authority. The Beresford Foreshore project coastal protection structures have been designed not to interrupt the sediment flow northwards from Beresford</p> <p>The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.</p> <p>Noted. These, and other adaptation options were assessed by the consultant to identify sustainable long term adaptation pathways for the assets and values in the coastal zone.</p> <p>The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.</p> <p>Acknowledgement of submission</p>	<p>Note the submission</p> <p>Note the submission</p> <p>Note the submission</p> <p>Note the submission</p> <p>Note the submission</p>
23	17/08/2018	20/08/2018	Private submission	<p>On page 24 CHRMAP states that the calculation of the erosion setback was based on four components, one of them being 'Historical Rate of Change' Question 1: How far back did you look into the historical change? I was told the data was only taken from a 'post harbour era'. If that is the case, the result of the setback lines may be quite unreliable. I imagine that the erosion after building the port would not necessarily occur at a linear progression (same after the dredging of the channel). It would be a shame if the setback lines were based on misleading statistics. CHRMAP, page 29 reads: 'Detailed geotechnical data is not available for most of the coastal areas.' And: 'Velocity of flood waters in extreme events has not been determined.' It seems to me that scientific research would have provided a good base for a CHRMAP rather than relying on various uncertain components (pg 24) Question 2: Shouldn't proper scientific data have been used for the CHRMAP?</p> <p>Part 1, Appendices On page 11 it says that the communication with residents and property owners in the project area will be carried out by direct mail outs and email. However, this didn't happen, hence I'm still bumping into property owners in the affected area who haven't heard about the CHRMAP. Question 3: Can the city promise that the communication on this matter will be transparent from now on?</p> <p>On page 44 CHRMAP classes the car park at St Georges Beach to be at 'high risk', the toilet block at 'extreme risk' to be eroded away by 2030, although the car park is closer to the ocean than the toilet block. Question 4: How does that make sense?</p> <p>Furthermore: The plan continuously mentions the non-existing boat ramp at St Georges Beach...</p> <p>Part 2 Page 8 states: The city will need to determine whether it follows a "Do Nothing" or "Managed Retreat" pathway (in regards of the properties that are at extreme risk already). However, I remember the mention of a third pathway, which was "Protection". Question 5: Is that already ruled out for those properties?</p> <p>Part 2, Appendices Page 60: Maintenance of a sea wall is quoted at \$60.000 p/a. Question 6: What sort of maintenance does a sea wall require?</p> <p>Page 62: Option artificial reef in Drummonds: 5000m in length. Question 7: Are you serious about the 5km or should that say 500m?</p> <p>Page 65: Geotextile groynes for St Georges Beach apparently require \$9600 worth of maintenance p/a. As far as I am aware, the one that was installed in 2016 has not required any maintenance to this day. Question 8: Is that correct?</p> <p>Page 68: Under base scenario, 16 Bluff Point properties will fall under 'managed retreat' between 2030 and 2070, which means they would be acquired and returned to the foreshore reserve. Values for Bluff Point properties are estimated at \$297.500! However, in part 1 (economic analysis) the CHRMAP states that the average Bluff Point property is valued at \$462.000. Question 9: Is \$297.500 what the city would pay to the property owners for acquisition? And can you please explain the discrepancy between the two figures?</p> <p>The city could have tackled the erosion problem from another end. The CHRMAP raises the question what should be done about the assets that are at risk through erosion. There is no doubt that the coast between Cape Burney and Drummonds Cove can be protected. Therefore, the question we need to ask is: Question 10: What assets do we want to protect? Those areas then won't need an adaption or implementation plan whatsoever. To find out what assets should be protected, we need to look at the balance of lost versus retained values. We need to consider economic, personal, community, ecological, social and reputational values. Let's look at the example of Rundle Park. .... Bottom line is, the protection of Rundle Park and with it the properties landwards does not only outweigh a 'managed retreat' in regards of personal, community, ecological, social and reputational values, it will even deliver a net return! According to the Adaption Report, each \$1 spent in protection is estimated to return \$2.4 in economic benefits! The same outcome is possible for other areas. Sunset Beach for instance, is a major surf spot for water sport enthusiasts from all around Geraldton and the rest of the world. Is has been the venue for State and National titles in various water sports and its social and community values can not even be weighed up in dollars. A simple wall of geotextile bags would solve the problem of losing more of the reserve. We have a perfectly working example of that on our doorstep, and we can assume, what works for Horrocks will work for Geraldton.</p>	<p>The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.</p> <p>The development of the Geraldton CHRMAP report has had extensive community consultation. Community consultation will continue throughout the CHRMAP process.</p> <p>This is related to the adaptive capacity of assets. This is explained from page 34 of the report</p> <p>The St Georges Beach boat ramp was removed in 2013.</p> <p>No</p> <p>The annual maintenance costs for each adaptation option is based on 2% of construction cost. This covers monitoring and inspection of structures, maintenance and damage repair</p> <p>An artificial reef of 500m is presented as an option</p> <p>The annual maintenance costs for each adaptation option is based on 2% of construction cost. This covers monitoring and inspection of structures, maintenance and damage repair</p> <p>No decision has been made on the resumption of property into the public domain. The difference between the figures is: \$462,000 was an median estimate based on the rates; \$297,500 was a median estimate based on recent property sales available through www.realestate.com.au.</p> <p>Acknowledgement of submission</p>	<p>Note the submission</p> <p>Note the submission</p> <p>Note the submission</p> <p>Uphold submission. All references to the St Georges Beach boat ramp will be removed.</p> <p>Note the submission</p> <p>Note the submission</p> <p>Uphold submission. Provide correct length .</p> <p>Note the submission</p> <p>Uphold submission. Consultant to update report with consistent house price scenarios</p> <p>Note the submission</p>



Submission Information				Submission and Comment		
ID	Received	Responded	Submitter	Comment Submission	CGG Comment	Recommendation
				As far as the houses at the northern end of Kempton Street go I believe, that as a community we have a certain responsibility to help those people saving their livelihoods. Coastal erosion needs to be looked at similarly to a natural disaster and should open doors to allocate money reserved for less important things to erosion emergencies. Question 11: Just as an example, if there happened to be a serious earthquake in Geraldton, wouldn't the city consider spending \$50,000 on emergency work rather than on a statue in front of the Art Gallery, which - according to our Deputy Mayor - will be great for city folks to have a selfie taken with?	This is outside the scope of this project	Note the submission
				As for the caveat on title deeds: This does not help in any way to solve our erosion problem. Question 12: Are you seriously considering letting the ocean eat away the city of Geraldton over the next few hundred years? Because once you let the 'managed retreat' go ahead, it might not stop until you can roll down from the Moresby Ranges straight into the ocean. Putting a caveat on the title deeds will devalue the properties dramatically as nobody would possibly consider buying a house with this tag attached. Hence, the rates of all affected properties would have to be lowered drastically, resulting in a big loss for the city. Further more, there would be no incentive for property owners to look after their houses. In no time properties would be run down and the once beautiful tourist drive would look very shabby. Not exactly what the city has in mind with the push on tourism. Bottom line: I'm all for the protection of our shores where valuable assets (reserves, private and public property) are at risk.	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
24	17/08/2018	20/08/2018	Steve Weldon	3.1.2 Community Coastal Survey and Workshops Page 7. The attached report (Appendix A.2) does not reflect what was reported in "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017. The beach and residential properties in Drummonds are highly valued by the community. In the "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017", it was identified that the loss of residential property and community areas would have a catastrophic impact. The results of the workshop were to 'Protect' Drummonds properties and many of the other properties and beaches that the CHRMAP has changed to 'managed retreat.' Solution: The requirements of the CHRMAP process, state that community valuing and feedback is required in order to be successful. The CHRMAP needs to be updated to reflect what is important to the community by adhering to the Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report. Changing valuable assets to the community, such as properties and beaches, to "PROTECT".	The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops were undertaken to provide the opportunity for the community to identify and prioritise assets and values of importance to them in the coastal zone. The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops also explained the Coastal Adaptation Types and provided the opportunity for the community participants to suggest adaptation measures for each adaptation type. This provided information for the consultant to identify the long term adaptation pathway for the assets and values in the coastal zone.	Note the submission
				See attached Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report October 2017 Summary Page 2-Section 2.1 Purpose "The severity of erosion and inundation impact along Geraldton's coastal areas is determined by a range of factors, and over the next 100-years the coastal region is projected to experience adverse effects from coastal hazard impact at some time." The factors used in this calculation need to be defined. Does it take into account sand replenishing, man made modifications ect. Responsibility for increased erosion has been admitted by the ports. The Geraldton Guardian has also claimed the city is also responsible for the increased erosion due to the works at the foreshore. Is this part of the calculation?	The factors used in the calculation are for coastal erosion and coastal inundation are identified in State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. In addition the Geraldton CHRMAP Report takes into account existing treatments such as the Northern Beaches Stabilisation Programme (NBSPP) sand by-passing works undertaken each year by the Port Authority. The Beresford Foreshore project coastal protection structures have been designed not to interrupt the sediment flow northwards from Beresford.	Note the submission
				There is sufficient justification to have the properties and community areas classified as "PROTECT" rather than the proposed "Accommodate/Managed Retreat" in Drummonds. "PROTECT" Adaptation options have been provided at a significantly lower cost to other Coastal Management Units. Not exceeding 4 million dollars. This would also remove the need to add "Section 70a notification on Title" saving millions to home owners. Refer to Technical Appendices- Table 3-2 "Cost estimates for adaptation options"	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note the submission
				The Adaptation plans per the report ("Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017") were as follows: Sunset Beach houses - Protect- Seawall, artificial reef, sand nourishment, dune rehabilitation, Geotextile containers.	Noted. These, and other adaptation options were assessed by the consultant to identify sustainable long term adaptation pathways for the assets and values in the coastal zone.	Note the submission
				Page 105 -15.1.3 Managed Retreat Pathway Out of the three pathways for managed retreat, in all cases, protect is the least costly and damaging to the city. The First Option "Do Nothing" will incur reputation damage and legal costs to the city. This will detour tourism and investors from coming to Geraldton. Without a legal precedent, legal counsel will need to be sought out, incurring more costs without any benefit to the community. The Second Option 'Planned Retreat' the City would be required to reserve funds to acquire the properties before or at the time of the erosion trigger. Costing over \$35,760,000 for Sunset Beach [sic] alone. The Third Option "Protect" has been identified to have the least cost. risk and the biggest reward to the community and stakeholders. The community has recommended a proactive approach to protect the properties and beaches. This would ensure the best benefit to the City of Greater Geraldton, encouraging tourism, investments and showing everyone in WA that Geraldton cares about it's residents	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note the submission
25	17/08/2018	20/08/2018	Steve Weldon	3.1.2 Community Coastal Planning Survey and Workshops Page 7. The attached report (Appendix A.2) does not reflect what was reported in "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017. The beach and residential properties in Kempton Street are highly valued by the community. In the "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017", it was identified that the loss of residential property and community areas would have a catastrophic impact. The results of the workshop were to 'Protect' Kempton Street properties and many of the other properties and beaches that the CHRMAP has changed to 'managed retreat.' Solution: The requirements of the CHRMAP process, state that community valuing and feedback is required in order to be successful. The CHRMAP needs to be updated to reflect what is important to the community by adhering to the Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report. Changing valuable assets to the community, such as properties and beaches, to "PROTECT".	The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops were undertaken to provide the opportunity for the community to identify and prioritise assets and values of importance to them in the coastal zone. The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops also explained the Coastal Adaptation Types and provided the opportunity for the community participants to suggest adaptation measures for each adaptation type. This provided information for the consultant to identify the long term adaptation pathway for the assets and values in the coastal zone.	Note the submission
				See attached Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report October 2017 Summary Page 2-Section 2.1 Purpose "The severity of erosion and inundation impact along Geraldton's coastal areas is determined by a range of factors, and over the next 100-years the coastal region is projected to experience adverse effects from coastal hazard impact at some time." The factors used in this calculation need to be defined. Does it take into account sand replenishing, man made modifications ect. Responsibility for increased erosion has been admitted by the ports. The Geraldton Guardian has also claimed the city is also responsible for the increased erosion due to the works at the foreshore. Is this part of the calculation?	The factors used in the calculation are for coastal erosion and coastal inundation are identified in State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. In addition the Geraldton CHRMAP Report takes into account existing treatments such as the Northern Beaches Stabilisation Programme (NBSPP) sand by-passing works undertaken each year by the Port Authority. The Beresford Foreshore project coastal protection structures have been designed not to interrupt the sediment flow northwards from Beresford.	Note the submission
				There is sufficient justification to have the properties and community areas classified as "PROTECT" rather than the proposed "Accommodate/Managed Retreat" in Kempton Street. "PROTECT" Adaptation options have been provided at a significantly lower cost to other Coastal Management Units. Not exceeding 4 million dollars. This would also remove the need to add "Section 70a notification on Title" saving millions to home owners. Refer to Technical Appendices- Table 3-2 "Cost estimates for adaptation options"	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note the submission
				The Adaptation plans per the report ("Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017") were as follows: Kempton Street houses - Protect- Seawall, artificial reef, sand nourishment, dune rehabilitation, Geotextile containers.	Noted. These, and other adaptation options were assessed by the consultant to identify sustainable long term adaptation pathways for the assets and values in the coastal zone.	Note the submission
				Page 105 -15.1.3 Managed Retreat Pathway Out of the three pathways for managed retreat, in all cases, protect is the least costly and damaging to the city. The First Option "Do Nothing" will incur reputation damage and legal costs to the city. This will detour tourism and investors from coming to Geraldton. Without a legal precedent, legal counsel will need to be sought out, incurring more costs without any benefit to the community. The Second Option 'Planned Retreat' the City would be required to reserve funds to acquire the properties before or at the time of the erosion trigger. Costing over \$35,760,000 for Sunset Beach [sic] alone. The Third Option "Protect" has been identified to have the least cost. risk and the biggest reward to the community and stakeholders. The community has recommended a proactive approach to protect the properties and beaches. This would ensure the best benefit to the City of Greater Geraldton, encouraging tourism, investments and showing everyone in WA that Geraldton cares about it's residents	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note the submission
26	18/08/2018	23/08/2018	Private submission	1 I knew nothing about this CHRMAP until a concerned neighbour knocked on my door leaving me feeling very isolated, frightened and extremely concerned. On page 11 it states "we the residents will be notified by direct mail." I still have received nothing! 1. How do we know if communication on this matter will be transparent from now on? 2 Does the shire feel we have the right to protect our homes, have a say and be included in our future ?	The development of the Geraldton CHRMAP report has had extensive community consultation. Community consultation will continue throughout the CHRMAP process.	Note the submission
					The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops were undertaken to provide the opportunity for the community to identify and prioritise assets and values of importance to them in the coastal zone. The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops also explained the Coastal Adaptation Types and provided the opportunity for the community participants to suggest adaptation measures for each adaptation type. This provided information for the consultant to identify the long term adaptation pathway for the assets and values in the coastal zone.	Note the submission
				3 how far have the historical changes been looked at?	The Geraldton CHRMAP report looks at aerial photographs back to 1942	Note the submission
				4 are the setback lines based on misleading statistics?	The factors used in the calculation are for coastal erosion and coastal inundation are identified in State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. In addition the Geraldton CHRMAP Report takes into account existing treatments such as the Northern Beaches Stabilisation Programme (NBSPP) sand by-passing works undertaken each year by the Port Authority. The Beresford Foreshore project coastal protection structures have been designed not to interrupt the sediment flow northwards from Beresford.	Note the submission
				5 is Rundle Park worth saving after so much money has been invested in and around our beautiful park which is used and enjoyed by not only local residents but by the whole of Geraldton.	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note the submission
				6 has the shire noticed since the geotextile groynes have been put in place there has been no erosion? I check it daily so I know I'm right in my opinion.	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				7 does the shire feel our homes, our assets are worth saving which amount to a lifetime of hard work and dreams?	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report looks at how the City and the community can adapt to potential risks arising from coastal erosion and coastal inundation over the next 100 years	Note the submission
				8 is coastal erosion being looked at similar to a natural disaster?	No	Note the submission
				9 should money allocated in reserve be spent on protecting our shores where valuable assets are at risk or a statue for people to take selfies with?	That is a matter for Council to decide	Note the submission
				10 please don't disassociate your decisions with the lives of loyal, hardworking residents of this beautiful city with unnecessary decisions.	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				11 isn't protection the most important issue?	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note the submission
				12 I tried to fill in the submission form that I got from the shire but quite honestly the questions relating to the submission are very difficult to comply with. Do you think an easier submission form could have been formed for the everyday residents. I am one of the older generation living in this beautiful region.	The submission form asked four simple questions about the report. City officers were available to assist community members and answer questions they may have about the Geraldton CHRMAP Report.	Note the submission

Submission Information				Submission and Comment		
ID	Received	Responded	Submitter	Comment Submission	CGG Comment	Recommendation
27	19/08/2018	23/08/2018	Private submission (x2)	We moved to Geraldton (from Busselton) 18 months ago and we just want to say how impressed we are with how the Shire maintains Geraldton and keeping it looking so nice. We are volunteers as "Meeters & Greeters" to cruise ships visiting Geraldton, and so many of the visitors we speak to also say how lovely the City is and how clean it looks. We have also been extremely impressed with the infrastructure here and with the medical support. <u>We love living here in Geraldton - it has a lovely warm, hospitable and community atmosphere.</u>	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				Given the facts before us all regarding the important issue of coastal erosion we feel that Option A is not an option. To do nothing would be devastating to the area.	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				We also feel that Option B, Section 70A Notification on the Title (caveat) is not acceptable and will affect a high proportion of the population in Geraldton, having an extremely detrimental effect, both financially, mentally and physically on the community and on the City.	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				Our submission is that the Council undertakes Option C, the protection of all coastal areas affecting infrastructure and homes, including our locality of Bluff Point, and the necessary work carried out as soon as is practically possible (before further damaging erosion occurs), including rock walls and/or sand bags, as well as continual replanting in the dune areas. Our thoughts are that this would be the most cost effective and long term solution to addressing this problem. Should Option C be undertaken, as we very much hope so, could you please let us know how this would be funded.	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note the submission
28	20/08/2018	23/08/2018	Private submission (x2)	We would like it noted, unfortunately, our disappointment that many of the people most effected by coastal erosion at Bluff Point were not directly informed of the options that the council were considering to address the coastal erosion. We only heard from a fellow neighbour, who heard from a fellow neighbour. We have since been advised that notice had been given via face-book and on the Geraldton Council website, but not everyone accesses/has access to this kind of media. There are also residents who do not have the knowledge of such technology. We would suggest that any further communication on such an important issue as the coastal erosion that will personally affect us all, be via a distribution through letter boxes (as is done for elections). Could you please let us know how Geraldton Council intend to keep all residents of Geraldton informed on the outcome of these Submissions and any future plans and decisions that are being made. As mentioned, we feel postal communication to be the most effective to reach ALL residents affected. Will there be opportunities for local residents to attend future meetings to learn of progress and plans being addressed. Will there be any open public meetings.	The development of the Geraldton CHRMAP report has had extensive community consultation. Community consultation will continue throughout the CHRMAP process.	Note the submission
				My wife and I, _____, are long-term residents in Kempton St and business owners in Geraldton and we would like to reply to the Geraldton Coast Hazard Risk Management and Adaptation Planning Project. We would point out that we don't total understand the effects on many of the outer areas addressed in the paper but have lived, fished, surfed, walked and enjoyed Champion Bay for more than 40 years. We understand the City and the Government are facing Climate Change with the rest of us but to just except and not try and redeem our coastline for our community lifestyle seems week and unimaginative or leaving an easy way out. The outlooks facing all of us from climate change are evident and are being addressed in both local industry and our lifestyle everyday with many hard challenges ahead. On saying that many of the problems in Champion Bay are manmade and should be addressed. Champion Bay with its unique coastline was the only reason Geraldton was settled and hold the key to long-term suitability for people to reside in Geraldton. The extent of work to protect the Chapman road infrastructure is deemed necessary by the City Council and WA Government while other areas that are more frequently used by tourist and residents are deemed low priority to protect worries US.	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				Some troubling issues we would like addressed are; . The Cities lack of face to face interaction with heavily affected residential owners other than residents on the seaside of roads.	The development of the Geraldton CHRMAP report has had extensive community consultation. Community consultation will continue throughout the CHRMAP process.	Note the submission
				Why the Bluff Point area is deemed low importance to save, (parks, road, infrastructure and residential) but Beresford is high?	In line with State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy, the Beresford Foreshore Project, as new coastal protection works has progressed only after all other options for avoiding and adapting to coastal hazards had been fully explored, as part of a comprehensive coastal hazard risk management process	Note the submission
29	21/08/2018	23/08/2018	Private submission	The high value of rates (in the higher bracket of the city) paid by these affected residential properties would warrant that the council has a obligation to protect the infrastructure and its residents.	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note the submission
				Why the Memorandum of Understanding from the port for their structures and dredge works that have increased the erosion in Champion Bay have escape major scrutiny in this report?	Noted. The Port Enhancement Project went through a Public Environment Review as part of the approvals process. The Port has an ongoing commitment to bypass 12500m3 of sand from Pages Beach to the Northern Beaches between the Beresford Foreshore and the Chapman River annually.	Note the submission
				We have walked and surfed the area west of Fuller street for 40 years and the resident's rubble that was introduced has halted and slowed erosion over these years. This was a makeshift attempt, un engineered, and has proved a substantial barrier to the ocean. This coastal area between Fuller and Crowtherthorn streets, was always prone to weed build up which acted as a natural cushion for surge and wave action. With a hard rock substrate <u>underlying the beach some simple structure this could hold the weed and subdue wave action.</u>	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				The Cities obligation to protect its important infrastructure, Parks and Recreational areas, would only require some low-cost work at St Georges Beach, Rundle Park and north end of Kempton St compared to the massive works close to town.	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note the submission
				The coastal area in Champion Bay has always had an erosion problem but with the start of wharf and groyne building over many previous years the problem has escalated. The last dredge work to deepen and widen the channel was detrimental to the Champion Bay coast and has increased wave and swell action to the coast dramatically. This was identified by council and the port with the port paying for its percentage of costs for sand movements to the north side of the Batavia Marina for years. The backwash and swell now outside the harbour and marina make the bay considerably rougher than open sea most days.	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				Placing all the focus from the last 10 years on raised sea level heights and not port works is misleading considering even in your report there has only been a very small increase in average seas level recorded for past 20 years.	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report uses available data back to 1942. The coastal erosion and inundation hazards are based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy	Note the submission
				We strongly oppose the adding of a condition to titles held by affected individuals without face to face consultation.	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				The proposal that Kempton street land holders pay or assist in the cost of stabilizing the coastline seems unreasonable. It also causes implication in selling or financing of existing properties.	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				We purchased our land with its title unimpeded of conditions and to suddenly add conditions, mainly without major consultancy is unfair and unjust.	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				We believe the Midwest Ports and the City Council with WA Government has an obligation to protect its community infrastructure and residents.	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				3.1.2 Community Coastal Planning Survey and Workshops Page 7. The attached report (Appendix A.2) does not reflect what was reported in "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report,October 2017. The beach and residential properties in Kempton Street are highly valued by the community. In the "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report,October 2017", it was identified that the loss of residential property and community areas would have a catastrophic impact. The results of the workshop were to 'Protect' Kempton Street properties and many of the other properties and beaches that the CHRMAP has changed to 'managed retreat.' Solution: The requirements of the CHRMAP process, state that community valuing and feedback is required in order to be successful. The CHRMAP needs to be updated to reflect what is important to the community by adhering to the Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report. Changing valuable assets to the community, such as properties and beaches, to "PROTECT".	The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops were undertaken to provide the opportunity for the community to identify and prioritise assets and values of importance to them in the coastal zone. The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops also explained the Coastal Adaptation Types and provided the opportunity for the community participants to suggest adaptation measures for each adaptation type. This provided information for the consultant to identify the long term adaptation pathway for the assets and values in the coastal zone.	Note the submission
				See attached Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report October 2017 Summary Page 2-Section 2.1 Purpose "The severity of erosion and inundation impact along Geraldton's coastal areas is determined by a range of factors, and over the next 100-years the coastal region is projected to experience adverse effects from coastal hazard impact at some time." The factors used in this calculation need to be defined. Does it take into account sand replenishing, man made modifications ect. Responsibility for increased erosion has been admitted by the ports. The Geraldton Guardian has also claimed the city is also responsible for the increased erosion due to the works at the foreshore. Is this part of the calculation?	The factors used in the calculation are for coastal erosion and coastal inundation are identified in State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. In additional the Geraldton CHRMAP Report takes into account existing treatments such as the Northern Beaches Stabilisation Programme (NBSP) sand by-passing works undertaken each year by the Port Authority. The Beresford Foreshore project coastal protection structures have been designed not to interrupt the sediment flow northwards from Beresford	Note the submission
There is sufficient justification to have the properties and community areas classified as "PROTECT" rather than the proposed "Accomodate/Managed Retreat" in Sunset Beach. The costs of managed retreat would amount to \$35,760,000 = (149 homes x \$240,000 (median reported house price per this report) This is the lowest cost as homes located next to the ocean are valued higher. The Adaptation recommendation "Section 70a notification on Title" would devalue 149 residential properties within Sunset Beach, effecting the resale value. "PROTECT" Adaptation options have been provided at a significantly lower cost to other Coastal Management Units. Not exceeding 4 million dollars. This would also remove the need to add "Section 70a notification on Title" saving millions to home owners. Refer to Technical Appendices- Table 3-2 "Cost estimates for adaptation options"	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note the submission				
The Adaptation plans per the report ("Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017") were as follows: Sunset Beach houses - Protect- Seawall, artificial reef, sand nourishment, dune rehabilitation, Geotextile containers.	Noted. These, and other adaptation options were assessed by the consultant to identify sustainable long term adaptation pathways for the assets and values in the coastal zone.	Note the submission				
Page 105 -15.1.3 Managed Retreat Pathway Out of the three pathways for managed retreat, in all cases, protect is the least costly and damaging to the city. The First Option "Do Nothing" will incur reputation damage and legal costs to the city. This will detour tourism and investors from coming to Geraldton. Without a legal precedent, legal counsel will need to be sought out, incurring more costs without any benefit to the community. The Second Option "Planned Retreat" the City would be required to reserve funds to acquire the properties before or at the time of the erosion trigger. Costing over \$35,760,000 for Sunset Beach alone. The Third Option "Protect" has been identified to have the least cost. risk and the biggest reward to the community and stakeholders. The community has recommended a proactive approach to protect the properties and beaches. This would ensure the best benefit to the City of Greater Geraldton, encouraging tourism, investments and showing everyone in WA that Geraldton cares about it's residents	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note the submission				
I have lived in geraldton for majority of my life we choose geraldton because of its lovely beaches and the option to live near the beach for not only myself but my children, family and dog. I love living in Geraldton and would be very dishearten if the council were to offer to buy my home for a median price of \$242 not only would I be disappointed, this would put myself and my family and adjoining propoerty owners in Sunset Beach in severe debt to a house that will no longer be worth any value. I'm gussessing if the buying of properties was to go ahead and people disagreed our properties would become nil to insurance as well, therefore putting families and property owners under major stress and financial crisis. I have worked for teh council and know that they must have some compassion to residents to think wisely and take some respect of comments, considerations of all the communities affected	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission				



Submission Information				Submission and Comment		
ID	Received	Responded	Submitter	Comment Submission	CGG Comment	Recommendation
30	22/08/2018	23/08/2018	Private submission	<p>3.1.2 Community Coastal Planning Survey and Workshops Page 7. The attached report (Appendix A.2) does not reflect what was reported in "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017. The beach and residential properties in Kempton Street are highly valued by the community. In the "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017", it was identified that the loss of residential property and community areas would have a catastrophic impact. The results of the workshop were to 'Protect' Kempton Street properties and many of the other properties and beaches that the CHRMAP has changed to 'managed retreat.' Solution: The requirements of the CHRMAP process, state that community valuing and feedback is required in order to be successful. The CHRMAP needs to be updated to reflect what is important to the community by adhering to the Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report. Changing valuable assets to the community, such as properties and beaches, to "PROTECT".</p> <p>See attached Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report October 2017 Summary Page 2-Section 2.1 Purpose "The severity of erosion and inundation impact along Geraldton's coastal areas is determined by a range of factors, and over the next 100-years the coastal region is projected to experience adverse effects from coastal hazard impact at some time." The factors used in this calculation need to be defined. Does it take into account sand replenishing, man made modifications ect. Responsibility for increased erosion has been admitted by the ports. The Geraldton Guardian has also claimed the city is also responsible for the increased erosion due to the works at the foreshore. Is this part of the calculation?</p> <p>There is sufficient justification to have the properties and community areas classified as "PROTECT" rather than the proposed "Accomodate/Managed Retreat" in Sunset Beach. The costs of managed retreat would amount to \$35,760,000 = (149 homes x \$240,000 (median reported house price per this report) This is the lowest cost as homes located next to the ocean are valued higher. The Adaptation recommendation "Section 70a notification on Title" would devalue 149 residential properties within Sunset Beach, effecting the resale value. "PROTECT" Adaptation options have been provided at a significantly lower cost to other Coastal Management Units. Not exceeding 4 million dollars. This would also remove the need to add "Section 70a notification on Title" saving millions to home owners. Refer to Technical Appendices- Table 3-2 "Cost estimates for adaptation options"</p> <p>The Adaptation plans per the report ("Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017") were as follows: Sunset Beach houses - Protect- Seawall, artificial reef, sand nourishment, dune rehabilitation, Geotextile containers.</p> <p>Page 105 -15.1.3 Managed Retreat Pathway Out of the three pathways for managed retreat, in all cases, protect is the least costly and damaging to the city. The First Option "Do Nothing" will incur reputation damage and legal costs to the city. This will detour tourism and investors from coming to Geraldton. Without a legal precedent, legal counsel will need to be sought out, incurring more costs without any benefit to the community. The Second Option 'Planned Retreat' the City would be required to reserve funds to acquire the properties before or at the time of the erosion trigger. Costing over \$35,760,000 for Sunset Beach alone. The Third Option "Protect" has been identified to have the least cost. risk and the biggest reward to the community and stakeholders. The community has recommended a proactive approach to protect the properties and beaches. This would ensure the best benefit to the City of Greater Geraldton, encouraging tourism, investments and showing everyone in WA that Geraldton cares about it's residents</p>	<p>The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops were undertaken to provide the opportunity for the community to identify and prioritise assets and values of importance to them in the coastal zone. The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops also explained the Coastal Adaptation Types and provided the opportunity for the community participants to suggest adaptation measures for each adaptation type. This provided information for the consultant to identify the long term adaptation pathway for the assets and values in the coastal zone.</p> <p>The factors used in the calculation are for coastal erosion and coastal inundation are identified in State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. In addition the Geraldton CHRMAP Report takes into account existing treatments such as the Northern Beaches Stabilisation Programme (NBSPP) sand by-passing works undertaken each year by the Port Authority. The Beresford Foreshore project coastal protection structures have been designed not to interrupt the sediment flow northwards from Beresford.</p> <p>The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.</p> <p>Noted. These, and other adaptation options were assessed by the consultant to identify sustainable long term adaptation pathways for the assets and values in the coastal zone.</p> <p>The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.</p>	<p>Note the submission</p> <p>Note the submission</p> <p>Note the submission</p> <p>Note the submission</p> <p>Note the submission</p>
31	22/08/2018	23/08/2018	Private submission	<p>3.1.2 Community Coastal Planning Survey and Workshops Page 7. The attached report (Appendix A.2) does not reflect what was reported in "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017. The beach and residential properties in Kempton Street are highly valued by the community. In the "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017", it was identified that the loss of residential property and community areas would have a catastrophic impact. The results of the workshop were to 'Protect' Kempton Street properties and many of the other properties and beaches that the CHRMAP has changed to 'managed retreat.' Solution: The requirements of the CHRMAP process, state that community valuing and feedback is required in order to be successful. The CHRMAP needs to be updated to reflect what is important to the community by adhering to the Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report. Changing valuable assets to the community, such as properties and beaches, to "PROTECT".</p> <p>See attached Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report October 2017 Summary Page 2-Section 2.1 Purpose "The severity of erosion and inundation impact along Geraldton's coastal areas is determined by a range of factors, and over the next 100-years the coastal region is projected to experience adverse effects from coastal hazard impact at some time." The factors used in this calculation need to be defined. Does it take into account sand replenishing, man made modifications ect. Responsibility for increased erosion has been admitted by the ports. The Geraldton Guardian has also claimed the city is also responsible for the increased erosion due to the works at the foreshore. Is this part of the calculation?</p> <p>There is sufficient justification to have the properties and community areas classified as "PROTECT" rather than the proposed "Accomodate/Managed Retreat" in Sunset Beach. The costs of managed retreat would amount to \$35,760,000 = (149 homes x \$240,000 (median reported house price per this report) This is the lowest cost as homes located next to the ocean are valued higher. The Adaptation recommendation "Section 70a notification on Title" would devalue 149 residential properties within Sunset Beach, effecting the resale value. "PROTECT" Adaptation options have been provided at a significantly lower cost to other Coastal Management Units. Not exceeding 4 million dollars. This would also remove the need to add "Section 70a notification on Title" saving millions to home owners. Refer to Technical Appendices- Table 3-2 "Cost estimates for adaptation options"</p> <p>The Adaptation plans per the report ("Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017") were as follows: Sunset Beach houses - Protect- Seawall, artificial reef, sand nourishment, dune rehabilitation, Geotextile containers.</p> <p>Page 105 -15.1.3 Managed Retreat Pathway Out of the three pathways for managed retreat, in all cases, protect is the least costly and damaging to the city. The First Option "Do Nothing" will incur reputation damage and legal costs to the city. This will detour tourism and investors from coming to Geraldton. Without a legal precedent, legal counsel will need to be sought out, incurring more costs without any benefit to the community. The Second Option 'Planned Retreat' the City would be required to reserve funds to acquire the properties before or at the time of the erosion trigger. Costing over \$35,760,000 for Sunset Beach alone. The Third Option "Protect" has been identified to have the least cost. risk and the biggest reward to the community and stakeholders. The community has recommended a proactive approach to protect the properties and beaches. This would ensure the best benefit to the City of Greater Geraldton, encouraging tourism, investments and showing everyone in WA that Geraldton cares about it's residents</p>	<p>The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops were undertaken to provide the opportunity for the community to identify and prioritise assets and values of importance to them in the coastal zone. The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops also explained the Coastal Adaptation Types and provided the opportunity for the community participants to suggest adaptation measures for each adaptation type. This provided information for the consultant to identify the long term adaptation pathway for the assets and values in the coastal zone.</p> <p>The factors used in the calculation are for coastal erosion and coastal inundation are identified in State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. In addition the Geraldton CHRMAP Report takes into account existing treatments such as the Northern Beaches Stabilisation Programme (NBSPP) sand by-passing works undertaken each year by the Port Authority. The Beresford Foreshore project coastal protection structures have been designed not to interrupt the sediment flow northwards from Beresford.</p> <p>The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.</p> <p>Noted. These, and other adaptation options were assessed by the consultant to identify sustainable long term adaptation pathways for the assets and values in the coastal zone.</p> <p>The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.</p>	<p>Note the submission</p> <p>Note the submission</p> <p>Note the submission</p> <p>Note the submission</p> <p>Note the submission</p>
32	22/08/2018	23/08/2018	Private submission	<p>3.1.2 Community Coastal Planning Survey and Workshops Page 7. The attached report (Appendix A.2) does not reflect what was reported in "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017. The beach and residential properties in Kempton Street are highly valued by the community. In the "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017", it was identified that the loss of residential property and community areas would have a catastrophic impact. The results of the workshop were to 'Protect' Kempton Street properties and many of the other properties and beaches that the CHRMAP has changed to 'managed retreat.' Solution: The requirements of the CHRMAP process, state that community valuing and feedback is required in order to be successful. The CHRMAP needs to be updated to reflect what is important to the community by adhering to the Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report. Changing valuable assets to the community, such as properties and beaches, to "PROTECT".</p> <p>See attached Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report October 2017 Summary Page 2-Section 2.1 Purpose "The severity of erosion and inundation impact along Geraldton's coastal areas is determined by a range of factors, and over the next 100-years the coastal region is projected to experience adverse effects from coastal hazard impact at some time." The factors used in this calculation need to be defined. Does it take into account sand replenishing, man made modifications ect. Responsibility for increased erosion has been admitted by the ports. The Geraldton Guardian has also claimed the city is also responsible for the increased erosion due to the works at the foreshore. Is this part of the calculation?</p> <p>There is sufficient justification to have the properties and community areas classified as "PROTECT" rather than the proposed "Accomodate/Managed Retreat" in Sunset Beach. The costs of managed retreat would amount to \$35,760,000 = (149 homes x \$240,000 (median reported house price per this report) This is the lowest cost as homes located next to the ocean are valued higher. The Adaptation recommendation "Section 70a notification on Title" would devalue 149 residential properties within Sunset Beach, effecting the resale value. "PROTECT" Adaptation options have been provided at a significantly lower cost to other Coastal Management Units. Not exceeding 4 million dollars. This would also remove the need to add "Section 70a notification on Title" saving millions to home owners. Refer to Technical Appendices- Table 3-2 "Cost estimates for adaptation options"</p> <p>The Adaptation plans per the report ("Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017") were as follows: Sunset Beach houses - Protect- Seawall, artificial reef, sand nourishment, dune rehabilitation, Geotextile containers.</p> <p>Page 105 -15.1.3 Managed Retreat Pathway Out of the three pathways for managed retreat, in all cases, protect is the least costly and damaging to the city. The First Option "Do Nothing" will incur reputation damage and legal costs to the city. This will detour tourism and investors from coming to Geraldton. Without a legal precedent, legal counsel will need to be sought out, incurring more costs without any benefit to the community. The Second Option 'Planned Retreat' the City would be required to reserve funds to acquire the properties before or at the time of the erosion trigger. Costing over \$35,760,000 for Sunset Beach alone. The Third Option "Protect" has been identified to have the least cost. risk and the biggest reward to the community and stakeholders. The community has recommended a proactive approach to protect the properties and beaches. This would ensure the best benefit to the City of Greater Geraldton, encouraging tourism, investments and showing everyone in WA that Geraldton cares about it's residents</p>	<p>The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops were undertaken to provide the opportunity for the community to identify and prioritise assets and values of importance to them in the coastal zone. The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops also explained the Coastal Adaptation Types and provided the opportunity for the community participants to suggest adaptation measures for each adaptation type. This provided information for the consultant to identify the long term adaptation pathway for the assets and values in the coastal zone.</p> <p>The factors used in the calculation are for coastal erosion and coastal inundation are identified in State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. In addition the Geraldton CHRMAP Report takes into account existing treatments such as the Northern Beaches Stabilisation Programme (NBSPP) sand by-passing works undertaken each year by the Port Authority. The Beresford Foreshore project coastal protection structures have been designed not to interrupt the sediment flow northwards from Beresford.</p> <p>The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.</p> <p>Noted. These, and other adaptation options were assessed by the consultant to identify sustainable long term adaptation pathways for the assets and values in the coastal zone.</p> <p>The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.</p>	<p>Note the submission</p> <p>Note the submission</p> <p>Note the submission</p> <p>Note the submission</p> <p>Note the submission</p>
33	22/08/2018	24/08/2018	Private submission	<p>I, _____ who resides at _____, Drummond Cove, have read through your recent CHRMAP report and in reference to the Coastal Planning Community Survey Report January 2018, particularly pages 4 and 5, the whole of our community and tourists alike considers the beaches and associated coastal strip of paramount importance to their lifestyle and enjoyment. Living in close proximity of the beach, I see on a daily basis the number of cars both local and towing campers and caravans stopping at Drummonds to enjoy the beach areas and those tourism potentials into the economics that benefit community benefit everyone. During the community consultation phase of CHRMAP, the data clearly demonstrates that the Geraldton community at large values the beaches and foreshore of the municipality of Geraldton above all other assets. This view must expand to include all people in the entire region of the CofGG jurisdiction. Including, residents from the Shire of Chapman Valley who also enjoy the foreshore areas, particularly the connection to Drummond Cove. It is too narrow a perspective to view this CHRMAP report through a lens of only those residents living within coastal processes setback lines as affected.</p>	<p>Acknowledgement of submission</p>	<p>Note the submission</p>
				<p>In response to the overall recommendations: 1. I, _____ residing at _____, Drummond Cove 5320, reject the recommendations of Managed Retreat. The CofGG has adopted the strategy of Managed Retreat for many years now in the absence of a hazard mapping and CHRMAP reports. It has passed trigger points resulting in lost assets in Drummond Cove and must now act. It is not acceptable that the CHRMAP report is a justification for adopting Managed Retreat from this point forward as the CofGG has been aware and has obligations under the Planning Act to land owners. We recommend that the CofGG explore with the DCPA via community consultation the CBA (Cost Benefit Analysis) of strategies now, short term and long term. Considering Under the Western Australian legislative framework voluntary or compulsory acquisition is based on the value of the land and its improvements. Case law pertaining to compulsory acquisition judgments indicates that values paid usually far exceed current market value due to Courts also awarding on-costs like removal expenses and legal costs. 2. I recommend a 'Protect' approach (Pr1-7): The values of the properties within the report are significantly understated given current market value. Second, sufficient justification exists for permanent solutions development on coastal land areas that are available to buffer areas 'at risk from coastal erosion and inundation. I, Barbara Varney propose coastal protection works as there is an enormous need to preserve the Drummond Cove foreshore areas for all people in the CofGG. The CofGG should explore, with the direct involvement of community, protection works that consider public access, public safety, property and infrastructure as our coastal lifestyle is not expendable.</p>	<p>Acknowledgement of submission</p>	<p>Note the submission</p>

Submission Information				Submission and Comment		
ID	Received	Responded	Submitter	Comment Submission	CGG Comment	Recommendation
				In response to the following recommendations: Require Section 70A notification to be placed on titles to alert prospective purchasers to the risk of coastal erosion and / or inundation. I recommend that the CofGG undertake immediately Geophysical studies of all the shoreline areas to examine presence of rock strata that could reduce the erodibility of critical sections over the longer term (estimate \$25,000) and apply that data to the setback lines to create an accurate representation of setback lines. The current setbacks do not fit with specific height differences in adjacent areas not affected by setback lines indicating a broad-brush approach with significant financial implications at stake. I understand that the purpose of this study is to provide scope of works recommendations. However, more detailed information is necessary that includes analysis of rock strata within the setbacks and accurate elevations to be included. This is essential before any 70A notifications be placed on titles. I advise caution to the CofGG to avoid possible class action under the state planning act. Which will be triggered by a broad-based policy approach that de-values land by placing 70A notifications on titles. Such action as applying 70A's will require the CofGG to consider the legal costs associated with lengthy process of legal action. This will need to be taken into consideration as part of the CBA (Cost Benefit Analysis).	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				In response to the statement below: 1. "The initial stages of the Geraldton CHRMAP project involved community and stakeholder engagement and a risk-based assessment, which examined coastal assets under threat from erosion and inundation in future planning timeframes. The outcomes of this initial CHRMAP phase were reported in the Coastal Hazard and Risk Assessment report (Baird 2018)" It is important that the COFGG continues to engage with community going forward with the view to avoid at all costs, a fracturing of community. It is an unacceptable outcome that the city takes an approach that 'we know better' and pushes ahead with projects without community buy in and seek to avoid repeating it's past mistakes. The DCPA community is well versed in understanding the CHRMAP process and seeking action. This is evidenced by holding the Geraldton Coastal Adaptation Planning Forum in 2014, a partnership between the Drummonds Cove Progress Association and Sunset Beach Coastcare groups. Followed by Application A15220 in 2015 by the Drummond Cove Progress Association (DCPA) for works north of the John Batten Hall. A community action grant in partnership with the CofGG and NACC for the coastal zone north of the John Batten Hall. It needs to be acknowledged that the CofGG has been well aware of the issues north of John Batten Hall/Whitehill Rd. and now need to act to comply with State Planning requirements.	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				Following on from the above data, it is my position to explore specifically the following recommendations from the Baird report: Section 1 & Section 2. Drummond Cove Road to Community Centre & Community Centre to Seacrest Way – We agree with the following: "A coastal protection approach for Drummond Cove north of the Community Hall in front of the closed section of Whitehill Rd warrants further assessment. MCA and CBA analysis of options considered show a net return on investment on the value of assets protected on the landside is possible. The high value of property at risk of erosion in future planning periods and the values of the coast noted in the Community Engagement process underline the importance of this issue." Following on from the above, implement the foredune re-build strategy (Application A15220) for section 1 & 2 to implement a foredune re-build for both sections 1 & 2. This course of action is reinforced by the Baird report which states: "Nature based approaches to increase resilience of shorelines and foreshore areas (eg sand trapping fences, revegetation). Recommended for section north of the Community Hall. CGG led programs supported through grant funding (estimated \$10,000 annually)."	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				I would like the CofGG to adopt the resolution presented to council in July to re-establish a north south link and adjust the associated, planned works to reference CHRMAP and DCPA recommendations. Second, adjust any detailed plans to include creation of a natural buffer as planned in A15220 by the DCPA Coastcare group and NACC concept stage from 2015. Implement the above as a short/medium term approach and improve the amenity as this scope of works can be acted on immediately.	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				In response to the economic analysis below: 3.4 Economic Analysis – Adaptation options for Erosion Protection for Whitehill Rd and Community Centre I seek further clarification as to how the fundamentals were calculated to rank these options. Of note, I am of the opinion that Boat Launch Stage 1&2 has a much higher possibility of economic return by introducing a scope of works that has on-going revenue potential and tourism benefits for the whole region more than the other options. For example, an elevated rock sea wall significantly reduces the amenity and could have a negative impact for the community, tourism potential and real-estate investment. However, it will deliver coastal protection. This is an example where the CBA is presented through the lens of economic rationalism and does not consider the data to support the building of a boat ramp and associated protection works. This data appears not to have been taken into consideration in this analysis by Baird and therefore should be re-evaluated to more accurately reflect BCR values.	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				In summary, Coastal erosion and the CofGG's responses over the years indicate a knowledge of CHRMAP and that we are now well past the beginning of the journey that this Baird CHRMAP report represents. It's primary lens is "Managed Retreat" and recommends Managed Retreat. We have passed trigger points that require protection works for section 1 & Section 2. The significant underspend at Beresford should be directed into further coastal protection works at Drummond Cove, Bluff Point and Sunset Beach.	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
34	22/08/2018	24/08/2018	Private submission	3.1.2 Community Coastal Planning Survey and Workshops Page 7. The attached report (Appendix A.2) does not reflect what was reported in "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017". The beach and residential properties in Sunset Beach are highly valued by the community. In the "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017", it was identified that the loss of residential property and community areas would have a catastrophic impact. The results of the workshop were to "Protect" Sunset Beach properties and many of the other properties and beaches that the CHRMAP has changed to "managed retreat." Solution: The requirements of the CHRMAP process, state that community valuing and feedback is required in order to be successful. The CHRMAP needs to be updated to reflect what is important to the community by adhering to the Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report. Changing valuable assets to the community, such as properties and beaches, to "PROTECT".	The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops were undertaken to provide the opportunity for the community to identify and prioritise assets and values of importance to them in the coastal zone. The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops also explained the Coastal Adaptation Types and provided the opportunity for the community participants to suggest adaptation measures for each adaptation type. This provided information for the consultant to identify the long term adaptation pathway for the assets and values in the coastal zone.	Note the submission
				See attached Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report October 2017 Summary Page 2- Section 2.1 Purpose. "The severity of erosion and inundation impact along Geraldton's coastal areas is determined by a range of factors, and over the next 100-years the coastal region is projected to experience adverse effects from coastal hazard impact at some time." The factors used in this calculation need to be defined. Does it take into account sand replenishing, man made modifications ect. Responsibility for increased erosion has been admitted by the ports. The Geraldton Guardian has also claimed the city is also responsible for the increased erosion due to the works at the foreshore. Is this part of the calculation?	The factors used in the calculation are for coastal erosion and coastal inundation are identified in State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. In additional the Geraldton CHRMAP Report takes into account existing treatments such as the Northern Beaches Stabilisation Programme (NBSP) sand by-passing works undertaken each year by the Port Authority. The Beresford Foreshore project coastal protection structures have been designed not to interrupt the sediment flow northwards from Beresford.	Note the submission
				There is sufficient justification to have the properties and community areas classified as "PROTECT" rather than the proposed "Accomodate/Managed Retreat" in Sunset Beach. The costs of managed retreat would amount to \$35,760,000 = (149 homes x \$240,000 (median reported house price per this report) This is the lowest cost as homes located next to the ocean are valued higher. The Adaptation recommendation "Section 70a notification on Title" would devalue 149 residential properties within Sunset Beach, effecting the resale value. "PROTECT" Adaptation options have been provided at a significantly lower cost to other Coastal Management Units. Not exceeding 4 million dollars. This would also remove the need to add "Section 70a notification on Title" saving millions to home owners. Refer to Technical Appendices- Table 3-2 "Cost estimates for adaptation options"	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note the submission
				The Adaptation plans per the report ("Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017") were as follows: Sunset Beach houses - Protect- Seawall, artificial reef, sand nourishment, dune rehabilitation, Geotextile containers.	Noted. These, and other adaptation options were assessed by the consultant to identify sustainable long term adaptation pathways for the assets and values in the coastal zone.	Note the submission
				Page 105 -15.1.3 Managed Retreat Pathway Out of the three pathways for managed retreat, in all cases, protect is the least costly and damaging to the city. The First Option "Do Nothing" will incur reputation damage and legal costs to the city. This will detour tourism and investors from coming to Geraldton. Without a legal precedent, legal counsel will need to be sought out, incurring more costs without any benefit to the community. The Second Option "Planned Retreat" the City would be required to reserve funds to acquire the properties before or at the time of the erosion trigger. Costing over \$35,760,000 for Sunset Beach alone. The Third Option "Protect" has been identified to have the least cost. risk and the biggest reward to the community and stakeholders. The community has recommended a proactive approach to protect the properties and beaches. This would ensure the best benefit to the City of Greater Geraldton, encouraging tourism, investments and showing everyone in WA that Geraldton cares about it's residents	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note the submission
35	22/08/2018	24/08/2018	Private submission	3.1.2 Community Coastal Planning Survey and Workshops Page 7. The attached report (Appendix A.2) does not reflect what was reported in "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017". The beach and residential properties in Sunset Beach are highly valued by the community. In the "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017", it was identified that the loss of residential property and community areas would have a catastrophic impact. The results of the workshop were to "Protect" Sunset Beach properties and many of the other properties and beaches that the CHRMAP has changed to "managed retreat." Solution: The requirements of the CHRMAP process, state that community valuing and feedback is required in order to be successful. The CHRMAP needs to be updated to reflect what is important to the community by adhering to the Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report. Changing valuable assets to the community, such as properties and beaches, to "PROTECT".	The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops were undertaken to provide the opportunity for the community to identify and prioritise assets and values of importance to them in the coastal zone. The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops also explained the Coastal Adaptation Types and provided the opportunity for the community participants to suggest adaptation measures for each adaptation type. This provided information for the consultant to identify the long term adaptation pathway for the assets and values in the coastal zone.	Note the submission
				See attached Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report October 2017 Summary Page 2- Section 2.1 Purpose. "The severity of erosion and inundation impact along Geraldton's coastal areas is determined by a range of factors, and over the next 100-years the coastal region is projected to experience adverse effects from coastal hazard impact at some time." The factors used in this calculation need to be defined. Does it take into account sand replenishing, man made modifications ect. Responsibility for increased erosion has been admitted by the ports. The Geraldton Guardian has also claimed the city is also responsible for the increased erosion due to the works at the foreshore. Is this part of the calculation?	The factors used in the calculation are for coastal erosion and coastal inundation are identified in State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. In additional the Geraldton CHRMAP Report takes into account existing treatments such as the Northern Beaches Stabilisation Programme (NBSP) sand by-passing works undertaken each year by the Port Authority. The Beresford Foreshore project coastal protection structures have been designed not to interrupt the sediment flow northwards from Beresford.	Note the submission
				There is sufficient justification to have the properties and community areas classified as "PROTECT" rather than the proposed "Accomodate/Managed Retreat" in Sunset Beach. The costs of managed retreat would amount to \$35,760,000 = (149 homes x \$240,000 (median reported house price per this report) This is the lowest cost as homes located next to the ocean are valued higher. The Adaptation recommendation "Section 70a notification on Title" would devalue 149 residential properties within Sunset Beach, effecting the resale value. "PROTECT" Adaptation options have been provided at a significantly lower cost to other Coastal Management Units. Not exceeding 4 million dollars. This would also remove the need to add "Section 70a notification on Title" saving millions to home owners. Refer to Technical Appendices- Table 3-2 "Cost estimates for adaptation options"	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note the submission
				The Adaptation plans per the report ("Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017") were as follows: Sunset Beach houses - Protect- Seawall, artificial reef, sand nourishment, dune rehabilitation, Geotextile containers.	Noted. These, and other adaptation options were assessed by the consultant to identify sustainable long term adaptation pathways for the assets and values in the coastal zone.	Note the submission
				Page 105 -15.1.3 Managed Retreat Pathway Out of the three pathways for managed retreat, in all cases, protect is the least costly and damaging to the city. The First Option "Do Nothing" will incur reputation damage and legal costs to the city. This will detour tourism and investors from coming to Geraldton. Without a legal precedent, legal counsel will need to be sought out, incurring more costs without any benefit to the community. The Second Option "Planned Retreat" the City would be required to reserve funds to acquire the properties before or at the time of the erosion trigger. Costing over \$35,760,000 for Sunset Beach alone. The Third Option "Protect" has been identified to have the least cost. risk and the biggest reward to the community and stakeholders. The community has recommended a proactive approach to protect the properties and beaches. This would ensure the best benefit to the City of Greater Geraldton, encouraging tourism, investments and showing everyone in WA that Geraldton cares about it's residents	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note the submission
				This coastline has been here forever. Now it is being eroded. Why? The reclaimed land for the port. There is a famous current from the south to the north. Now because the port is out further than ever there is an eddy caused which takes away coastline north of teh pro. It's not rocket science. Maybe if some though was put into where the port should go, there would have been no problem because north of Gerladton: oakajee would have been proposed.... and completed.	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				The mess is created by those who had short site. The whole of Geraldton is paying for it over and over. The problem has been created, and should be sorted out by the peopl who created it. Not the residents.	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
36	23/08/2018	24/08/2018	Private submission (x2)	Drummond Cove Beach. I would like to see whitehill road put back to original waterfront like it once was. But the erosion is the main issue and needs immediate attention before the road is considered at all. Please stop our beach disappearing in front of our eyes. Fix the erosion first and foremost. With a stone wall or sea wall as suggested from the hail up to the end of Drummond Cove Road which is the closed off section.	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				Also needs groyne put in so the sand beach can build up and return. Which has also been suggested.	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				A Boat Ramp could be a good addition also. We have lived here for 10 years and cannot believe the waste of money spent by the city of Geraldton council on doing nothing of any real benefit.	This is outside the scope of this project	Note the submission

Submission Information				Submission and Comment		
ID	Received	Responded	Submitter	Comment Submission	CGG Comment	Recommendation
37	23/08/2018	24/08/2018	Private submission	I reject the recommendations of do nothing or managed retreat. Managed retreat has already been proven to fail e.g.: Drummond Cove & Sunset Beach Active prevention should be the only course of action to combat erosion. Previous to the construction of the new port and marina facilities, there appeared to be minimal erosion along the northern coast. How liable does the City of Geraldton and the Port Authority consider itself in regards to the damage caused on our northern coast post deepening of the port and rock wall construction that is protecting the port and CBD? Regarding the setback lines: what effect will further development within the port and city environs have on the existing set back lines. Will these be worsened by structures such as the Beresford reconstruction? The values of the properties within the CMU1 to CMU4 are grossly undervalued. The placing of a 70a and the SCA caveat on these properties will directly disadvantage stakeholders in these areas and will restrict further investment.	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				There is sufficient justification for further consideration and planning for protection of these areas. Has there been investigation into other technologies by the city such as: artificial reefs, sand replenishment, revegetation, seaweed planting, geotextile structures, off shore breakwaters and or barrier/seawalls?	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				Of all the proposed pathways, protect seem to be the least expensive option for the City costs and reputation. Do nothing will impact on investors and tourism as will managed retreat. The city will be required to put aside funds to acquire properties in the future. How have the values in the reports been derived at other than an across the board average price? Not all the properties have the same value. Is the city prepared to accommodate residents in their removal, relocation and land value loss to properties of equal or greater value? Has the city considered potential legal costs?	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
					Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
38	23/08/2018	24/08/2018	Private submission	I, _____ who resides at _____, Drummond Cove, have read through your recent CHRMAP report and in reference to the Coastal Planning Community Survey Report January 2018, particularly pages 4 and 5, the whole of our community and tourists alike considers the beaches and associated coastal strip of paramount importance to their lifestyle and enjoyment. Living in close proximity of the beach, I see on a daily basis the number of cars both local and towing campers and caravans stopping at Drummonds to enjoy the beach areas and those tourism potentials into the economics that benefit community benefit everyone. During the community consultation phase of CHRMAP, the data clearly demonstrates that the Geraldton community at large values the beaches and foreshore of the municipality of Geraldton above all other assets. This view must expand to include all people in the entire region of the CofGG jurisdiction. Including, residents from the Shire of Chapman Valley who also enjoy the foreshore areas, particularly the connection to Drummond Cove. It is too narrow a perspective to view this CHRMAP report through a lens of only those residents living within coastal processes setback lines as affected.	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				In response to the overall recommendations: 1. I, _____, reject the recommendations of Managed Retreat. The CofGG has adopted the strategy of Managed Retreat for many years now in the absence of a hazard mapping and CHRMAP reports. It has passed trigger points resulting in lost assets in Drummond Cove and must now act. It is not acceptable that the CHRMAP report is a justification for adopting Managed Retreat from this point forward as the CofGG has been aware and has obligations under the Planning Act to land owners. We recommend that the CofGG explore with the DCPA via community consultation the CBA (Cost Benefit Analysis) of strategies now, short term and long term. Considering Under the Western Australian legislative framework voluntary or compulsory acquisition is based on the value of the land and its improvements. Case law pertaining to compulsory acquisition judgments indicates that values paid usually far exceed current market value due to Courts also awarding on-costs like removal expenses and legal costs. 2. I recommend a 'Protect' approach (Pr1-7): The values of the properties within the report are significantly understated given current market value. Second, sufficient justification exists for permanent solutions development on coastal land areas that are available to buffer areas 'at risk from coastal erosion and inundation. I, _____ propose coastal protection works as there is an enormous need to preserve the Drummond Cove foreshore areas for all people in the CofGG. The CofGG should explore, with the direct involvement of community, protection works that consider public access, public safety, property and infrastructure as our coastal lifestyle is not expendable.	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				In response to the following recommendations: Require Section 70A notification to be placed on titles to alert prospective purchasers to the risk of coastal erosion and / or inundation. I recommend that the CofGG undertake immediately Geophysical studies of all the shoreline areas to examine presence of rock strata that could reduce the erodibility of critical sections over the longer term (estimate \$25,000) and apply that data to the setback lines to create an accurate representation of setback lines. The current setbacks do not fit with specific height differences in adjacent areas not affected by setback lines indicating a broad-brush approach with significant financial implications at stake. I understand that the purpose of this study is to provide scope of works recommendations. However, more detailed information is necessary that includes analysis of rock strata within the setbacks and accurate elevations to be included. This is essential before any 70A notifications be placed on titles. I advise caution to the CofGG to avoid possible class action under the state planning act. Which will be triggered by a broad-based policy approach that de-values land by placing 70A notifications on titles. Such action as applying 70A's will require the CofGG to consider the legal costs associated with lengthy process of legal action. This will need to be taken into consideration as part of the CBA (Cost Benefit Analysis).	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				I agree with the recommendations of continued immediate Monitoring and Management outlined below: Recommend a geophysical study of the shoreline areas is undertaken to examine presence of rock strata that could reduce the erodibility of critical sections over the longer term; The foreshore reserve area offers a crucial natural buffer against coastal erosion and inundation for coastal assets located landward (houses, roads etc), as well as providing highly valued public amenity. Active monitoring and nature-based approaches (e.g. coastal revegetation, sand trapping fences) to increase resilience of this foreshore reserve from erosion are strongly recommended. Community groups and local organisations should be included / supported in the delivery of these programs, to provide opportunity to raise awareness and build ownership of the coastal adaptation requirements. Again, I urge the CofGG to consider the tourism impacts to the region and future economic consequences of any policy, particularly the consequences of a Managed Retreat paradigm. Some of the recommended actions will bring about the outcome of 'protection' at a trigger point. The CofGG needs to acknowledge that we are well past trigger points at Whitehill Rd. It is my opinion that the scope of options and actions need to be fully explored, any action/response also include a thorough search for alternative/innovative approaches beyond the list of recommendations. I strongly advise the CofGG look to other adopted approaches in other states where the amenity of the coastal asset is the highest priority. Options such as off-shore artificial reefs to mitigate wave action as the driver of coastal erosion, being just one example. I implore the CofGG seek to preserve the natural amenity and improve tourism potential wherever possible. I ask the CofGG to put on a tourism lens as they view options and consider the CBA (Cost Benefit Analysis).	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				In response to the statement below: 1. "The initial stages of the Geraldton CHRMAP project involved community and stakeholder engagement and a risk-based assessment, which examined coastal assets under threat from erosion and inundation in future planning timeframes. The outcomes of this initial CHRMAP phase were reported in the Coastal Hazard and Risk Assessment report (Baird 2018)" It is important that the COFGG continues to engage with community going forward with the view to avoid at all costs, a fracturing of community. It is an unacceptable outcome that the city takes an approach that 'we know better' and pushes ahead with projects without community buy in and seek to avoid repeating it's past mistakes. The DCPA community is well versed in understanding the CHRMAP process and seeking action. This is evidenced by holding the Geraldton Coastal Adaptation Planning Forum in 2014, a partnership between the Drummonds Cove Progress Association and Sunset Beach Coastcare groups. Followed by Application A15220 in 2015 by the Drummond Cove Progress Association (DCPA) for works north of the John Batten Hall. A community action grant in partnership with the CofGG and NACC for the coastal zone north of the John Batten Hall. It needs to be acknowledged that the CofGG has been well aware of the issues north of John Batten Hall/Whitehill Rd. and now need to act to comply with State Planning requirements.	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				Following on from the above data, it is my position to explore specifically the following recommendations from the Baird report: Section 1 & Section 2. Drummond Cove Road to Community Centre & Community Centre to Seacrest Way – We agree with the following: "A coastal protection approach for Drummond Cove north of the Community Hall in front of the closed section of Whitehill Rd warrants further assessment. MCA and CBA analysis of options considered show a net return on investment on the value of assets protected on the landside is possible. The high value of property at risk of erosion in future planning periods and the values of the coast noted in the Community Engagement process underline the importance of this issue." Following on from the above, implement the foredune re-build strategy (Application A15220) for section 1 & 2 to implement a foredune re-build for both sections 1 & 2. This course of action is reinforced by the Baird report which states: "Nature based approaches to increase resilience of shorelines and foreshore areas (eg sand trapping fences, revegetation). Recommended for section north of the Community Hall. CGG led programs supported through grant funding (estimated \$10,000 annually)."	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				In response to the economic analysis below: 3.4 Economic Analysis – Adaptation options for Erosion Protection for Whitehill Rd and Community Centre. I seek further clarification as to how the fundamentals were calculated to rank these options. Of note, I am of the opinion that Boat Launch Stage 1&2 has a much higher possibility of economic return by introducing a scope of works that has on-going revenue potential and tourism benefits for the whole region more than the other options. For example, an elevated rock sea wall significantly reduces the amenity and could have a negative impact for the community, tourism potential and real-estate investment. However, it will deliver coastal protection. This is an example where the CBA is presented through the lens of economic rationalism and does not consider the data to support the building of a boat ramp and associated protection works. This data appears not to have been taken into consideration in this analysis by Baird and therefore should be re-evaluated to more accurately reflect BCR values.	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				In summary, Coastal erosion and the CofGG's responses over the years indicate a knowledge of CHRMAP and that we are now well past the beginning of the journey that this Baird CHRMAP report represents. It's primary lens is 'Managed Retreat' and recommends Managed Retreat. We have passed trigger points that require protection works for section 1 & Section 2. The significant underspend at Beresford should be directed into further coastal protection works at Drummond Cove, Bluff Point and Sunset Beach.	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
39	26/08/2018	28/08/2018	Private submission (x3)	We are of the belief that the COGG is to make a decision that will effect our properties. We did not hear of this subject from the COGG itself, but from a neighbour who had received a note in her letterbox from a concerned group. This we find quite incredible as the topic and options the shire are to make decisions on will effect all our lives. We have attempted to read and understand the CHRMAP without much luck due to its length and in depth reporting - which we understand is required for the report. However, it makes it difficult for the average person to follow, in particular the effect on different areas discussed. Our concern is for the Buff Point area and how the COGG will deal with it.	The development of the Geraldton CHRMAP report has had extensive community consultation. Community consultation will continue throughout the CHRMAP process.	Note the submission
				In particular our queries include: Impact on property values; Potential increases in insurance and therefore cost of living How the COGG will handle the public assets such as roads, power lines, sewerage etc - will these assets be removed or allowed to wash into the sea.	This is outside the scope of this project The Geraldton CHRMAP Report looks at he risks to these assets and their long-term adaptation pathway	Note the submission
				The Lighthouse Estate units are new, having been built in the last 3 years. Will the COGG continue to allow more units to be built and the village completed if they go with the "managed retreat" option?	That is outside the scope of this report	Note the submission
				We are of the belief that the COGG together with the State Government is planning to spend a large amount of money on tourism infrastructure for the Abrolhos Islands. We would have thought that the Abrolhos Islands would be facing inundation issues of their own by 2030. Surely it would be preferable for the COGG and the State Government to be looking at protecting existing coastal infrastructure rather than adding new infrastructure to what we see as an existing problem.	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				We would like to see a report from the COGG summarising the CHRMAP report so the average person can understand what decisions are to be made on their behalf. A summary with hyperlinks to more detailed reports for each individual area. This way each person who is being represented by a shire counsellor has the ability to comment and discuss with their elected represented the issue. The shire counsellors are only representatives for the people in their electorate and as such should be ensuring that they are making the decision for the people in their electorate.	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report identifies and summarises the recommended long-term adaptation pathways for the 12 Coastal Management Units.	Note the submission
				We would like more time given to allowing submissions from the public until we can understand the decisions to be made on our behalf.	The development of the Geraldton CHRMAP report has had extensive community consultation. Community consultation will continue throughout the CHRMAP process.	Note the submission



Submission Information				Submission and Comment		
ID	Received	Responded	Submitter	Comment Submission	CGG Comment	Recommendation
40	27/08/2018	28/08/2018	Private submission	I reject the recommendations of Managed retreat. The C of GG have adopted the strategy of managed retreat for many years now in the absence of a hazard mapping and CHRMAP reports. It has passed trigger points that have lost assets in Drummond Cove and urgent action is required. It is not acceptable to use the CHRMAP report as justification for adopting managed retreat. Going forward we require the C of GG to be aware of it's obligations under the Planning Act to land owners. I recommend that the C of GG explore with the DCPA via community consultation the CBA (Cost Benefit Analysis) of strategies now, short term and long term. Considering under the Western Australia legislation framework voluntary or compulsory acquisition is based on the value of the land and it's improvement. Case law pertaining to compulsory acquisition judgments indicate that values paid are usually far exceeded current market value due to court also awarding ongoing costs and including legal fee's. I believe the entire community of Geraldton will benefit from improving our coastline. Drummond Cove has always been a popular beach and has a substantial influx of surfers, fishermen and tourists.	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				The foreshore redevelopment is a beautiful asset for Geraldton. Unfortunately Drummond residents will have to pay for our foreshore. As stated by the CEO Beresford residents are not required to contribute to the cost even though they have had their assets protected.	The primary driver for the Beresford Foreshore Project was to protect State and Local Government assets and utilities at risk from coastal erosion. The project was funded through the Royalties for Regions funding. The City committed \$1.85 to improvement of the amenity to address a deficiency in POS amenity for the Beresford locality.	Note the submission
				I recommend a Protect approach (Pr 1-7). The values of the properties within the report are significantly understated given current market value. Sufficient justification exists for a permanent solution to develop the coastal land areas that are available to the buffer areas at risk from coastal erosion and inundation. I propose that coastal protection works as there is a need to preserve the Drummond Cove foreshore areas for all the people in C of GG. Direct community involvement in the protection works that consider public access, public safety, property and infrastructure as our coastal lifestyle is not expendable.	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				I recommend that the C of GG undertake immediately Geophysical studies of all the shorelir areas to examine the presence rock strata that could reduce the erosion of critical sections over the longer term and apply that data to the create an accurate representation of setback lines.	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				The current setbacks do not fit with specific height differences in adjacent areas (Our block is 2m higher than than road level) indicating a broad-brush approach with significant financial implications.	The coastal hazards maps are based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy	Note the submission
				I believe the C of GG will use the CHRMAP to immediately apply 70A notifications (encumbrance) on our titles. Even though councils will say that it has very little impact that has not been proven. Prices drop, rates go up and insurance increases. I advise caution to the C of GG to avoid a class action under the state planning act. The C of GG are at risk of legal costs associated with the lengthy process of legal action. I am strongly against the 70A notification which is repeated excessively through the Baird CHRMAP report.	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note the submission
				The councilors keep saying this is a hundred year report however this will be implemented as soon as they can get it though.	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note the submission
				It is important moving forward that the C of GG continue to engage the community going forward to avoid at all costs, a fractured community. It would be an unacceptable outcome if the city takes the approach of "We know best" and pushes ahead with projects without consultation within the community. The DCPA community is well versed in understanding CHRMAP process and seeking action. This is evidence by holding the Geraldton Coastal Adaptation Planning Forum in 2014, a partnership between the Drummond Cove Progress Association (DCPA) for works North of the John Batten Hall. A Community action grant in partnership with the C of GG and NACC for the coastal zone north of John Batten Hall.	The development of the Geraldton CHRMAP report has had extensive community consultation. Community consultation will continue throughout the CHRMAP process.	Note the submission
				It needs to be acknowledged that the C of GG has been well aware of the issues north of John Batten hall/Whitehill Rd and now need to act to comply with State Planning requirements. Coastal protection is the only longterm solution. We have substantial assets that have to be protected and properties of high values. Whitehill Rd is the perfect result of managed retreat. Managed retreat means do nothing, watch the road wash away and then use it to prove we need to protect, move the set backs further and implement 70A notifications.	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note the submission
				I feel there is a lot of fear and loathing in this report. It already has the community looking at the fact their house can be compulsory re-acquired at a substantially reduced value compared to the market value, 70A notifications with the same outcome of compulsory re-acquired or just let our homes fall into the sea. I will walk around with a placard and it wont say "Save the beaches" it will say "Vote out our Councilors" I believe there are multiple alternatives that haven't been explored in the vision for Drummond Cove.	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
41	27/08/2018	28/08/2018	Private submission	I reject the recommendations of Managed retreat. The C of GG have adopted the strategy of managed retreat for many years now in the absence of a hazard mapping and CHRMAP reports. It has passed trigger points that have lost assets in Drummond Cove and urgent action is required. It is not acceptable to use the CHRMAP report as justification for adopting managed retreat. Going forward we require the C of GG to be aware of it's obligations under the Planning Act to land owners. I recommend that the C of GG explore with the DCPA via community consultation the CBA (Cost Benefit Analysis) of strategies now, short term and long term. Considering under the Western Australia legislation framework voluntary or compulsory acquisition is based on the value of the land and it's improvement. Case law pertaining to compulsory acquisition judgments indicate that values paid are usually far exceeded current market value due to court also awarding ongoing costs and including legal fee's. I believe the entire community of Geraldton will benefit from improving our coastline. Drummond Cove has always been a popular beach and has a substantial influx of surfers, fishermen and tourists.	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				The foreshore redevelopment is a beautiful asset for Geraldton. Unfortunately Drummond residents will have to pay for our foreshore. As stated by the CEO Beresford residents are not required to contribute to the cost even though they have had their assets protected.	The primary driver for the Beresford Foreshore Project was to protect State and Local Government assets and utilities at risk from coastal erosion. The project was funded through the Royalties for Regions funding. The City committed \$1.85M to improvement of the amenity to address a deficiency in POS amenity for the Beresford locality.	Note the submission
				I recommend a Protect approach (Pr 1-7). The values of the properties within the report are significantly understated given current market value. Sufficient justification exists for a permanent solution to develop the coastal land areas that are available to the buffer areas at risk from coastal erosion and inundation. I propose that coastal protection works as there is a need to preserve the Drummond Cove foreshore areas for all the people in C of GG. Direct community involvement in the protection works that consider public access, public safety, property and infrastructure as our coastal lifestyle is not expendable.	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				I recommend that the C of GG undertake immediately Geophysical studies of all the shorelir areas to examine the presence rock strata that could reduce the erosion of critical sections over the longer term and apply that data to the create an accurate representation of setback lines.	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				The current setbacks do not fit with specific height differences in adjacent areas (Our block is 2m higher than than road level) indicating a broad-brush approach with significant financial implications.	The coastal hazards maps are based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy	Note the submission
				I believe the C of GG will use the CHRMAP to immediately apply 70A notifications (encumbrance) on our titles. Even though councils will say that it has very little impact that has not been proven. Prices drop, rates go up and insurance increases. I advise caution to the C of GG to avoid a class action under the state planning act. The C of GG are at risk of legal costs associated with the lengthy process of legal action. I am strongly against the 70A notification which is repeated excessively through the Baird CHRMAP report.	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note the submission
				The councilors keep saying this is a hundred year report however this will be implemented as soon as they can get it though.	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note the submission
				It is important moving forward that the C of GG continue to engage the community going forward to avoid at all costs, a fractured community. It would be an unacceptable outcome if the city takes the approach of "We know best" and pushes ahead with projects without consultation within the community. The DCPA community is well versed in understanding CHRMAP process and seeking action. This is evidence by holding the Geraldton Coastal Adaptation Planning Forum in 2014, a partnership between the Drummond Cove Progress Association (DCPA) for works North of the John Batten Hall. A Community action grant in partnership with the C of GG and NACC for the coastal zone north of John Batten Hall.	The development of the Geraldton CHRMAP report has had extensive community consultation. Community consultation will continue throughout the CHRMAP process.	Note the submission
				It needs to be acknowledged that the C of GG has been well aware of the issues north of John Batten hall/Whitehill Rd and now need to act to comply with State Planning requirements. Coastal protection is the only longterm solution. We have substantial assets that have to be protected and properties of high values. Whitehill Rd is the perfect result of managed retreat. Managed retreat means do nothing, watch the road wash away and then use it to prove we need to protect, move the set backs further and implement 70A notifications.	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note the submission
				I feel there is a lot of fear and loathing in this report. It already has the community looking at the fact their house can be compulsory re-acquired at a substantially reduced value compared to the market value, 70A notifications with the same outcome of compulsory re-acquired or just let our homes fall into the sea. I will walk around with a placard and it wont say "Save the beaches" it will say "Vote out our Councilors" I believe there are multiple alternatives that haven't been explored in the vision for Drummond Cove.	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
42	27/08/2018	28/08/2018	Private submission	I reject the recommendations of Managed retreat. The C of GG have adopted the strategy of managed retreat for many years now in the absence of a hazard mapping and CHRMAP reports. It has passed trigger points that have lost assets in Drummond Cove and urgent action is required. It is not acceptable to use the CHRMAP report as justification for adopting managed retreat. Going forward we require the C of GG to be aware of it's obligations under the Planning Act to land owners. I recommend that the C of GG explore with the DCPA via community consultation the CBA (Cost Benefit Analysis) of strategies now, short term and long term. Considering under the Western Australia legislation framework voluntary or compulsory acquisition is based on th value of the land and it's improvement. Case law pertaining to compulsory acquisition judgments indicate that values paid are usually far exceeded current market value due to court also awarding ongoing costs and including legal fee's. I believe the entire community of Geraldton will benefit from improving our coastline. Drummond Cove has always been a popular beach and has a substantial influx of surfers, fishermen and tourists.	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				The foreshore redevelopment is a beautiful asset for Geraldton. Unfortunately Drummond residents will have to pay for our foreshore. As stated by the CEO Beresford residents are not required to contribute to the cost even though they have had their assets protected.	The primary driver for the Beresford Foreshore Project was to protect State and Local Government assets and utilities at risk from coastal erosion. The project was funded through the Royalties for Regions funding. The City committed \$1.85M to improvement of the amenity to address a deficiency in POS amenity for the Beresford locality.	Note the submission
				I recommend a Protect approach (Pr 1-7). The values of the properties within the report are significantly understated given current market value. Sufficient justification exists for a permanent solution to develop the coastal land areas that are available to the buffer areas at risk from coastal erosion and inundation. I propose that coastal protection works as there is a need to preserve the Drummond Cove foreshore areas for all the people in C of GG. Direct community involvement in the protection works that consider public access, public safety, property and infrastructure as our coastal lifestyle is not expendable.	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				I recommend that the C of GG undertake immediately Geophysical studies of all the shorelir areas to examine the presence rock strata that could reduce the erosion of critical sections over the longer term and apply that data to the create an accurate representation of setback lines.	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				The current setbacks do not fit with specific height differences in adjacent areas (Our block is 2m higher than than road level) indicating a broad-brush approach with significant financial implications.	The coastal hazards maps are based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy	Note the submission

Submission Information				Submission and Comment		
ID	Received	Responded	Submitter	Comment Submission	CGG Comment	Recommendation
				I believe the C of GG will use the CHRMAP to immediately apply 70A notifications (encumbrance) on our titles. Even though councils will say that it has very little impact that has not been proven. Prices drop, rates go up and insurance increases. I advise caution to the C of GG to avoid a class action under the state planning act. The C of GG are at risk of legal costs associated with the lengthy process of legal action. I am strongly against the 70A notification which is repeated excessively through the Baird CHRMAP report.	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note the submission
				The councilors keep saying this is a hundred year report however this will be implemented as soon as they can get it though.	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note the submission
				It is important moving forward that the C of GG continue to engage the community going forward to avoid at all costs, a fractured community. It would be an unacceptable outcome if the city takes the approach of "We know best" and pushes ahead with projects without consultation within the community. The DCPA community is well versed in understanding CHRMAP process and seeking action. This is evidence by holding the Geraldton Coastal Adaptation Planning Forum in 2014, a partnership between the Drummond Cove Progress Association (DCPA) for works North of the John Batten Hall. A Community action grant in partnership with the C of GG and NACC for the coastal zone north of John Batten Hall.	The development of the Geraldton CHRMAP report has had extensive community consultation. Community consultation will continue throughout the CHRMAP process.	Note the submission
				It needs to be acknowledged that the C of GG has been well aware of the issues north of John Batten hall/Whitehill Rd and now need to act to comply with State Planning requirements. Coastal protection is the only longterm solution. We have substantial assets that have to be protected and properties of high values. Whitehill Rd is the perfect result of managed retreat. Managed retreat means do nothing, watch the road wash away and then use it to prove we need to protect, move the set backs further and implement 70A notifications.	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note the submission
				I feel there is a lot of fear and loathing in this report. It already has the community looking at the fact their house can be compulsory re-acquired at a substantially reduced value compared to the market value, 70A notifications with the same outcome of compulsory re-acquired or just let our homes fall into the sea. I will walk around with a placard and it wont say "Save the beaches" it will say "Vote out our Councilors" I believe there are multiple alternatives that haven't been explored in the vision for Drummond Cove.	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
43	27/08/2018	28/08/2018	Private submission	I reject the recommendations of Managed retreat. The C of GG have adopted the strategy of managed retreat for many years now in the absence of a hazard mapping and CHRMAP reports. It has passed trigger points that have lost assets in Drummond Cove and urgent action is required. It is not acceptable to use the CHRMAP report as justification for adopting managed retreat. Going forward we require the C of GG to be aware of it's obligations under the Planning Act to land owners. I recommend that the C of GG explore with the DCPA via community consultation the CBA (Cost Benefit Analysis) of strategies now, short term and long term. Considering under the Western Australia legislation framework voluntary or compulsory acquisition is based on th value of the land and it's improvement. Case law pertaining to compulsory acquisition judgments indicate that values paid are usually far exceeded current market value due to court also awarding ongoing costs and including legal fee's. I believe the entire community of Geraldton will benefit from improving our coastline. Drummond Cove has always been a popular beach and has a substantial influx of surfers, fishermen and tourists.	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				The foreshore redevelopment is a beautiful asset for Geraldton. Unfortunately Drummond residents will have to pay for our foreshore. As stated by the CEO Beresford residents are not required to contribute to the cost even though they have had their assets protected.	The primary driver for the Beresford Foreshore Project was to protect State and Local Government assets and utilities at risk from coastal erosion. The project was funded through the Royalties for Regions funding. The City committed \$1.85M to improvement of the amenity to address a deficiency in POS amenity for the Beresford locality	Note the submission
				I recommend a Protect approach (Pr 1-7). The values of the properties within the report are significantly understated given current market value. Sufficient justification exists for a permanent solution to develop the coastal land areas that are available to the buffer areas at risk from coastal erosion and inundation. I propose that coastal protection works as there is a need to preserve the Drummond Cove foreshore areas for all the people in C of GG. Direct community involvement in the protection works that consider public access, public safety, property and infrastructure as our coastal lifestyle is not expendable.	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				I recommend that the C of GG undertake immediately Geophysical studies of all the shorelir areas to examine the presence rock strata that could reduce the erosion of critical sections over the longer term and apply that data to the create an accurate representation of setback lines.	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				The current setbacks do not fit with specific height differences in adjacent areas (Our block is 2m higher than than road level) indicating a broad-brush approach with significant financial implications.	The coastal hazards maps are based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy	Note the submission
				I believe the C of GG will use the CHRMAP to immediately apply 70A notifications (encumbrance) on our titles. Even though councils will say that it has very little impact that has not been proven. Prices drop, rates go up and insurance increases. I advise caution to the C of GG to avoid a class action under the state planning act. The C of GG are at risk of legal costs associated with the lengthy process of legal action. I am strongly against the 70A notification which is repeated excessively through the Baird CHRMAP report.	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note the submission
				The councilors keep saying this is a hundred year report however this will be implemented as soon as they can get it though.	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note the submission
				It is important moving forward that the C of GG continue to engage the community going forward to avoid at all costs, a fractured community. It would be an unacceptable outcome if the city takes the approach of "We know best" and pushes ahead with projects without consultation within the community. The DCPA community is well versed in understanding CHRMAP process and seeking action. This is evidence by holding the Geraldton Coastal Adaptation Planning Forum in 2014, a partnership between the Drummond Cove Progress Association (DCPA) for works North of the John Batten Hall. A Community action grant in partnership with the C of GG and NACC for the coastal zone north of John Batten Hall.	The development of the Geraldton CHRMAP report has had extensive community consultation. Community consultation will continue throughout the CHRMAP process.	Note the submission
				It needs to be acknowledged that the C of GG has been well aware of the issues north of John Batten hall/Whitehill Rd and now need to act to comply with State Planning requirements. Coastal protection is the only longterm solution. We have substantial assets that have to be protected and properties of high values. Whitehill Rd is the perfect result of managed retreat. Managed retreat means do nothing, watch the road wash away and then use it to prove we need to protect, move the set backs further and implement 70A notifications.	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note the submission
				I feel there is a lot of fear and loathing in this report. It already has the community looking at the fact their house can be compulsory re-acquired at a substantially reduced value compared to the market value, 70A notifications with the same outcome of compulsory re-acquired or just let our homes fall into the sea. I will walk around with a placard and it wont say "Save the beaches" it will say "Vote out our Councilors" I believe there are multiple alternatives that haven't been explored in the vision for Drummond Cove.	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
44	27/08/2018	28/08/2018	Private submission	It is comforting to know the issue of the erosion of the coastline has had a comprehensive assessment documented. Congratulations to Council for implementing such a study. As a landowner near the water it is of constant concern as to the effect that erosion can bestow upon us. We have lived in our house for 21 years and have not noticed any significant erosion set back, apart from sand and seaweed movement during the winter months. This does not mean we can become complacent after witnessing the demise of Drummonds over the last 5 years. I found the document difficult to absorb due to the length and although the importance of detail is paramount, the complexity was excessive for a mere layman. It has proved to be a huge wake-up call and I can assume due diligence by Council will prevail from this point in time to mitigate and monitor progressive erosion and enforce active prevention measures.	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				I support the "Acomodate" and "Protection" adoption pathways - I see no alternative to all CMU's as each one is important to the individual affected. It is hard to comprehend A.5 Coastal Hazard mapping erosion projections as a given and that they do only constitute worst case scenario. The maps and charts don't appear to be consistent in relation to individual properties and seem to vary e.g. Inundation levels in Kempton Street don't appear as far reaching as erosion. My observation is that if the erosion occurs, then surely the inundation would follow like for like. All options PR 1 - PR 7 of the Adaption Tool Box are the only consideration to adopt over a 50 year time frame. Which PR that is, would depend on the impact status of each individua CMU as some areas would require remediation sooner and of a different remedy than others.	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				Suggestions of management retreat, avoid, buyback and 70A Imposition cannot be considered in any form and all reference to these options should be struck of the report. All the above will retard investment and have a massive decline off people's asset value. Incomprehensible scenarios. It is the coastline and beach atmosphere that attract people to Geraldton. If we lose our beaches then Geraldton will have little to offer and the entire community will stagnate	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note the submission
				Mostly covered in the 3 previous pages. We do have a major problem and I am humbled by the fact that good governance will find a solution. Summary: Active prevention must be prioritized. The report admits that protection and modified structures together with deepening the harbour has inhibited the natural flow of sediment to the North. It therefore rests on the City and Port Authority to resurrect, and not at the expense of the unsuspecting home owners under threat.	Noted. The Port Enhancement Project went through a Public Environment Review as part of the approvals process. The Port has an ongoing commitment to bypass 12500m3 of sand from Pages Beach to the Northern Beaches between the Beresford Foreshore and the Chapman River annually.	Note the submission
				Acquisition/Managed Retreat is not an option and remediation is the responsibility of all the ratepayers on the electoral roll as all the people use the foreshore so are therefore beneficiaries. Beresford has had the luxury of a free ride.	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note the submission
				Offshore break waters/ new shore structures/ artificial reefs could be the most cost effective immediate solution. 70 A cannot be considered.due to the impact on individual land owners personal asset value and resale opportunities	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				I suggest a fighting fund be set up within council to impose an annual levy of 1.5% on all rate payers to build up a cashe for cost of repairs. This could be matched \$ for \$ with the State Government plus \$ for \$ with the Port Authority. Year on year this would amount tens of millions being used for direct active prevention over 50 years.They might not agree, but it can't hurt to make a request!	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
45	27/08/2018	28/08/2018	Private submission	DO NOTHING OR MANAGED RETREAT EQUATE TO THE SAME THING AND ARE NOT OPTIONS AT ALL. ACTIVE PREVENTION AND CONSERVATION GLOBALLY SHOUL DBE THE OPTIONS OF ACTIONS TO COMBAT EROSION. RESIDENCES AND THEREFORE RESIDENTS ARE CONFUSED AND UPSET	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note the submission
				THERE ARE MANY NEW TECHNOLOGIES THAT COULD BE TRIED HERE AND HAVE BEEN IMPLEMENTED GLOBALLY WITH SUCCESS. FOR INSTANCE: PLANTING OF SEAWEED, OFFSHORE BREAKWATERS, ARTIFICIAL REEFS, SAND REPLENISHMENT, GEOXTILE. DO NOTHIN COULD LEAD TO THE LOSS OF ECOSYSTEMS RELIANT ON THE CHAPMAN RIVER	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				PLACING A 70A CAVEAT DIRECTLY DISADVANTAGES STAKEHOLDERS IN THESE AREA. THESE ARE EXTREMELY EXPENSIVE PROPERTIES AND PEOPLE AREA LL FULLY INVESTED. COMMUNITY MEMBERS WHO WILL NOT TAKE IT EASY	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				MANAGED RETREAT AND AVOID - THESE ARE NOT ACCEPTABLE OPTIONS. PLACING OF 70A AND SCA ARE NOT RESPONSIBLE ACTIONS	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note the submission

Submission Information				Submission and Comment		
ID	Received	Responded	Submitter	Comment Submission	CGG Comment	Recommendation
				THESE OPTIONS JEOPARDISE PROPERT VALUES, LEIFESTYLE AND COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT. IT LEAVES THE CITY OPEN TO LITIGATION IF EOPLE LEFT AT RISK OF LOSING THERE POPOERTIES, THEIR LIFE SAVINGS. PEOPLE COME TO GERALDTON FOR ITS COASTAL LIFESTYLE IT OFFERS AND THE FUTURE OF THIS LIFESTYLE IS AT SERIOUS RISK THE DRAFT REPORT IS CONFUSING THERE HAS BEEN A COMPLETE LACK OF COMMUNICATION IN TH EPLANNING PROCESS AND EVALUATION OF THE REPORT	Acknowledgement of submission  The development of the Geraldton CHRMAP report has had extensive community consultation. <b>Community consultation will continue throughout the CHRMAP process.</b>	Note the submission  Note the submission
46	28/08/2018	30/08/2018	Private submission	3.1.2 Community Coastal Planning Survey and Workshops Page 7. The attached report (Appendix A.2) does not reflect what was reported in "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report,October 2017. The beach and residential properties in Kempton Street are highly valued by the community. In the "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report,October 2017", it was identified that the loss of residential property and community areas would have a catastrophic impact. The results of the workshop were to 'Protect' Kempton Street properties and many of the other properties and beaches that the CHRMAP has changed to 'managed retreat.' Solution: The requirements of the CHRMAP process, state that community valuing and feedback is required in order to be successful. The CHRMAP needs to be updated to reflect what is important to the community by adhering to the Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report. Changing valuable assets to the community, such as properties and beaches, to "PROTECT".  See attached Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report October 2017 Summary Page 2-Section 2.1 Purpose "The severity of erosion and inundation impact along Geraldton's coastal areas is determined by a range of factors, and over the next 100-years the coastal region is projected to experience adverse effects from coastal hazard impact at some time." The factors used in this calculation need to be defined. Does it take into account sand replenishing, man made modifications ect. Responsibility for increased erosion has been admitted by the ports. The Geraldton Guardian has also claimed the city is also responsible for the increased erosion due to the works at the foreshore. Is this part of the calculation?  There is sufficient justification to have the properties and community areas classified as "PROTECT" rather than the proposed "Accomodate/Managed Retreat" in Sunset Beach. The costs of managed retreat would amount to \$35,760,000 = (149 homes x \$240,000 (median reported house price per this report) This is the lowest cost as homes located next to the ocean are valued higher. The Adaptation recommendation "Section 70a notification on Title" would devalue 149 residential properties within Sunset Beach, effecting the resale value. "PROTECT" Adaptation options have been provided at a significantly lower cost to other Coastal Management Units. Not exceeding 4 million dollars. This would also remove the need to add "Section 70a notification on Title" saving millions to home owners. Refer to Technical Appendices- Table 3-2 "Cost estimates for adaptation options" The Adaptation plans per the report ("Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017") were as follows: Sunset Beach houses - Protect- Seawall, artificial reef, sand nourishment, dune rehabilitation, Geotextile containers. Page 105 -15.1.3 Managed Retreat Pathway Out of the three pathways for managed retreat, in all cases, protect is the least costly and damaging to the city. The First Option "Do Nothing" will incur reputation damage and legal costs to the city. This will detour tourism and investors from coming to Geraldton. Without a legal precedent, legal counsel will need to be sought out, incurring more costs without any benefit to the community. The Second Option "Planned Retreat" the City would be required to reserve funds to acquire the properties before or at the time of the erosion trigger. Costing over \$35,760,000 for Sunset Beach alone. The Third Option "Protect" has been identified to have the least cost. risk and the biggest reward to the community and stakeholders. The community has recommended a proactive approach to protect the properties and beaches. This would ensure the best benefit to the City of Greater Geraldton, encouraging tourism, investments and showing everyone in WA that Geraldton cares about it's residents  I attended the Coastal Hazard and Risk Management Workshop last year. I have been disappointed that the Council has not seen fit to liaise with the community now that the report has been issued. The report is very hard to read and understand and it would have been helpful if the Council had arranged some explanatory meetings What I can gather is that the report only speaks about plannig retreats and does not offer any hope to remediation. As a resident of Sunset Beach, and probably one of those closet to the erosion I strongly urge the council to consult with residents and explore the many possibilities that would save this lovely beach and our homes.	The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops were undertaken to provide the opportunity for the community to identify and prioritise assets and values of importance to them in the coastal zone. The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops also explained the Coastal Adaptation Types and provided the opportunity for the community participants to suggest adaptation measures for each adaptation type. This provided information for the consultant to identify the long term adaptation pathway for the assets and values in the coastal zone.  The factors used in the calculation are for coastal erosion and coastal inundation are identified in State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. In additional the Geraldton CHRMAP Report takes into account existing treatments such as the Northern Beaches Stabilisation Programme (NBSP) sand by-passing works undertaken each year by the Port Authority. The Beresford Foreshore project coastal protection structures have been designed not to interrupt the sediment flow northwards from Beresford  The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.  Noted. These, and other adaptation options were assessed by the consultant to identify sustainable long term adaptation pathways for the assets and values in the coastal zone.  The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note the submission  Note the submission  Note the submission  Note the submission
47	28/08/2018	30/08/2018	Private submission	3.1.2 Community Coastal Planning Survey and Workshops Page 7. The attached report (Appendix A.2) does not reflect what was reported in "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report,October 2017. The beach and residential properties in Kempton Street are highly valued by the community. In the "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report,October 2017", it was identified that the loss of residential property and community areas would have a catastrophic impact. The results of the workshop were to 'Protect' Kempton Street properties and many of the other properties and beaches that the CHRMAP has changed to 'managed retreat.' Solution: The requirements of the CHRMAP process, state that community valuing and feedback is required in order to be successful. The CHRMAP needs to be updated to reflect what is important to the community by adhering to the Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report. Changing valuable assets to the community, such as properties and beaches, to "PROTECT".  See attached Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report October 2017 Summary Page 2-Section 2.1 Purpose "The severity of erosion and inundation impact along Geraldton's coastal areas is determined by a range of factors, and over the next 100-years the coastal region is projected to experience adverse effects from coastal hazard impact at some time." The factors used in this calculation need to be defined. Does it take into account sand replenishing, man made modifications ect. Responsibility for increased erosion has been admitted by the ports. The Geraldton Guardian has also claimed the city is also responsible for the increased erosion due to the works at the foreshore. Is this part of the calculation?  There is sufficient justification to have the properties and community areas classified as "PROTECT" rather than the proposed "Accomodate/Managed Retreat" in Sunset Beach. The costs of managed retreat would amount to \$35,760,000 = (149 homes x \$240,000 (median reported house price per this report) This is the lowest cost as homes located next to the ocean are valued higher. The Adaptation recommendation "Section 70a notification on Title" would devalue 149 residential properties within Sunset Beach, effecting the resale value. "PROTECT" Adaptation options have been provided at a significantly lower cost to other Coastal Management Units. Not exceeding 4 million dollars. This would also remove the need to add "Section 70a notification on Title" saving millions to home owners. Refer to Technical Appendices- Table 3-2 "Cost estimates for adaptation options" The Adaptation plans per the report ("Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017") were as follows: Sunset Beach houses - Protect- Seawall, artificial reef, sand nourishment, dune rehabilitation, Geotextile containers. Page 105 -15.1.3 Managed Retreat Pathway Out of the three pathways for managed retreat, in all cases, protect is the least costly and damaging to the city. The First Option "Do Nothing" will incur reputation damage and legal costs to the city. This will detour tourism and investors from coming to Geraldton. Without a legal precedent, legal counsel will need to be sought out, incurring more costs without any benefit to the community. The Second Option "Planned Retreat" the City would be required to reserve funds to acquire the properties before or at the time of the erosion trigger. Costing over \$35,760,000 for Sunset Beach alone. The Third Option "Protect" has been identified to have the least cost. risk and the biggest reward to the community and stakeholders. The community has recommended a proactive approach to protect the properties and beaches. This would ensure the best benefit to the City of Greater Geraldton, encouraging tourism, investments and showing everyone in WA that Geraldton cares about it's residents	The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops were undertaken to provide the opportunity for the community to identify and prioritise assets and values of importance to them in the coastal zone. The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops also explained the Coastal Adaptation Types and provided the opportunity for the community participants to suggest adaptation measures for each adaptation type. This provided information for the consultant to identify the long term adaptation pathway for the assets and values in the coastal zone.  The factors used in the calculation are for coastal erosion and coastal inundation are identified in State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. In additional the Geraldton CHRMAP Report takes into account existing treatments such as the Northern Beaches Stabilisation Programme (NBSP) sand by-passing works undertaken each year by the Port Authority. The Beresford Foreshore project coastal protection structures have been designed not to interrupt the sediment flow northwards from Beresford  The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.  Noted. These, and other adaptation options were assessed by the consultant to identify sustainable long term adaptation pathways for the assets and values in the coastal zone.  The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note the submission  Note the submission  Note the submission  Note the submission
48	28/08/2018	30/08/2018	Private submission	3.1.2 Community Coastal Planning Survey and Workshops Page 7. The attached report (Appendix A.2) does not reflect what was reported in "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report,October 2017. The beach and residential properties in Kempton Street are highly valued by the community. In the "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report,October 2017", it was identified that the loss of residential property and community areas would have a catastrophic impact. The results of the workshop were to 'Protect' Kempton Street properties and many of the other properties and beaches that the CHRMAP has changed to 'managed retreat.' Solution: The requirements of the CHRMAP process, state that community valuing and feedback is required in order to be successful. The CHRMAP needs to be updated to reflect what is important to the community by adhering to the Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report. Changing valuable assets to the community, such as properties and beaches, to "PROTECT".  See attached Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report October 2017 Summary Page 2-Section 2.1 Purpose "The severity of erosion and inundation impact along Geraldton's coastal areas is determined by a range of factors, and over the next 100-years the coastal region is projected to experience adverse effects from coastal hazard impact at some time." The factors used in this calculation need to be defined. Does it take into account sand replenishing, man made modifications ect. Responsibility for increased erosion has been admitted by the ports. The Geraldton Guardian has also claimed the city is also responsible for the increased erosion due to the works at the foreshore. Is this part of the calculation?  There is sufficient justification to have the properties and community areas classified as "PROTECT" rather than the proposed "Accomodate/Managed Retreat" in Sunset Beach. The costs of managed retreat would amount to \$35,760,000 = (149 homes x \$240,000 (median reported house price per this report) This is the lowest cost as homes located next to the ocean are valued higher. The Adaptation recommendation "Section 70a notification on Title" would devalue 149 residential properties within Sunset Beach, effecting the resale value. "PROTECT" Adaptation options have been provided at a significantly lower cost to other Coastal Management Units. Not exceeding 4 million dollars. This would also remove the need to add "Section 70a notification on Title" saving millions to home owners. Refer to Technical Appendices- Table 3-2 "Cost estimates for adaptation options" The Adaptation plans per the report ("Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017") were as follows: Sunset Beach houses - Protect- Seawall, artificial reef, sand nourishment, dune rehabilitation, Geotextile containers. Page 105 -15.1.3 Managed Retreat Pathway Out of the three pathways for managed retreat, in all cases, protect is the least costly and damaging to the city. The First Option "Do Nothing" will incur reputation damage and legal costs to the city. This will detour tourism and investors from coming to Geraldton. Without a legal precedent, legal counsel will need to be sought out, incurring more costs without any benefit to the community. The Second Option "Planned Retreat" the City would be required to reserve funds to acquire the properties before or at the time of the erosion trigger. Costing over \$35,760,000 for Sunset Beach alone. The Third Option "Protect" has been identified to have the least cost. risk and the biggest reward to the community and stakeholders. The community has recommended a proactive approach to protect the properties and beaches. This would ensure the best benefit to the City of Greater Geraldton, encouraging tourism, investments and showing everyone in WA that Geraldton cares about it's residents	The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops were undertaken to provide the opportunity for the community to identify and prioritise assets and values of importance to them in the coastal zone. The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops also explained the Coastal Adaptation Types and provided the opportunity for the community participants to suggest adaptation measures for each adaptation type. This provided information for the consultant to identify the long term adaptation pathway for the assets and values in the coastal zone.  The factors used in the calculation are for coastal erosion and coastal inundation are identified in State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. In additional the Geraldton CHRMAP Report takes into account existing treatments such as the Northern Beaches Stabilisation Programme (NBSP) sand by-passing works undertaken each year by the Port Authority. The Beresford Foreshore project coastal protection structures have been designed not to interrupt the sediment flow northwards from Beresford  The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.  Noted. These, and other adaptation options were assessed by the consultant to identify sustainable long term adaptation pathways for the assets and values in the coastal zone.  The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note the submission  Note the submission  Note the submission  Note the submission
49	28/08/2018	30/08/2018	Private submission	3.1.2 Community Coastal Planning Survey and Workshops Page 7. The attached report (Appendix A.2) does not reflect what was reported in "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report,October 2017. The beach and residential properties in Kempton Street are highly valued by the community. In the "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report,October 2017", it was identified that the loss of residential property and community areas would have a catastrophic impact. The results of the workshop were to 'Protect' Kempton Street properties and many of the other properties and beaches that the CHRMAP has changed to 'managed retreat.' Solution: The requirements of the CHRMAP process, state that community valuing and feedback is required in order to be successful. The CHRMAP needs to be updated to reflect what is important to the community by adhering to the Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report. Changing valuable assets to the community, such as properties and beaches, to "PROTECT".	The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops were undertaken to provide the opportunity for the community to identify and prioritise assets and values of importance to them in the coastal zone. The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops also explained the Coastal Adaptation Types and provided the opportunity for the community participants to suggest adaptation measures for each adaptation type. This provided information for the consultant to identify the long term adaptation pathway for the assets and values in the coastal zone.	Note the submission



Submission Information				Submission and Comment		
ID	Received	Responded	Submitter	Comment Submission	CGG Comment	Recommendation
				See attached Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report October 2017 Summary Page 2-Section 2.1 Purpose "The severity of erosion and inundation impact along Geraldton's coastal areas is determined by a range of factors, and over the next 100-years the coastal region is projected to experience adverse effects from coastal hazard impact at some time." The factors used in this calculation need to be defined. Does it take into account sand replenishing, man made modifications ect. Responsibility for increased erosion has been admitted by the ports. The Geraldton Guardian has also claimed the city is also responsible for the increased erosion due to the works at the foreshore. Is this part of the calculation?	The factors used in the calculation are for coastal erosion and coastal inundation are identified in State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. In additional the Geraldton CHRMAP Report takes into account existing treatments such as the Northern Beaches Stabilisation Programme (NBSP) sand by-passing works undertaken each year by the Port Authority. The Beresford Foreshore project coastal protection structures have been designed not to interrupt the sediment flow northwards from Beresford	Note the submission
				There is sufficient justification to have the properties and community areas classified as "PROTECT" rather than the proposed "Accomodate/Managed Retreat" in Sunset Beach. The costs of managed retreat would amount to \$35,760,000 = (149 homes x \$240,000 (median reported house price per this report) This is the lowest cost as homes located next to the ocean are valued higher. The Adaptation recommendation "Section 70a notification on Title" would devalue 149 residential properties within Sunset Beach, effecting the resale value. "PROTECT" Adaptation options have been provided at a significantly lower cost to other Coastal Management Units. Not exceeding 4 million dollars. This would also remove the need to add "Section 70a notification on Title" saving millions to home owners. Refer to Technical Appendices- Table 3-2 "Cost estimates for adaptation options"	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note the submission
				The Adaptation plans per the report ("Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017") were as follows: Sunset Beach houses - Protect- Seawall, artificial reef, sand nourishment, dune rehabilitation, Geotextile containers.	Noted. These, and other adaptation options were assessed by the consultant to identify sustainable long term adaptation pathways for the assets and values in the coastal zone.	Note the submission
				Page 105 -15.1.3 Managed Retreat Pathway Out of the three pathways for managed retreat, in all cases, protect is the least costly and damaging to the city. The First Option "Do Nothing" will incur reputation damage and legal costs to the city. This will detour tourism and investors from coming to Geraldton. Without a legal precedent, legal counsel will need to be sought out, incurring more costs without any benefit to the community. The Second Option "Planned Retreat" the City would be required to reserve funds to acquire the properties before or at the time of the erosion trigger. Costing over \$35,760,000 for Sunset Beach alone. The Third Option "Protect" has been identified to have the least cost. risk and the biggest reward to the community and stakeholders. The community has recommended a proactive approach to protect the properties and beaches. This would ensure the best benefit to the City of Greater Geraldton, encouraging tourism, investments and showing everyone in WA that Geraldton cares about it's residents	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note the submission
50	28/08/2018	30/08/2018	Private submission	3.1.2 Community Coastal Planning Survey and Workshops Page 7. The attached report (Appendix A.2) does not reflect what was reported in "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report,October 2017. The beach and residential properties in Kempton Street are highly valued by the community. In the "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report,October 2017", it was identified that the loss of residential property and community areas would have a catastrophic impact. The results of the workshop were to 'Protect' Kempton Street properties and many of the other properties and beaches that the CHRMAP has changed to 'managed retreat.' Solution: The requirements of the CHRMAP process, state that community valuing and feedback is required in order to be successful. The CHRMAP needs to be updated to reflect what is important to the community by adhering to the Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report. Changing valuable assets to the community, such as properties and beaches, to "PROTECT".	The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops were undertaken to provide the opportunity for the community to identify and prioritise assets and values of importance to them in the coastal zone. The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops also explained the Coastal Adaptation Types and provided the opportunity for the community participants to suggest adaptation measures for each adaptation type. This provided information for the consultant to identify the long term adaptation pathway for the assets and values in the coastal zone.	Note the submission
				See attached Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report October 2017 Summary Page 2-Section 2.1 Purpose "The severity of erosion and inundation impact along Geraldton's coastal areas is determined by a range of factors, and over the next 100-years the coastal region is projected to experience adverse effects from coastal hazard impact at some time." The factors used in this calculation need to be defined. Does it take into account sand replenishing, man made modifications ect. Responsibility for increased erosion has been admitted by the ports. The Geraldton Guardian has also claimed the city is also responsible for the increased erosion due to the works at the foreshore. Is this part of the calculation?	The factors used in the calculation are for coastal erosion and coastal inundation are identified in State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. In additional the Geraldton CHRMAP Report takes into account existing treatments such as the Northern Beaches Stabilisation Programme (NBSP) sand by-passing works undertaken each year by the Port Authority. The Beresford Foreshore project coastal protection structures have been designed not to interrupt the sediment flow northwards from Beresford	Note the submission
				There is sufficient justification to have the properties and community areas classified as "PROTECT" rather than the proposed "Accomodate/Managed Retreat" in Sunset Beach. The costs of managed retreat would amount to \$35,760,000 = (149 homes x \$240,000 (median reported house price per this report) This is the lowest cost as homes located next to the ocean are valued higher. The Adaptation recommendation "Section 70a notification on Title" would devalue 149 residential properties within Sunset Beach, effecting the resale value. "PROTECT" Adaptation options have been provided at a significantly lower cost to other Coastal Management Units. Not exceeding 4 million dollars. This would also remove the need to add "Section 70a notification on Title" saving millions to home owners. Refer to Technical Appendices- Table 3-2 "Cost estimates for adaptation options"	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note the submission
				The Adaptation plans per the report ("Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017") were as follows: Sunset Beach houses - Protect- Seawall, artificial reef, sand nourishment, dune rehabilitation, Geotextile containers.	Noted. These, and other adaptation options were assessed by the consultant to identify sustainable long term adaptation pathways for the assets and values in the coastal zone.	Note the submission
				Page 105 -15.1.3 Managed Retreat Pathway Out of the three pathways for managed retreat, in all cases, protect is the least costly and damaging to the city. The First Option "Do Nothing" will incur reputation damage and legal costs to the city. This will detour tourism and investors from coming to Geraldton. Without a legal precedent, legal counsel will need to be sought out, incurring more costs without any benefit to the community. The Second Option "Planned Retreat" the City would be required to reserve funds to acquire the properties before or at the time of the erosion trigger. Costing over \$35,760,000 for Sunset Beach alone. The Third Option "Protect" has been identified to have the least cost. risk and the biggest reward to the community and stakeholders. The community has recommended a proactive approach to protect the properties and beaches. This would ensure the best benefit to the City of Greater Geraldton, encouraging tourism, investments and showing everyone in WA that Geraldton cares about it's residents	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note the submission
51	28/08/2018	30/08/2018	Private submission	3.1.2 Community Coastal Planning Survey and Workshops Page 7. The attached report (Appendix A.2) does not reflect what was reported in "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report,October 2017. The beach and residential properties in Kempton Street are highly valued by the community. In the "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report,October 2017", it was identified that the loss of residential property and community areas would have a catastrophic impact. The results of the workshop were to 'Protect' Kempton Street properties and many of the other properties and beaches that the CHRMAP has changed to 'managed retreat.' Solution: The requirements of the CHRMAP process, state that community valuing and feedback is required in order to be successful. The CHRMAP needs to be updated to reflect what is important to the community by adhering to the Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report. Changing valuable assets to the community, such as properties and beaches, to "PROTECT".	The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops were undertaken to provide the opportunity for the community to identify and prioritise assets and values of importance to them in the coastal zone. The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops also explained the Coastal Adaptation Types and provided the opportunity for the community participants to suggest adaptation measures for each adaptation type. This provided information for the consultant to identify the long term adaptation pathway for the assets and values in the coastal zone.	Note the submission
				See attached Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report October 2017 Summary Page 2-Section 2.1 Purpose "The severity of erosion and inundation impact along Geraldton's coastal areas is determined by a range of factors, and over the next 100-years the coastal region is projected to experience adverse effects from coastal hazard impact at some time." The factors used in this calculation need to be defined. Does it take into account sand replenishing, man made modifications ect. Responsibility for increased erosion has been admitted by the ports. The Geraldton Guardian has also claimed the city is also responsible for the increased erosion due to the works at the foreshore. Is this part of the calculation?	The factors used in the calculation are for coastal erosion and coastal inundation are identified in State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. In additional the Geraldton CHRMAP Report takes into account existing treatments such as the Northern Beaches Stabilisation Programme (NBSP) sand by-passing works undertaken each year by the Port Authority. The Beresford Foreshore project coastal protection structures have been designed not to interrupt the sediment flow northwards from Beresford	Note the submission
				There is sufficient justification to have the properties and community areas classified as "PROTECT" rather than the proposed "Accomodate/Managed Retreat" in Sunset Beach. The costs of managed retreat would amount to \$35,760,000 = (149 homes x \$240,000 (median reported house price per this report) This is the lowest cost as homes located next to the ocean are valued higher. The Adaptation recommendation "Section 70a notification on Title" would devalue 149 residential properties within Sunset Beach, effecting the resale value. "PROTECT" Adaptation options have been provided at a significantly lower cost to other Coastal Management Units. Not exceeding 4 million dollars. This would also remove the need to add "Section 70a notification on Title" saving millions to home owners. Refer to Technical Appendices- Table 3-2 "Cost estimates for adaptation options"	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note the submission
				The Adaptation plans per the report ("Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017") were as follows: Sunset Beach houses - Protect- Seawall, artificial reef, sand nourishment, dune rehabilitation, Geotextile containers.	Noted. These, and other adaptation options were assessed by the consultant to identify sustainable long term adaptation pathways for the assets and values in the coastal zone.	Note the submission
				Page 105 -15.1.3 Managed Retreat Pathway Out of the three pathways for managed retreat, in all cases, protect is the least costly and damaging to the city. The First Option "Do Nothing" will incur reputation damage and legal costs to the city. This will detour tourism and investors from coming to Geraldton. Without a legal precedent, legal counsel will need to be sought out, incurring more costs without any benefit to the community. The Second Option "Planned Retreat" the City would be required to reserve funds to acquire the properties before or at the time of the erosion trigger. Costing over \$35,760,000 for Sunset Beach alone. The Third Option "Protect" has been identified to have the least cost. risk and the biggest reward to the community and stakeholders. The community has recommended a proactive approach to protect the properties and beaches. This would ensure the best benefit to the City of Greater Geraldton, encouraging tourism, investments and showing everyone in WA that Geraldton cares about it's residents	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note the submission
52	28/08/2018	30/08/2018	Private submission	3.1.2 Community Coastal Planning Survey and Workshops Page 7. The attached report (Appendix A.2) does not reflect what was reported in "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report,October 2017. The beach and residential properties in Kempton Street are highly valued by the community. In the "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report,October 2017", it was identified that the loss of residential property and community areas would have a catastrophic impact. The results of the workshop were to 'Protect' Kempton Street properties and many of the other properties and beaches that the CHRMAP has changed to 'managed retreat.' Solution: The requirements of the CHRMAP process, state that community valuing and feedback is required in order to be successful. The CHRMAP needs to be updated to reflect what is important to the community by adhering to the Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report. Changing valuable assets to the community, such as properties and beaches, to "PROTECT".	The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops were undertaken to provide the opportunity for the community to identify and prioritise assets and values of importance to them in the coastal zone. The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops also explained the Coastal Adaptation Types and provided the opportunity for the community participants to suggest adaptation measures for each adaptation type. This provided information for the consultant to identify the long term adaptation pathway for the assets and values in the coastal zone.	Note the submission
				See attached Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report October 2017 Summary Page 2-Section 2.1 Purpose "The severity of erosion and inundation impact along Geraldton's coastal areas is determined by a range of factors, and over the next 100-years the coastal region is projected to experience adverse effects from coastal hazard impact at some time." The factors used in this calculation need to be defined. Does it take into account sand replenishing, man made modifications ect. Responsibility for increased erosion has been admitted by the ports. The Geraldton Guardian has also claimed the city is also responsible for the increased erosion due to the works at the foreshore. Is this part of the calculation?	The factors used in the calculation are for coastal erosion and coastal inundation are identified in State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. In additional the Geraldton CHRMAP Report takes into account existing treatments such as the Northern Beaches Stabilisation Programme (NBSP) sand by-passing works undertaken each year by the Port Authority. The Beresford Foreshore project coastal protection structures have been designed not to interrupt the sediment flow northwards from Beresford	Note the submission
				There is sufficient justification to have the properties and community areas classified as "PROTECT" rather than the proposed "Accomodate/Managed Retreat" in Sunset Beach. The costs of managed retreat would amount to \$35,760,000 = (149 homes x \$240,000 (median reported house price per this report) This is the lowest cost as homes located next to the ocean are valued higher. The Adaptation recommendation "Section 70a notification on Title" would devalue 149 residential properties within Sunset Beach, effecting the resale value. "PROTECT" Adaptation options have been provided at a significantly lower cost to other Coastal Management Units. Not exceeding 4 million dollars. This would also remove the need to add "Section 70a notification on Title" saving millions to home owners. Refer to Technical Appendices- Table 3-2 "Cost estimates for adaptation options"	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note the submission
				The Adaptation plans per the report ("Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017") were as follows: Sunset Beach houses - Protect- Seawall, artificial reef, sand nourishment, dune rehabilitation, Geotextile containers.	Noted. These, and other adaptation options were assessed by the consultant to identify sustainable long term adaptation pathways for the assets and values in the coastal zone.	Note the submission
				Page 105 -15.1.3 Managed Retreat Pathway Out of the three pathways for managed retreat, in all cases, protect is the least costly and damaging to the city. The First Option "Do Nothing" will incur reputation damage and legal costs to the city. This will detour tourism and investors from coming to Geraldton. Without a legal precedent, legal counsel will need to be sought out, incurring more costs without any benefit to the community. The Second Option "Planned Retreat" the City would be required to reserve funds to acquire the properties before or at the time of the erosion trigger. Costing over \$35,760,000 for Sunset Beach alone. The Third Option "Protect" has been identified to have the least cost. risk and the biggest reward to the community and stakeholders. The community has recommended a proactive approach to protect the properties and beaches. This would ensure the best benefit to the City of Greater Geraldton, encouraging tourism, investments and showing everyone in WA that Geraldton cares about it's residents	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note the submission
				I would like my property protected with a proactive approach	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission

Submission Information				Submission and Comment		
ID	Received	Responded	Submitter	Comment Submission	CGG Comment	Recommendation
53	28/08/2018	30/08/2018	Private submission	<p>3.1.2 Community Coastal Planning Survey and Workshops Page 7. The attached report (Appendix A.2) does not reflect what was reported in "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017. The beach and residential properties in Kempton Street are highly valued by the community. In the "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017", it was identified that the loss of residential property and community areas would have a catastrophic impact. The results of the workshop were to 'Protect' Kempton Street properties and many of the other properties and beaches that the CHRMAP has changed to 'managed retreat.' Solution: The requirements of the CHRMAP process, state that community valuing and feedback is required in order to be successful. The CHRMAP needs to be updated to reflect what is important to the community by adhering to the Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report. Changing valuable assets to the community, such as properties and beaches, to "PROTECT".</p> <p>See attached Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report October 2017 Summary Page 2-Section 2.1 Purpose "The severity of erosion and inundation impact along Geraldton's coastal areas is determined by a range of factors, and over the next 100-years the coastal region is projected to experience adverse effects from coastal hazard impact at some time." The factors used in this calculation need to be defined. Does it take into account sand replenishing, man made modifications ect. Responsibility for increased erosion has been admitted by the ports. The Geraldton Guardian has also claimed the city is also responsible for the increased erosion due to the works at the foreshore. Is this part of the calculation?</p> <p>There is sufficient justification to have the properties and community areas classified as "PROTECT" rather than the proposed "Accomodate/Managed Retreat" in Sunset Beach. The costs of managed retreat would amount to \$35,760,000 = (149 homes x \$240,000 (median reported house price per this report) This is the lowest cost as homes located next to the ocean are valued higher. The Adaptation recommendation "Section 70a notification on Title" would devalue 149 residential properties within Sunset Beach, effecting the resale value. "PROTECT" Adaptation options have been provided at a significantly lower cost to other Coastal Management Units. Not exceeding 4 million dollars. This would also remove the need to add "Section 70a notification on Title" saving millions to home owners. Refer to Technical Appendices- Table 3-2 "Cost estimates for adaptation options"</p> <p>The Adaptation plans per the report ("Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017") were as follows: Sunset Beach houses - Protect- Seawall, artificial reef, sand nourishment, dune rehabilitation, Geotextile containers.</p> <p>Page 105 -15.1.3 Managed Retreat Pathway Out of the three pathways for managed retreat, in all cases, protect is the least costly and damaging to the city. The First Option "Do Nothing" will incur reputation damage and legal costs to the city. This will detour tourism and investors from coming to Geraldton. Without a legal precedent, legal counsel will need to be sought out, incurring more costs without any benefit to the community. The Second Option 'Planned Retreat' the City would be required to reserve funds to acquire the properties before or at the time of the erosion trigger. Costing over \$35,760,000 for Sunset Beach alone. The Third Option "Protect" has been identified to have the least cost. risk and the biggest reward to the community and stakeholders. The community has recommended a proactive approach to protect the properties and beaches. This would ensure the best benefit to the City of Greater Geraldton, encouraging tourism, investments and showing everyone in WA that Geraldton cares about it's residents</p>	<p>The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops were undertaken to provide the opportunity for the community to identify and prioritise assets and values of importance to them in the coastal zone. The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops also explained the Coastal Adaptation Types and provided the opportunity for the community participants to suggest adaptation measures for each adaptation type. This provided information for the consultant to identify the long term adaptation pathway for the assets and values in the coastal zone.</p> <p>The factors used in the calculation are for coastal erosion and coastal inundation are identified in State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. In additional the Geraldton CHRMAP Report takes into account existing treatments such as the Northern Beaches Stabilisation Programme (NBSP) sand by-passing works undertaken each year by the Port Authority. The Beresford Foreshore project coastal protection structures have been designed not to interrupt the sediment flow northwards from Beresford</p> <p>The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.</p> <p>Noted. These, and other adaptation options were assessed by the consultant to identify sustainable long term adaptation pathways for the assets and values in the coastal zone.</p> <p>The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.</p>	<p>Note the submission</p> <p>Note the submission</p> <p>Note the submission</p> <p>Note the submission</p> <p>Note the submission</p>
54	28/08/2018	30/08/2018	Private submission	<p>3.1.2 Community Coastal Planning Survey and Workshops Page 7. The attached report (Appendix A.2) does not reflect what was reported in "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017. The beach and residential properties in Kempton Street are highly valued by the community. In the "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017", it was identified that the loss of residential property and community areas would have a catastrophic impact. The results of the workshop were to 'Protect' Kempton Street properties and many of the other properties and beaches that the CHRMAP has changed to 'managed retreat.' Solution: The requirements of the CHRMAP process, state that community valuing and feedback is required in order to be successful. The CHRMAP needs to be updated to reflect what is important to the community by adhering to the Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report. Changing valuable assets to the community, such as properties and beaches, to "PROTECT".</p> <p>See attached Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report October 2017 Summary Page 2-Section 2.1 Purpose "The severity of erosion and inundation impact along Geraldton's coastal areas is determined by a range of factors, and over the next 100-years the coastal region is projected to experience adverse effects from coastal hazard impact at some time." The factors used in this calculation need to be defined. Does it take into account sand replenishing, man made modifications ect. Responsibility for increased erosion has been admitted by the ports. The Geraldton Guardian has also claimed the city is also responsible for the increased erosion due to the works at the foreshore. Is this part of the calculation?</p> <p>There is sufficient justification to have the properties and community areas classified as "PROTECT" rather than the proposed "Accomodate/Managed Retreat" in Sunset Beach. The costs of managed retreat would amount to \$35,760,000 = (149 homes x \$240,000 (median reported house price per this report) This is the lowest cost as homes located next to the ocean are valued higher. The Adaptation recommendation "Section 70a notification on Title" would devalue 149 residential properties within Sunset Beach, effecting the resale value. "PROTECT" Adaptation options have been provided at a significantly lower cost to other Coastal Management Units. Not exceeding 4 million dollars. This would also remove the need to add "Section 70a notification on Title" saving millions to home owners. Refer to Technical Appendices- Table 3-2 "Cost estimates for adaptation options"</p> <p>The Adaptation plans per the report ("Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017") were as follows: Sunset Beach houses - Protect- Seawall, artificial reef, sand nourishment, dune rehabilitation, Geotextile containers.</p> <p>Page 105 -15.1.3 Managed Retreat Pathway Out of the three pathways for managed retreat, in all cases, protect is the least costly and damaging to the city. The First Option "Do Nothing" will incur reputation damage and legal costs to the city. This will detour tourism and investors from coming to Geraldton. Without a legal precedent, legal counsel will need to be sought out, incurring more costs without any benefit to the community. The Second Option 'Planned Retreat' the City would be required to reserve funds to acquire the properties before or at the time of the erosion trigger. Costing over \$35,760,000 for Sunset Beach alone. The Third Option "Protect" has been identified to have the least cost. risk and the biggest reward to the community and stakeholders. The community has recommended a proactive approach to protect the properties and beaches. This would ensure the best benefit to the City of Greater Geraldton, encouraging tourism, investments and showing everyone in WA that Geraldton cares about it's residents</p> <p>Any work on the coast should be done by coastal engineers not civil engineers</p> <p>A precedence has already been set by protecting coastal land in the Beresford Area</p> <p>Sandbagging should be used instead of rocks in all areas protected</p>	<p>The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops were undertaken to provide the opportunity for the community to identify and prioritise assets and values of importance to them in the coastal zone. The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops also explained the Coastal Adaptation Types and provided the opportunity for the community participants to suggest adaptation measures for each adaptation type. This provided information for the consultant to identify the long term adaptation pathway for the assets and values in the coastal zone.</p> <p>The factors used in the calculation are for coastal erosion and coastal inundation are identified in State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. In additional the Geraldton CHRMAP Report takes into account existing treatments such as the Northern Beaches Stabilisation Programme (NBSP) sand by-passing works undertaken each year by the Port Authority. The Beresford Foreshore project coastal protection structures have been designed not to interrupt the sediment flow northwards from Beresford</p> <p>The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.</p> <p>Noted. These, and other adaptation options were assessed by the consultant to identify sustainable long term adaptation pathways for the assets and values in the coastal zone.</p> <p>The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.</p> <p>Acknowledgement of submission</p> <p>In line with State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy, the Beresford Foreshore Project, as new coastal protection works has progressed only after all other options for avoiding and adapting to coastal hazards had been fully explored, as part of a comprehensive coastal hazard risk management process</p> <p>Acknowledgement of submission</p>	<p>Note the submission</p> <p>Note the submission</p> <p>Note the submission</p> <p>Note the submission</p> <p>Note the submission</p> <p>Note the submission</p> <p>Note the submission</p>
55	28/08/2018	30/08/2018	Private submission	<p>3.1.2 Community Coastal Planning Survey and Workshops Page 7. The attached report (Appendix A.2) does not reflect what was reported in "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017. The beach and residential properties in Kempton Street are highly valued by the community. In the "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017", it was identified that the loss of residential property and community areas would have a catastrophic impact. The results of the workshop were to 'Protect' Kempton Street properties and many of the other properties and beaches that the CHRMAP has changed to 'managed retreat.' Solution: The requirements of the CHRMAP process, state that community valuing and feedback is required in order to be successful. The CHRMAP needs to be updated to reflect what is important to the community by adhering to the Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report. Changing valuable assets to the community, such as properties and beaches, to "PROTECT".</p> <p>See attached Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report October 2017 Summary Page 2-Section 2.1 Purpose "The severity of erosion and inundation impact along Geraldton's coastal areas is determined by a range of factors, and over the next 100-years the coastal region is projected to experience adverse effects from coastal hazard impact at some time." The factors used in this calculation need to be defined. Does it take into account sand replenishing, man made modifications ect. Responsibility for increased erosion has been admitted by the ports. The Geraldton Guardian has also claimed the city is also responsible for the increased erosion due to the works at the foreshore. Is this part of the calculation?</p> <p>There is sufficient justification to have the properties and community areas classified as "PROTECT" rather than the proposed "Accomodate/Managed Retreat" in Sunset Beach. The costs of managed retreat would amount to \$35,760,000 = (149 homes x \$240,000 (median reported house price per this report) This is the lowest cost as homes located next to the ocean are valued higher. The Adaptation recommendation "Section 70a notification on Title" would devalue 149 residential properties within Sunset Beach, effecting the resale value. "PROTECT" Adaptation options have been provided at a significantly lower cost to other Coastal Management Units. Not exceeding 4 million dollars. This would also remove the need to add "Section 70a notification on Title" saving millions to home owners. Refer to Technical Appendices- Table 3-2 "Cost estimates for adaptation options"</p> <p>The Adaptation plans per the report ("Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017") were as follows: Sunset Beach houses - Protect- Seawall, artificial reef, sand nourishment, dune rehabilitation, Geotextile containers.</p> <p>Page 105 -15.1.3 Managed Retreat Pathway Out of the three pathways for managed retreat, in all cases, protect is the least costly and damaging to the city. The First Option "Do Nothing" will incur reputation damage and legal costs to the city. This will detour tourism and investors from coming to Geraldton. Without a legal precedent, legal counsel will need to be sought out, incurring more costs without any benefit to the community. The Second Option 'Planned Retreat' the City would be required to reserve funds to acquire the properties before or at the time of the erosion trigger. Costing over \$35,760,000 for Sunset Beach alone. The Third Option "Protect" has been identified to have the least cost. risk and the biggest reward to the community and stakeholders. The community has recommended a proactive approach to protect the properties and beaches. This would ensure the best benefit to the City of Greater Geraldton, encouraging tourism, investments and showing everyone in WA that Geraldton cares about it's residents</p>	<p>The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops were undertaken to provide the opportunity for the community to identify and prioritise assets and values of importance to them in the coastal zone. The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops also explained the Coastal Adaptation Types and provided the opportunity for the community participants to suggest adaptation measures for each adaptation type. This provided information for the consultant to identify the long term adaptation pathway for the assets and values in the coastal zone.</p> <p>The factors used in the calculation are for coastal erosion and coastal inundation are identified in State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. In additional the Geraldton CHRMAP Report takes into account existing treatments such as the Northern Beaches Stabilisation Programme (NBSP) sand by-passing works undertaken each year by the Port Authority. The Beresford Foreshore project coastal protection structures have been designed not to interrupt the sediment flow northwards from Beresford</p> <p>The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.</p> <p>Noted. These, and other adaptation options were assessed by the consultant to identify sustainable long term adaptation pathways for the assets and values in the coastal zone.</p> <p>The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.</p>	<p>Note the submission</p> <p>Note the submission</p> <p>Note the submission</p> <p>Note the submission</p>
56	28/08/2018	30/08/2018	Private submission	<p>3.1.2 Community Coastal Planning Survey and Workshops Page 7. The attached report (Appendix A.2) does not reflect what was reported in "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017. The beach and residential properties in Kempton Street are highly valued by the community. In the "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017", it was identified that the loss of residential property and community areas would have a catastrophic impact. The results of the workshop were to 'Protect' Kempton Street properties and many of the other properties and beaches that the CHRMAP has changed to 'managed retreat.' Solution: The requirements of the CHRMAP process, state that community valuing and feedback is required in order to be successful. The CHRMAP needs to be updated to reflect what is important to the community by adhering to the Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report. Changing valuable assets to the community, such as properties and beaches, to "PROTECT".</p> <p>See attached Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report October 2017 Summary Page 2-Section 2.1 Purpose "The severity of erosion and inundation impact along Geraldton's coastal areas is determined by a range of factors, and over the next 100-years the coastal region is projected to experience adverse effects from coastal hazard impact at some time." The factors used in this calculation need to be defined. Does it take into account sand replenishing, man made modifications ect. Responsibility for increased erosion has been admitted by the ports. The Geraldton Guardian has also claimed the city is also responsible for the increased erosion due to the works at the foreshore. Is this part of the calculation?</p>	<p>The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops were undertaken to provide the opportunity for the community to identify and prioritise assets and values of importance to them in the coastal zone. The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops also explained the Coastal Adaptation Types and provided the opportunity for the community participants to suggest adaptation measures for each adaptation type. This provided information for the consultant to identify the long term adaptation pathway for the assets and values in the coastal zone.</p> <p>The factors used in the calculation are for coastal erosion and coastal inundation are identified in State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. In additional the Geraldton CHRMAP Report takes into account existing treatments such as the Northern Beaches Stabilisation Programme (NBSP) sand by-passing works undertaken each year by the Port Authority. The Beresford Foreshore project coastal protection structures have been designed not to interrupt the sediment flow northwards from Beresford</p>	<p>Note the submission</p> <p>Note the submission</p>



Submission Information				Submission and Comment		
ID	Received	Responded	Submitter	Comment Submission	CGG Comment	Recommendation
				<p>There is sufficient justification to have the properties and community areas classified as "PROTECT" rather than the proposed "Accomodate/Managed Retreat" in Sunset Beach. The costs of managed retreat would amount to \$35,760,000 = (149 homes x \$240,000 (median reported house price per this report) This is the lowest cost as homes located next to the ocean are valued higher. The Adaptation recommendation "Section 70a notification on Title" would devalue 149 residential properties within Sunset Beach, effecting the resale value. "PROTECT" Adaptation options have been provided at a significantly lower cost to other Coastal Management Units. Not exceeding 4 million dollars. This would also remove the need to add "Section 70a notification on Title" saving millions to home owners. Refer to Technical Appendices- Table 3-2 "Cost estimates for adaptation options"</p> <p>The Adaptation plans per the report ("Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017") were as follows: Sunset Beach houses - Protect- Seawall, artificial reef, sand nourishment, dune rehabilitation, Geotextile containers.</p> <p>Page 105 -15.1.3 Managed Retreat Pathway Out of the three pathways for managed retreat, in all cases, protect is the least costly and damaging to the city. The First Option "Do Nothing" will incur reputation damage and legal costs to the city. This will detour tourism and investors from coming to Geraldton. Without a legal precedent, legal counsel will need to be sought out, incurring more costs without any benefit to the community. The Second Option 'Planned Retreat' the City would be required to reserve funds to acquire the properties before or at the time of the erosion trigger. Costing over \$35,760,000 for Sunset Beach alone. The Third Option "Protect" has been identified to have the least cost. risk and the biggest reward to the community and stakeholders. The community has recommended a proactive approach to protect the properties and beaches. This would ensure the best benefit to the City of Greater Geraldton, encouraging tourism, investments and showing everyone in WA that Geraldton cares about it's residents</p>	<p>The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.</p> <p>Noted. These, and other adaptation options were assessed by the consultant to identify sustainable long term adaptation pathways for the assets and values in the coastal zone.</p> <p>The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.</p>	<p>Note the submission</p> <p>Note the submission</p>
57	28/08/2018	30/08/2018	Private submission (x2)	<p>3.1.2 Community Coastal Planning Survey and Workshops Page 7. The attached report (Appendix A.2) does not reflect what was reported in "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report,October 2017. The beach and residential properties in Kempton Street are highly valued by the community. In the "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report,October 2017", it was identified that the loss of residential property and community areas would have a catastrophic impact. The results of the workshop were to 'Protect' Kempton Street properties and many of the other properties and beaches that the CHRMAP has changed to 'managed retreat.' Solution: The requirements of the CHRMAP process, state that community valuing and feedback is required in order to be successful. The CHRMAP needs to be updated to reflect what is important to the community by adhering to the Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report. Changing valuable assets to the community, such as properties and beaches, to "PROTECT".</p> <p>See attached Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report October 2017 Summary Page 2-Section 2.1 Purpose "The severity of erosion and inundation impact along Geraldton's coastal areas is determined by a range of factors, and over the next 100-years the coastal region is projected to experience adverse effects from coastal hazard impact at some time." The factors used in this calculation need to be defined. Does it take into account sand replenishing, man made modifications ect. Responsibility for increased erosion has been admitted by the ports. The Geraldton Guardian has also claimed the city is also responsible for the increased erosion due to the works at the foreshore. Is this part of the calculation?</p> <p>There is sufficient justification to have the properties and community areas classified as "PROTECT" rather than the proposed "Accomodate/Managed Retreat" in Sunset Beach. The costs of managed retreat would amount to \$35,760,000 = (149 homes x \$240,000 (median reported house price per this report) This is the lowest cost as homes located next to the ocean are valued higher. The Adaptation recommendation "Section 70a notification on Title" would devalue 149 residential properties within Sunset Beach, effecting the resale value. "PROTECT" Adaptation options have been provided at a significantly lower cost to other Coastal Management Units. Not exceeding 4 million dollars. This would also remove the need to add "Section 70a notification on Title" saving millions to home owners. Refer to Technical Appendices- Table 3-2 "Cost estimates for adaptation options"</p> <p>The Adaptation plans per the report ("Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017") were as follows: Sunset Beach houses - Protect- Seawall, artificial reef, sand nourishment, dune rehabilitation, Geotextile containers.</p> <p>Page 105 -15.1.3 Managed Retreat Pathway Out of the three pathways for managed retreat, in all cases, protect is the least costly and damaging to the city. The First Option "Do Nothing" will incur reputation damage and legal costs to the city. This will detour tourism and investors from coming to Geraldton. Without a legal precedent, legal counsel will need to be sought out, incurring more costs without any benefit to the community. The Second Option 'Planned Retreat' the City would be required to reserve funds to acquire the properties before or at the time of the erosion trigger. Costing over \$35,760,000 for Sunset Beach alone. The Third Option "Protect" has been identified to have the least cost. risk and the biggest reward to the community and stakeholders. The community has recommended a proactive approach to protect the properties and beaches. This would ensure the best benefit to the City of Greater Geraldton, encouraging tourism, investments and showing everyone in WA that Geraldton cares about it's residents</p> <p>We relocated to Geraldton in 2012 and have invested in the City, choosing to raise our children and purchase our family home in Sunstet Beach. WE made a commitment to Geraldton in good faith and we urge you to take a proactive approach to the northern beaches erosion issue. Sitting back and "Doing Nothin" or managing a "Planned Retreat" is not an option for the Sunset Beach residents. We implore you to use the expertise and facilities that you have at your disposal to "Protect" our community and our investment</p>	<p>The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops were undertaken to provide the opportunity for the community to identify and prioritise assets and values of importance to them in the coastal zone. The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops also explained the Coastal Adaptation Types and provided the opportunity for the community participants to suggest adaptation measures for each adaptation type. This provided information for the consultant to identify the long term adaptation pathway for the assets and values in the coastal zone.</p> <p>The factors used in the calculation are for coastal erosion and coastal inundation are identified in State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. In additional the Geraldton CHRMAP Report takes into account existing treatments such as the Northern Beaches Stabilisation Programme (NBSP) sand by-passing works undertaken each year by the Port Authority. The Beresford Foreshore project coastal protection structures have been designed not to interrupt the sediment flow northwards from Beresford</p> <p>The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.</p> <p>Noted. These, and other adaptation options were assessed by the consultant to identify sustainable long term adaptation pathways for the assets and values in the coastal zone.</p> <p>The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.</p> <p>Acknowledgement of submission</p>	<p>Note the submission</p> <p>Note the submission</p> <p>Note the submission</p> <p>Note the submission</p> <p>Note the submission</p>
58	28/08/2018	30/08/2018	Private submission	<p>3.1.2 Community Coastal Planning Survey and Workshops Page 7. The attached report (Appendix A.2) does not reflect what was reported in "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report,October 2017. The beach and residential properties in Kempton Street are highly valued by the community. In the "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report,October 2017", it was identified that the loss of residential property and community areas would have a catastrophic impact. The results of the workshop were to 'Protect' Kempton Street properties and many of the other properties and beaches that the CHRMAP has changed to 'managed retreat.' Solution: The requirements of the CHRMAP process, state that community valuing and feedback is required in order to be successful. The CHRMAP needs to be updated to reflect what is important to the community by adhering to the Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report. Changing valuable assets to the community, such as properties and beaches, to "PROTECT".</p> <p>See attached Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report October 2017 Summary Page 2-Section 2.1 Purpose "The severity of erosion and inundation impact along Geraldton's coastal areas is determined by a range of factors, and over the next 100-years the coastal region is projected to experience adverse effects from coastal hazard impact at some time." The factors used in this calculation need to be defined. Does it take into account sand replenishing, man made modifications ect. Responsibility for increased erosion has been admitted by the ports. The Geraldton Guardian has also claimed the city is also responsible for the increased erosion due to the works at the foreshore. Is this part of the calculation?</p> <p>There is sufficient justification to have the properties and community areas classified as "PROTECT" rather than the proposed "Accomodate/Managed Retreat" in Sunset Beach. The costs of managed retreat would amount to \$35,760,000 = (149 homes x \$240,000 (median reported house price per this report) This is the lowest cost as homes located next to the ocean are valued higher. The Adaptation recommendation "Section 70a notification on Title" would devalue 149 residential properties within Sunset Beach, effecting the resale value. "PROTECT" Adaptation options have been provided at a significantly lower cost to other Coastal Management Units. Not exceeding 4 million dollars. This would also remove the need to add "Section 70a notification on Title" saving millions to home owners. Refer to Technical Appendices- Table 3-2 "Cost estimates for adaptation options"</p> <p>The Adaptation plans per the report ("Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017") were as follows: Sunset Beach houses - Protect- Seawall, artificial reef, sand nourishment, dune rehabilitation, Geotextile containers.</p> <p>Page 105 -15.1.3 Managed Retreat Pathway Out of the three pathways for managed retreat, in all cases, protect is the least costly and damaging to the city. The First Option "Do Nothing" will incur reputation damage and legal costs to the city. This will detour tourism and investors from coming to Geraldton. Without a legal precedent, legal counsel will need to be sought out, incurring more costs without any benefit to the community. The Second Option 'Planned Retreat' the City would be required to reserve funds to acquire the properties before or at the time of the erosion trigger. Costing over \$35,760,000 for Sunset Beach alone. The Third Option "Protect" has been identified to have the least cost. risk and the biggest reward to the community and stakeholders. The community has recommended a proactive approach to protect the properties and beaches. This would ensure the best benefit to the City of Greater Geraldton, encouraging tourism, investments and showing everyone in WA that Geraldton cares about it's residents</p> <p>"PROTECT"</p>	<p>The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops were undertaken to provide the opportunity for the community to identify and prioritise assets and values of importance to them in the coastal zone. The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops also explained the Coastal Adaptation Types and provided the opportunity for the community participants to suggest adaptation measures for each adaptation type. This provided information for the consultant to identify the long term adaptation pathway for the assets and values in the coastal zone.</p> <p>The factors used in the calculation are for coastal erosion and coastal inundation are identified in State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. In additional the Geraldton CHRMAP Report takes into account existing treatments such as the Northern Beaches Stabilisation Programme (NBSP) sand by-passing works undertaken each year by the Port Authority. The Beresford Foreshore project coastal protection structures have been designed not to interrupt the sediment flow northwards from Beresford</p> <p>The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.</p> <p>Noted. These, and other adaptation options were assessed by the consultant to identify sustainable long term adaptation pathways for the assets and values in the coastal zone.</p> <p>The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.</p> <p>Acknowledgement of submission</p>	<p>Note the submission</p> <p>Note the submission</p> <p>Note the submission</p> <p>Note the submission</p> <p>Note the submission</p>
59	28/08/2018	30/08/2018	Private submission	<p>3.1.2 Community Coastal Planning Survey and Workshops Page 7. The attached report (Appendix A.2) does not reflect what was reported in "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report,October 2017. The beach and residential properties in Kempton Street are highly valued by the community. In the "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report,October 2017", it was identified that the loss of residential property and community areas would have a catastrophic impact. The results of the workshop were to 'Protect' Kempton Street properties and many of the other properties and beaches that the CHRMAP has changed to 'managed retreat.' Solution: The requirements of the CHRMAP process, state that community valuing and feedback is required in order to be successful. The CHRMAP needs to be updated to reflect what is important to the community by adhering to the Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report. Changing valuable assets to the community, such as properties and beaches, to "PROTECT".</p> <p>See attached Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report October 2017 Summary Page 2-Section 2.1 Purpose "The severity of erosion and inundation impact along Geraldton's coastal areas is determined by a range of factors, and over the next 100-years the coastal region is projected to experience adverse effects from coastal hazard impact at some time." The factors used in this calculation need to be defined. Does it take into account sand replenishing, man made modifications ect. Responsibility for increased erosion has been admitted by the ports. The Geraldton Guardian has also claimed the city is also responsible for the increased erosion due to the works at the foreshore. Is this part of the calculation?</p> <p>There is sufficient justification to have the properties and community areas classified as "PROTECT" rather than the proposed "Accomodate/Managed Retreat" in Sunset Beach. The costs of managed retreat would amount to \$35,760,000 = (149 homes x \$240,000 (median reported house price per this report) This is the lowest cost as homes located next to the ocean are valued higher. The Adaptation recommendation "Section 70a notification on Title" would devalue 149 residential properties within Sunset Beach, effecting the resale value. "PROTECT" Adaptation options have been provided at a significantly lower cost to other Coastal Management Units. Not exceeding 4 million dollars. This would also remove the need to add "Section 70a notification on Title" saving millions to home owners. Refer to Technical Appendices- Table 3-2 "Cost estimates for adaptation options"</p> <p>The Adaptation plans per the report ("Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017") were as follows: Sunset Beach houses - Protect- Seawall, artificial reef, sand nourishment, dune rehabilitation, Geotextile containers.</p> <p>Page 105 -15.1.3 Managed Retreat Pathway Out of the three pathways for managed retreat, in all cases, protect is the least costly and damaging to the city. The First Option "Do Nothing" will incur reputation damage and legal costs to the city. This will detour tourism and investors from coming to Geraldton. Without a legal precedent, legal counsel will need to be sought out, incurring more costs without any benefit to the community. The Second Option 'Planned Retreat' the City would be required to reserve funds to acquire the properties before or at the time of the erosion trigger. Costing over \$35,760,000 for Sunset Beach alone. The Third Option "Protect" has been identified to have the least cost. risk and the biggest reward to the community and stakeholders. The community has recommended a proactive approach to protect the properties and beaches. This would ensure the best benefit to the City of Greater Geraldton, encouraging tourism, investments and showing everyone in WA that Geraldton cares about it's residents</p>	<p>The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops were undertaken to provide the opportunity for the community to identify and prioritise assets and values of importance to them in the coastal zone. The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops also explained the Coastal Adaptation Types and provided the opportunity for the community participants to suggest adaptation measures for each adaptation type. This provided information for the consultant to identify the long term adaptation pathway for the assets and values in the coastal zone.</p> <p>The factors used in the calculation are for coastal erosion and coastal inundation are identified in State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. In additional the Geraldton CHRMAP Report takes into account existing treatments such as the Northern Beaches Stabilisation Programme (NBSP) sand by-passing works undertaken each year by the Port Authority. The Beresford Foreshore project coastal protection structures have been designed not to interrupt the sediment flow northwards from Beresford</p> <p>The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.</p> <p>Noted. These, and other adaptation options were assessed by the consultant to identify sustainable long term adaptation pathways for the assets and values in the coastal zone.</p> <p>The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.</p>	<p>Note the submission</p> <p>Note the submission</p> <p>Note the submission</p> <p>Note the submission</p> <p>Note the submission</p>



Submission Information				Submission and Comment		
ID	Received	Responded	Submitter	Comment Submission	CGG Comment	Recommendation
60	28/08/2018	30/08/2018	Private submission	<p>3.1.2 Community Coastal Planning Survey and Workshops Page 7. The attached report (Appendix A.2) does not reflect what was reported in "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017. The beach and residential properties in Kempton Street are highly valued by the community. In the "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017", it was identified that the loss of residential property and community areas would have a catastrophic impact. The results of the workshop were to 'Protect' Kempton Street properties and many of the other properties and beaches that the CHRMAP has changed to 'managed retreat.' Solution: The requirements of the CHRMAP process, state that community valuing and feedback is required in order to be successful. The CHRMAP needs to be updated to reflect what is important to the community by adhering to the Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report. Changing valuable assets to the community, such as properties and beaches, to "PROTECT".</p> <p>See attached Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report October 2017 Summary Page 2-Section 2.1 Purpose "The severity of erosion and inundation impact along Geraldton's coastal areas is determined by a range of factors, and over the next 100-years the coastal region is projected to experience adverse effects from coastal hazard impact at some time." The factors used in this calculation need to be defined. Does it take into account sand replenishing, man made modifications ect. Responsibility for increased erosion has been admitted by the ports. The Geraldton Guardian has also claimed the city is also responsible for the increased erosion due to the works at the foreshore. Is this part of the calculation?</p> <p>There is sufficient justification to have the properties and community areas classified as "PROTECT" rather than the proposed "Accomodate/Managed Retreat" in Sunset Beach. The costs of managed retreat would amount to \$35,760,000 = (149 homes x \$240,000 (median reported house price per this report) This is the lowest cost as homes located next to the ocean are valued higher. The Adaptation recommendation "Section 70a notification on Title" would devalue 149 residential properties within Sunset Beach, effecting the resale value. "PROTECT" Adaptation options have been provided at a significantly lower cost to other Coastal Management Units. Not exceeding 4 million dollars. This would also remove the need to add "Section 70a notification on Title" saving millions to home owners. Refer to Technical Appendices- Table 3-2 "Cost estimates for adaptation options"</p> <p>The Adaptation plans per the report ("Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017") were as follows: Sunset Beach houses - Protect- Seawall, artificial reef, sand nourishment, dune rehabilitation, Geotextile containers.</p> <p>Page 105 -15.1.3 Managed Retreat Pathway Out of the three pathways for managed retreat, in all cases, protect is the least costly and damaging to the city. The First Option "Do Nothing" will incur reputation damage and legal costs to the city. This will detour tourism and investors from coming to Geraldton. Without a legal precedent, legal counsel will need to be sought out, incurring more costs without any benefit to the community. The Second Option 'Planned Retreat' the City would be required to reserve funds to acquire the properties before or at the time of the erosion trigger. Costing over \$35,760,000 for Sunset Beach alone. The Third Option "Protect" has been identified to have the least cost. risk and the biggest reward to the community and stakeholders. The community has recommended a proactive approach to protect the properties and beaches. This would ensure the best benefit to the City of Greater Geraldton, encouraging tourism, investments and showing everyone in WA that Geraldton cares about it's residents</p>	<p>The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops were undertaken to provide the opportunity for the community to identify and prioritise assets and values of importance to them in the coastal zone. The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops also explained the Coastal Adaptation Types and provided the opportunity for the community participants to suggest adaptation measures for each adaptation type. This provided information for the consultant to identify the long term adaptation pathway for the assets and values in the coastal zone.</p> <p>The factors used in the calculation are for coastal erosion and coastal inundation are identified in State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. In addition the Geraldton CHRMAP Report takes into account existing treatments such as the Northern Beaches Stabilisation Programme (NBSP) sand by-passing works undertaken each year by the Port Authority. The Beresford Foreshore project coastal protection structures have been designed not to interrupt the sediment flow northwards from Beresford</p> <p>The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.</p> <p>Noted. These, and other adaptation options were assessed by the consultant to identify sustainable long term adaptation pathways for the assets and values in the coastal zone.</p> <p>The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.</p>	<p>Note the submission</p> <p>Note the submission</p> <p>Note the submission</p> <p>Note the submission</p> <p>Note the submission</p>
61	28/08/2018	30/08/2018	Private submission	<p>3.1.2 Community Coastal Planning Survey and Workshops Page 7. The attached report (Appendix A.2) does not reflect what was reported in "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017. The beach and residential properties in Kempton Street are highly valued by the community. In the "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017", it was identified that the loss of residential property and community areas would have a catastrophic impact. The results of the workshop were to 'Protect' Kempton Street properties and many of the other properties and beaches that the CHRMAP has changed to 'managed retreat.' Solution: The requirements of the CHRMAP process, state that community valuing and feedback is required in order to be successful. The CHRMAP needs to be updated to reflect what is important to the community by adhering to the Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report. Changing valuable assets to the community, such as properties and beaches, to "PROTECT".</p> <p>See attached Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report October 2017 Summary Page 2-Section 2.1 Purpose "The severity of erosion and inundation impact along Geraldton's coastal areas is determined by a range of factors, and over the next 100-years the coastal region is projected to experience adverse effects from coastal hazard impact at some time." The factors used in this calculation need to be defined. Does it take into account sand replenishing, man made modifications ect. Responsibility for increased erosion has been admitted by the ports. The Geraldton Guardian has also claimed the city is also responsible for the increased erosion due to the works at the foreshore. Is this part of the calculation?</p> <p>There is sufficient justification to have the properties and community areas classified as "PROTECT" rather than the proposed "Accomodate/Managed Retreat" in Sunset Beach. The costs of managed retreat would amount to \$35,760,000 = (149 homes x \$240,000 (median reported house price per this report) This is the lowest cost as homes located next to the ocean are valued higher. The Adaptation recommendation "Section 70a notification on Title" would devalue 149 residential properties within Sunset Beach, effecting the resale value. "PROTECT" Adaptation options have been provided at a significantly lower cost to other Coastal Management Units. Not exceeding 4 million dollars. This would also remove the need to add "Section 70a notification on Title" saving millions to home owners. Refer to Technical Appendices- Table 3-2 "Cost estimates for adaptation options"</p> <p>The Adaptation plans per the report ("Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017") were as follows: Sunset Beach houses - Protect- Seawall, artificial reef, sand nourishment, dune rehabilitation, Geotextile containers.</p> <p>Page 105 -15.1.3 Managed Retreat Pathway Out of the three pathways for managed retreat, in all cases, protect is the least costly and damaging to the city. The First Option "Do Nothing" will incur reputation damage and legal costs to the city. This will detour tourism and investors from coming to Geraldton. Without a legal precedent, legal counsel will need to be sought out, incurring more costs without any benefit to the community. The Second Option 'Planned Retreat' the City would be required to reserve funds to acquire the properties before or at the time of the erosion trigger. Costing over \$35,760,000 for Sunset Beach alone. The Third Option "Protect" has been identified to have the least cost. risk and the biggest reward to the community and stakeholders. The community has recommended a proactive approach to protect the properties and beaches. This would ensure the best benefit to the City of Greater Geraldton, encouraging tourism, investments and showing everyone in WA that Geraldton cares about it's residents</p>	<p>The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops were undertaken to provide the opportunity for the community to identify and prioritise assets and values of importance to them in the coastal zone. The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops also explained the Coastal Adaptation Types and provided the opportunity for the community participants to suggest adaptation measures for each adaptation type. This provided information for the consultant to identify the long term adaptation pathway for the assets and values in the coastal zone.</p> <p>The factors used in the calculation are for coastal erosion and coastal inundation are identified in State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. In addition the Geraldton CHRMAP Report takes into account existing treatments such as the Northern Beaches Stabilisation Programme (NBSP) sand by-passing works undertaken each year by the Port Authority. The Beresford Foreshore project coastal protection structures have been designed not to interrupt the sediment flow northwards from Beresford</p> <p>The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.</p> <p>Noted. These, and other adaptation options were assessed by the consultant to identify sustainable long term adaptation pathways for the assets and values in the coastal zone.</p> <p>The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.</p>	<p>Note the submission</p> <p>Note the submission</p> <p>Note the submission</p> <p>Note the submission</p> <p>Note the submission</p>
62	28/08/2018	30/08/2018	Private submission	<p>3.1.2 Community Coastal Planning Survey and Workshops Page 7. The attached report (Appendix A.2) does not reflect what was reported in "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017. The beach and residential properties in Kempton Street are highly valued by the community. In the "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017", it was identified that the loss of residential property and community areas would have a catastrophic impact. The results of the workshop were to 'Protect' Kempton Street properties and many of the other properties and beaches that the CHRMAP has changed to 'managed retreat.' Solution: The requirements of the CHRMAP process, state that community valuing and feedback is required in order to be successful. The CHRMAP needs to be updated to reflect what is important to the community by adhering to the Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report. Changing valuable assets to the community, such as properties and beaches, to "PROTECT".</p> <p>See attached Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report October 2017 Summary Page 2-Section 2.1 Purpose "The severity of erosion and inundation impact along Geraldton's coastal areas is determined by a range of factors, and over the next 100-years the coastal region is projected to experience adverse effects from coastal hazard impact at some time." The factors used in this calculation need to be defined. Does it take into account sand replenishing, man made modifications ect. Responsibility for increased erosion has been admitted by the ports. The Geraldton Guardian has also claimed the city is also responsible for the increased erosion due to the works at the foreshore. Is this part of the calculation?</p> <p>There is sufficient justification to have the properties and community areas classified as "PROTECT" rather than the proposed "Accomodate/Managed Retreat" in Sunset Beach. The costs of managed retreat would amount to \$35,760,000 = (149 homes x \$240,000 (median reported house price per this report) This is the lowest cost as homes located next to the ocean are valued higher. The Adaptation recommendation "Section 70a notification on Title" would devalue 149 residential properties within Sunset Beach, effecting the resale value. "PROTECT" Adaptation options have been provided at a significantly lower cost to other Coastal Management Units. Not exceeding 4 million dollars. This would also remove the need to add "Section 70a notification on Title" saving millions to home owners. Refer to Technical Appendices- Table 3-2 "Cost estimates for adaptation options"</p> <p>The Adaptation plans per the report ("Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017") were as follows: Sunset Beach houses - Protect- Seawall, artificial reef, sand nourishment, dune rehabilitation, Geotextile containers.</p> <p>Page 105 -15.1.3 Managed Retreat Pathway Out of the three pathways for managed retreat, in all cases, protect is the least costly and damaging to the city. The First Option "Do Nothing" will incur reputation damage and legal costs to the city. This will detour tourism and investors from coming to Geraldton. Without a legal precedent, legal counsel will need to be sought out, incurring more costs without any benefit to the community. The Second Option 'Planned Retreat' the City would be required to reserve funds to acquire the properties before or at the time of the erosion trigger. Costing over \$35,760,000 for Sunset Beach alone. The Third Option "Protect" has been identified to have the least cost. risk and the biggest reward to the community and stakeholders. The community has recommended a proactive approach to protect the properties and beaches. This would ensure the best benefit to the City of Greater Geraldton, encouraging tourism, investments and showing everyone in WA that Geraldton cares about it's residents</p>	<p>The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops were undertaken to provide the opportunity for the community to identify and prioritise assets and values of importance to them in the coastal zone. The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops also explained the Coastal Adaptation Types and provided the opportunity for the community participants to suggest adaptation measures for each adaptation type. This provided information for the consultant to identify the long term adaptation pathway for the assets and values in the coastal zone.</p> <p>The factors used in the calculation are for coastal erosion and coastal inundation are identified in State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. In addition the Geraldton CHRMAP Report takes into account existing treatments such as the Northern Beaches Stabilisation Programme (NBSP) sand by-passing works undertaken each year by the Port Authority. The Beresford Foreshore project coastal protection structures have been designed not to interrupt the sediment flow northwards from Beresford</p> <p>The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.</p> <p>Noted. These, and other adaptation options were assessed by the consultant to identify sustainable long term adaptation pathways for the assets and values in the coastal zone.</p> <p>The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.</p>	<p>Note the submission</p> <p>Note the submission</p> <p>Note the submission</p> <p>Note the submission</p> <p>Note the submission</p>
63	28/08/2018	30/08/2018	Private submission	<p>3.1.2 Community Coastal Planning Survey and Workshops Page 7. The attached report (Appendix A.2) does not reflect what was reported in "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017. The beach and residential properties in Kempton Street are highly valued by the community. In the "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017", it was identified that the loss of residential property and community areas would have a catastrophic impact. The results of the workshop were to 'Protect' Kempton Street properties and many of the other properties and beaches that the CHRMAP has changed to 'managed retreat.' Solution: The requirements of the CHRMAP process, state that community valuing and feedback is required in order to be successful. The CHRMAP needs to be updated to reflect what is important to the community by adhering to the Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report. Changing valuable assets to the community, such as properties and beaches, to "PROTECT".</p> <p>See attached Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report October 2017 Summary Page 2-Section 2.1 Purpose "The severity of erosion and inundation impact along Geraldton's coastal areas is determined by a range of factors, and over the next 100-years the coastal region is projected to experience adverse effects from coastal hazard impact at some time." The factors used in this calculation need to be defined. Does it take into account sand replenishing, man made modifications ect. Responsibility for increased erosion has been admitted by the ports. The Geraldton Guardian has also claimed the city is also responsible for the increased erosion due to the works at the foreshore. Is this part of the calculation?</p> <p>There is sufficient justification to have the properties and community areas classified as "PROTECT" rather than the proposed "Accomodate/Managed Retreat" in Sunset Beach. The costs of managed retreat would amount to \$35,760,000 = (149 homes x \$240,000 (median reported house price per this report) This is the lowest cost as homes located next to the ocean are valued higher. The Adaptation recommendation "Section 70a notification on Title" would devalue 149 residential properties within Sunset Beach, effecting the resale value. "PROTECT" Adaptation options have been provided at a significantly lower cost to other Coastal Management Units. Not exceeding 4 million dollars. This would also remove the need to add "Section 70a notification on Title" saving millions to home owners. Refer to Technical Appendices- Table 3-2 "Cost estimates for adaptation options"</p> <p>The Adaptation plans per the report ("Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017") were as follows: Sunset Beach houses - Protect- Seawall, artificial reef, sand nourishment, dune rehabilitation, Geotextile containers.</p>	<p>The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops were undertaken to provide the opportunity for the community to identify and prioritise assets and values of importance to them in the coastal zone. The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops also explained the Coastal Adaptation Types and provided the opportunity for the community participants to suggest adaptation measures for each adaptation type. This provided information for the consultant to identify the long term adaptation pathway for the assets and values in the coastal zone.</p> <p>The factors used in the calculation are for coastal erosion and coastal inundation are identified in State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. In addition the Geraldton CHRMAP Report takes into account existing treatments such as the Northern Beaches Stabilisation Programme (NBSP) sand by-passing works undertaken each year by the Port Authority. The Beresford Foreshore project coastal protection structures have been designed not to interrupt the sediment flow northwards from Beresford</p> <p>The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.</p> <p>Noted. These, and other adaptation options were assessed by the consultant to identify sustainable long term adaptation pathways for the assets and values in the coastal zone.</p>	<p>Note the submission</p> <p>Note the submission</p> <p>Note the submission</p> <p>Note the submission</p>

Submission Information				Submission and Comment		
ID	Received	Responded	Submitter	Comment Submission	CGG Comment	Recommendation
				Page 105 -15.1.3 Managed Retreat Pathway Out of the three pathways for managed retreat, in all cases, protect is the least costly and damaging to the city. The First Option "Do Nothing" will incur reputation damage and legal costs to the city. This will detour tourism and investors from coming to Geraldton. Without a legal precedent, legal counsel will need to be sought out, incurring more costs without any benefit to the community. The Second Option "Planned Retreat" the City would be required to reserve funds to acquire the properties before or at the time of the erosion trigger. Costing over \$35,760,000 for Sunset Beach alone. The Third Option "Protect" has been identified to have the least cost. risk and the biggest reward to the community and stakeholders. The community has recommended a proactive approach to protect the properties and beaches. This would ensure the best benefit to the City of Greater Geraldton, encouraging tourism, investments and showing everyone in WA that Geraldton cares about it's residents	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note the submission
64	28/08/2018	30/08/2018	Private submission (x2)	We reject the recommendations of 'do nothing' or 'managed retreat'. Managed retreat has already proven to fail e.g.: Drummond Cove & Sunset Beach. We feel protecting the coast and peoples properties is the only option for the long term. We feel protecting the coast and peoples properties is the only option for the long term. We appreciate at the present time the COGG and the state government does not have funding for the 'protect' option but we believe this could possibly change in the future and this should be qualified now. Previous to the construction of the additional hard lay area at the Fishermen's Wharf and the deepening of the channel and method used, there appeared to be minimal erosion along the northern coast. How liable does the Midwest Ports and the Government consider itself in regards to the damage caused on our northern coast post deepening of the channel and port and Marina and Eastern Breakwater rock wall construction that is protecting the port and Port controlled beaches.  Regarding the setback lines: what effect will further development within the port and city environment have on the existing set back lines. Will these be affected by structures such as the Beresford Foreshore improvements? The values of the properties within the CMU1 to CMU4 are grossly undervalued. The placing of a 70a and the SCA caveat on these properties will directly disadvantage stakeholders in these areas and will restrict further investment. There are many options that could be tried, to name a few below. Breakwaters; Sand Replenishment; Barrier walls; Artificial reefs. The cost of 'protect' will be cheaper than 'managed retreat'. The shifting of properties at risk to the public is not a supported option. This would be an enormous cost to the city. The Bluff Point average quoted for a buy back is grossly under valuing many properties. This option would be challenged by all property owners Of all the proposed pathways, 'protect' seems to be the least expensive option for the City costs and reputation. 'Do nothing' will impact on investors and tourism as will 'managed retreat'.The city will be required to put aside funds to acquire properties in the future. How have the values in the reports been derived at other than an across the board average price? Not all the properties have the same value. Is the city prepared to accommodate residents in their removal, relocation and land value loss to properties of equal or greater value? If a 70A caveat is attached to a property but in the future the plan is changed to 'protect', once the protection is in place can the 70A caveat be removed from the property? Has the city considered potential legal costs to both the City and land owners?  Owners of the houses in these threatened areas deserve the right not to have their assets devalued by a section 70A attached to their title. It would seem that long term, the CGG's cheapest option would be to 'protect'. Will this help the City solve erosion problems? Will investors purchase properties and invest within the city in the future when the city is not prepared to protect its residents, properties and businesses?  Values for Bluff Point properties are estimated at \$297,500 in one of these reports yet the CHRMAP report states that average price is \$462,000. (part 1 economic analysis)  The prices considered for value of each property should be considered on an individual basis of valuation (market value from a licensed private valuer) with monetary priority given to those properties at extreme and immediate risk within the next 12 years i.e.: those with SCA & 70A conditions on them. The community has clearly recommended a proactive approach to protect peoples properties. This would encourage investment and tourism and give confidence that the CGG will be there for its residents.	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
					The Port Enhancement Project went through a Public Environment Review as part of the approvals process. The Port has an ongoing commitment to bypass 12500m3 of sand from Pages Beach to the Northern Beaches between the Beresford Foreshore and the Chapman River annually.	Note the submission
					The Beresford Foreshore project coastal protection structures have been designed not to interrupt the sediment flow northwards from Beresford	Note the submission
					Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
					The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note the submission
					The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note the submission
					The difference between the figures is: \$462,000 was a median estimate based on the rates; \$297,500 was a median estimate based on recent property sales available through www.realestate.com.au.	Uphold submission. Consultant to update report with consistent house price scenarios
					Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
65	28/08/2018	30/08/2018	Private submission	I have lived, raised a family and run a business in this shire (in its various forms) for over thirty years now. It is the lifestyle, beaches and the ocean and surrounds in general that makes this region and community such a great place to live. I have chosen to live in the Drummonds Cove area for at least 12 years now and invested a lot of money, time and effort into doing so therefore a lot of the information in this CHRMAP report is of great consequence to me my family and the broader community's future. It is an extensive and complex document and issue, but I will keep my submission simple and to the main points. I'm sure many submissions will already cover a lot of my views a lot more extensively. I'm a member of the Drummond Cove Progress Association and aligned with those views put forward by them in general. This submission however is on a more personal note. The document seems biased towards the managed retreat option which I think is for the most part the wrong way to go. Sure there are undeveloped sections of our coast where that is fine and no doubt the only way to go. The coastline is of huge importance to why we are all here so why let it go in the already developed areas. The Shire has done or is doing a great job of controlling the erosion from the Marina to St George's. It took a long time for action but it finally seems to be sorted so congratulations on that. However what about the areas? It seems a little unfair that just that part of town gets looked after and the other areas not. There is a definite precedent been set there. I think that protection is the only way forward. I personally purchased a block of land from the Council (in whatever form it was then) direct at auction in Drummonds Cove as part of their own subdivision approx 10 years ago. They were happy to take the money then even though you were aware of the erosion problems which are why the shacks to the west of Whitehill Road were removed eventually and leases cancelled. I believe it is morally and legally wrong to then turn around 10 years later and propose to put a 70a notification or maybe even a compulsory acquisition order on a property. I firmly believe this will result in expensive legal ramifications to all concerned by way of class actions or similar. I have spoken and attended meetings with many other landholders/ ratepayers in this situation. There is a significant ground swell of concern. I have been through the compulsory acquisition process before with The State Government on the Oakajee Buffer Zone. It is an Expensive, slow drawn out, unfair process that ends up costing a lot more than everybody thinks at the start. There are no winners! It would seem and I have looked at some of the projected costings being estimated, that it would be a lot cheaper and better for over the next decades to just protect the coast where needed. There are many things that could be done to reduce the erosion. Sandbags or some sort of artificial reef options could be utilised to break the energy of shore. This could be done in such a way to provide extra habitats for marine life, create surf breaks along the coast and many other benefits to the broader community and tourism in general. A marina or groins around Drummonds could be used it's not a large section of coast to protect. I won't get into the details of what can be done here as there are many options that have been utilised all over the world to do this. The cost associated with retreat apart from just buying out houses etc must be enormous. Water and sewer services in the low lying areas, power water, roads, other business, community buildings etc. Surely this money would be better spent on just protecting and improving our coast over time. For me and the vast number of people I have spoken to Managed Retreat represents a continuing future of a coastline of half done orange bunting, fencing and concrete blocks plonked around our beautiful coast like some ugly construction site. What a wonderful tourist attraction and Image for Greater Geraldton. <del>Managed Retreat, what a terrible compromise and a waste of money. It is a disaster that in my mind, has no future.</del>	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
66	28/08/2018	31/08/2018	Private submission	3.1.2 Community Coastal Planning Survey and Workshops Page 7. The attached report (Appendix A.2) does not reflect what was reported in "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report,October 2017. The beach and residential properties in Kempton Street are highly valued by the community. In the "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report,October 2017", it was identified that the loss of residential property and community areas would have a catastrophic impact. The results of the workshop were to 'Protect' Kempton Street properties and many of the other properties and beaches that the CHRMAP has changed to 'managed retreat.' Solution: The requirements of the CHRMAP process, state that community valuing and feedback is required in order to be successful. The CHRMAP needs to be updated to reflect what is important to the community by adhering to the Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report. Changing valuable assets to the community, such as properties and beaches, to "PROTECT".  See attached Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report October 2017 Summary Page 2-Section 2.1 Purpose "The severity of erosion and inundation impact along Geraldton's coastal areas is determined by a range of factors, and over the next 100-years the coastal region is projected to experience adverse effects from coastal hazard impact at some time." The factors used in this calculation need to be defined. Does it take into account sand replenishing, man made modifications ect. Responsibility for increased erosion has been admitted by the ports. The Geraldton Guardian has also claimed the city is also responsible for the increased erosion due to the works at the foreshore. Is this part of the calculation?  There is sufficient justification to have the properties and community areas classified as "PROTECT" rather than the proposed "Accomodate/Managed Retreat" in Sunset Beach. The costs of managed retreat would amount to \$35,760,000 = (149 homes x \$240,000 (median reported house price per this report) This is the lowest cost as homes located next to the ocean are valued higher. The Adaptation recommendation "Section 70a notification on Title" would devalue 149 residential properties within Sunset Beach, effecting the resale value. "PROTECT" Adaptation options have been provided at a significantly lower cost to other Coastal Management Units. Not exceeding 4 million dollars. This would also remove the need to add "Section 70a notification on Title" saving millions to home owners. Refer to Technical Appendices- Table 3-2 "Cost estimates for adaptation options" The Adaptation plans per the report ("Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017") were as follows: Sunset Beach houses - Protect- Seawall, artificial reef, sand nourishment, dune rehabilitation, Geotextile containers.	The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops were undertaken to provide the opportunity for the community to identify and prioritise assets and values of importance to them in the coastal zone. The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops also explained the Coastal Adaptation Types and provided the opportunity for the community participants to suggest adaptation measures for each adaptation type. This provided information for the consultant to identify the long term adaptation pathway for the assets and values in the coastal zone. The factors used in the calculation are for coastal erosion and coastal inundation are identified in State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. In addition the Geraldton CHRMAP Report takes into account existing treatments such as the Northern Beaches Stabilisation Programme (NBSP) sand bypassing works undertaken each year by the Port Authority. The Beresford Foreshore project coastal protection structures have been designed not to interrupt the sediment flow northwards from Beresford	Note the submission
					The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note the submission
					Noted. These, and other adaptation options were assessed by the consultant to identify sustainable long term adaptation pathways for the assets and values in the coastal zone.	Note the submission
67	28/08/2018	31/08/2018	Private submission	Page 105 -15.1.3 Managed Retreat Pathway Out of the three pathways for managed retreat, in all cases, protect is the least costly and damaging to the city. The First Option "Do Nothing" will incur reputation damage and legal costs to the city. This will detour tourism and investors from coming to Geraldton. Without a legal precedent, legal counsel will need to be sought out, incurring more costs without any benefit to the community. The Second Option "Planned Retreat" the City would be required to reserve funds to acquire the properties before or at the time of the erosion trigger. Costing over \$35,760,000 for Sunset Beach alone. The Third Option "Protect" has been identified to have the least cost. risk and the biggest reward to the community and stakeholders. The community has recommended a proactive approach to protect the properties and beaches. This would ensure the best benefit to the City of Greater Geraldton, encouraging tourism, investments and showing everyone in WA that Geraldton cares about it's residents	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note the submission
					The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops were undertaken to provide the opportunity for the community to identify and prioritise assets and values of importance to them in the coastal zone. The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops also explained the Coastal Adaptation Types and provided the opportunity for the community participants to suggest adaptation measures for each adaptation type. This provided information for the consultant to identify the long term adaptation pathway for the assets and values in the coastal zone.	Note the submission



Submission Information				Submission and Comment		
ID	Received	Responded	Submitter	Comment Submission	CGG Comment	Recommendation
				See attached Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report October 2017 Summary Page 2-Section 2.1 Purpose "The severity of erosion and inundation impact along Geraldton's coastal areas is determined by a range of factors, and over the next 100-years the coastal region is projected to experience adverse effects from coastal hazard impact at some time." The factors used in this calculation need to be defined. Does it take into account sand replenishing, man made modifications ect. Responsibility for increased erosion has been admitted by the ports. The Geraldton Guardian has also claimed the city is also responsible for the increased erosion due to the works at the foreshore. Is this part of the calculation?	The factors used in the calculation are for coastal erosion and coastal inundation are identified in State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. In additional the Geraldton CHRMAP Report takes into account existing treatments such as the Northern Beaches Stabilisation Programme (NBSP) sand by-passing works undertaken each year by the Port Authority. The Beresford Foreshore project coastal protection structures have been designed not to interrupt the sediment flow northwards from <a href="#">Beresford</a>	Note the submission
				There is sufficient justification to have the properties and community areas classified as "PROTECT" rather than the proposed "Accomodate/Managed Retreat" in Sunset Beach. The costs of managed retreat would amount to \$35,760,000 = (149 homes x \$240,000 (median reported house price per this report) This is the lowest cost as homes located next to the ocean are valued higher. The Adaptation recommendation "Section 70a notification on Title" would devalue 149 residential properties within Sunset Beach, effecting the resale value. "PROTECT" Adaptation options have been provided at a significantly lower cost to other Coastal Management Units. Not exceeding 4 million dollars. This would also remove the need to add "Section 70a notification on Title" saving millions to home owners. Refer to Technical Appendices- Table 3-2 "Cost estimates for adaptation options"	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note the submission
				The Adaptation plans per the report ("Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017") were as follows: Sunset Beach houses - Protect- Seawall, artificial reef, sand nourishment, dune rehabilitation, Geotextile containers.	Noted. These, and other adaptation options were assessed by the consultant to identify sustainable long term adaptation pathways for the assets and values in the coastal zone.	Note the submission
68	28/08/2018	3/09/2018	Private submission	Page 105 -15.1.3 Managed Retreat Pathway Out of the three pathways for managed retreat, in all cases, protect is the least costly and damaging to the city. The First Option "Do Nothing" will incur reputation damage and legal costs to the city. This will detour tourism and investors from coming to Geraldton. Without a legal precedent, legal counsel will need to be sought out, incurring more costs without any benefit to the community. The Second Option "Planned Retreat" the City would be required to reserve funds to acquire the properties before or at the time of the erosion trigger. Costing over \$35,760,000 for Sunset Beach alone. The Third Option "Protect" has been identified to have the least cost. risk and the biggest reward to the community and stakeholders. The community has recommended a proactive approach to protect the properties and beaches. This would ensure the best benefit to the City of Greater Geraldton, encouraging tourism, investments and showing everyone in WA that Geraldton cares about it's residents	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note the submission
				3.1.2 Community Coastal Planning Survey and Workshops Page 7. The attached report (Appendix A.2) does not reflect what was reported in "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report,October 2017. The beach and residential properties in Kempton Street are highly valued by the community. In the "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report,October 2017", it was identified that the loss of residential property and community areas would have a catastrophic impact. The results of the workshop were to 'Protect' Kempton Street properties and many of the other properties and beaches that the CHRMAP has changed to 'managed retreat.' Solution: The requirements of the CHRMAP process, state that community valuing and feedback is required in order to be successful. The CHRMAP needs to be updated to reflect what is important to the community by adhering to the Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report. Changing valuable assets to the community, such as properties and beaches, to "PROTECT".	The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops were undertaken to provide the opportunity for the community to identify and prioritise assets and values of importance to them in the coastal zone. The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops also explained the Coastal Adaptation Types and provided the opportunity for the community participants to suggest adaptation measures for each adaptation type. This provided information for the consultant to identify the long term adaptation pathway for the assets and values in the coastal zone.	Note the submission
				See attached Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report October 2017 Summary Page 2-Section 2.1 Purpose "The severity of erosion and inundation impact along Geraldton's coastal areas is determined by a range of factors, and over the next 100-years the coastal region is projected to experience adverse effects from coastal hazard impact at some time." The factors used in this calculation need to be defined. Does it take into account sand replenishing, man made modifications ect. Responsibility for increased erosion has been admitted by the ports. The Geraldton Guardian has also claimed the city is also responsible for the increased erosion due to the works at the foreshore. Is this part of the calculation?	The factors used in the calculation are for coastal erosion and coastal inundation are identified in State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. In additional the Geraldton CHRMAP Report takes into account existing treatments such as the Northern Beaches Stabilisation Programme (NBSP) sand by-passing works undertaken each year by the Port Authority. The Beresford Foreshore project coastal protection structures have been designed not to interrupt the sediment flow northwards from <a href="#">Beresford</a>	Note the submission
				There is sufficient justification to have the properties and community areas classified as "PROTECT" rather than the proposed "Accomodate/Managed Retreat" in Sunset Beach. The costs of managed retreat would amount to \$35,760,000 = (149 homes x \$240,000 (median reported house price per this report) This is the lowest cost as homes located next to the ocean are valued higher. The Adaptation recommendation "Section 70a notification on Title" would devalue 149 residential properties within Sunset Beach, effecting the resale value. "PROTECT" Adaptation options have been provided at a significantly lower cost to other Coastal Management Units. Not exceeding 4 million dollars. This would also remove the need to add "Section 70a notification on Title" saving millions to home owners. Refer to Technical Appendices- Table 3-2 "Cost estimates for adaptation options"	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note the submission
				The Adaptation plans per the report ("Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017") were as follows: Sunset Beach houses - Protect- Seawall, artificial reef, sand nourishment, dune rehabilitation, Geotextile containers.	Noted. These, and other adaptation options were assessed by the consultant to identify sustainable long term adaptation pathways for the assets and values in the coastal zone.	Note the submission
				Page 105 -15.1.3 Managed Retreat Pathway Out of the three pathways for managed retreat, in all cases, protect is the least costly and damaging to the city. The First Option "Do Nothing" will incur reputation damage and legal costs to the city. This will detour tourism and investors from coming to Geraldton. Without a legal precedent, legal counsel will need to be sought out, incurring more costs without any benefit to the community. The Second Option "Planned Retreat" the City would be required to reserve funds to acquire the properties before or at the time of the erosion trigger. Costing over \$35,760,000 for Sunset Beach alone. The Third Option "Protect" has been identified to have the least cost. risk and the biggest reward to the community and stakeholders. The community has recommended a proactive approach to protect the properties and beaches. This would ensure the best benefit to the City of Greater Geraldton, encouraging tourism, investments and showing everyone in WA that Geraldton cares about it's residents	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note the submission
69	28/08/2018	31/08/2018	Private submission (x2)	<b>Please put large rocks or geotextile sandbags on foreshore and get rid of groins</b>	<b>Acknowledgement of submission</b>	Note the submission
				3.1.2 Community Coastal Planning Survey and Workshops Page 7. The attached report (Appendix A.2) does not reflect what was reported in "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report,October 2017. The beach and residential properties in Kempton Street are highly valued by the community. In the "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report,October 2017", it was identified that the loss of residential property and community areas would have a catastrophic impact. The results of the workshop were to 'Protect' Kempton Street properties and many of the other properties and beaches that the CHRMAP has changed to 'managed retreat.' Solution: The requirements of the CHRMAP process, state that community valuing and feedback is required in order to be successful. The CHRMAP needs to be updated to reflect what is important to the community by adhering to the Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report. Changing valuable assets to the community, such as properties and beaches, to "PROTECT".	The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops were undertaken to provide the opportunity for the community to identify and prioritise assets and values of importance to them in the coastal zone. The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops also explained the Coastal Adaptation Types and provided the opportunity for the community participants to suggest adaptation measures for each adaptation type. This provided information for the consultant to identify the long term adaptation pathway for the assets and values in the coastal zone.	Note the submission
				See attached Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report October 2017 Summary Page 2-Section 2.1 Purpose "The severity of erosion and inundation impact along Geraldton's coastal areas is determined by a range of factors, and over the next 100-years the coastal region is projected to experience adverse effects from coastal hazard impact at some time." The factors used in this calculation need to be defined. Does it take into account sand replenishing, man made modifications ect. Responsibility for increased erosion has been admitted by the ports. The Geraldton Guardian has also claimed the city is also responsible for the increased erosion due to the works at the foreshore. Is this part of the calculation?	The factors used in the calculation are for coastal erosion and coastal inundation are identified in State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. In additional the Geraldton CHRMAP Report takes into account existing treatments such as the Northern Beaches Stabilisation Programme (NBSP) sand by-passing works undertaken each year by the Port Authority. The Beresford Foreshore project coastal protection structures have been designed not to interrupt the sediment flow northwards from <a href="#">Beresford</a>	Note the submission
				There is sufficient justification to have the properties and community areas classified as "PROTECT" rather than the proposed "Accomodate/Managed Retreat" in Sunset Beach. The costs of managed retreat would amount to \$35,760,000 = (149 homes x \$240,000 (median reported house price per this report) This is the lowest cost as homes located next to the ocean are valued higher. The Adaptation recommendation "Section 70a notification on Title" would devalue 149 residential properties within Sunset Beach, effecting the resale value. "PROTECT" Adaptation options have been provided at a significantly lower cost to other Coastal Management Units. Not exceeding 4 million dollars. This would also remove the need to add "Section 70a notification on Title" saving millions to home owners. Refer to Technical Appendices- Table 3-2 "Cost estimates for adaptation options"	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note the submission
				The Adaptation plans per the report ("Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017") were as follows: Sunset Beach houses - Protect- Seawall, artificial reef, sand nourishment, dune rehabilitation, Geotextile containers.	Noted. These, and other adaptation options were assessed by the consultant to identify sustainable long term adaptation pathways for the assets and values in the coastal zone.	Note the submission
				Page 105 -15.1.3 Managed Retreat Pathway Out of the three pathways for managed retreat, in all cases, protect is the least costly and damaging to the city. The First Option "Do Nothing" will incur reputation damage and legal costs to the city. This will detour tourism and investors from coming to Geraldton. Without a legal precedent, legal counsel will need to be sought out, incurring more costs without any benefit to the community. The Second Option "Planned Retreat" the City would be required to reserve funds to acquire the properties before or at the time of the erosion trigger. Costing over \$35,760,000 for Sunset Beach alone. The Third Option "Protect" has been identified to have the least cost. risk and the biggest reward to the community and stakeholders. The community has recommended a proactive approach to protect the properties and beaches. This would ensure the best benefit to the City of Greater Geraldton, encouraging tourism, investments and showing everyone in WA that Geraldton cares about it's residents	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note the submission
70	28/08/2018	31/08/2018	Private submission (x2)	<b>We brought this property for our retirement and investment for children. Please do something to protect our beach with geotextile containers</b>	<b>Acknowledgement of submission</b>	Note the submission
				3.1.2 Community Coastal Planning Survey and Workshops Page 7. The attached report (Appendix A.2) does not reflect what was reported in "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report,October 2017. The beach and residential properties in Kempton Street are highly valued by the community. In the "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report,October 2017", it was identified that the loss of residential property and community areas would have a catastrophic impact. The results of the workshop were to 'Protect' Kempton Street properties and many of the other properties and beaches that the CHRMAP has changed to 'managed retreat.' Solution: The requirements of the CHRMAP process, state that community valuing and feedback is required in order to be successful. The CHRMAP needs to be updated to reflect what is important to the community by adhering to the Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report. Changing valuable assets to the community, such as properties and beaches, to "PROTECT".	The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops were undertaken to provide the opportunity for the community to identify and prioritise assets and values of importance to them in the coastal zone. The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops also explained the Coastal Adaptation Types and provided the opportunity for the community participants to suggest adaptation measures for each adaptation type. This provided information for the consultant to identify the long term adaptation pathway for the assets and values in the coastal zone.	Note the submission
				See attached Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report October 2017 Summary Page 2-Section 2.1 Purpose "The severity of erosion and inundation impact along Geraldton's coastal areas is determined by a range of factors, and over the next 100-years the coastal region is projected to experience adverse effects from coastal hazard impact at some time." The factors used in this calculation need to be defined. Does it take into account sand replenishing, man made modifications ect. Responsibility for increased erosion has been admitted by the ports. The Geraldton Guardian has also claimed the city is also responsible for the increased erosion due to the works at the foreshore. Is this part of the calculation?	The factors used in the calculation are for coastal erosion and coastal inundation are identified in State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. In additional the Geraldton CHRMAP Report takes into account existing treatments such as the Northern Beaches Stabilisation Programme (NBSP) sand by-passing works undertaken each year by the Port Authority. The Beresford Foreshore project coastal protection structures have been designed not to interrupt the sediment flow northwards from <a href="#">Beresford</a>	Note the submission
				There is sufficient justification to have the properties and community areas classified as "PROTECT" rather than the proposed "Accomodate/Managed Retreat" in Sunset Beach. The costs of managed retreat would amount to \$35,760,000 = (149 homes x \$240,000 (median reported house price per this report) This is the lowest cost as homes located next to the ocean are valued higher. The Adaptation recommendation "Section 70a notification on Title" would devalue 149 residential properties within Sunset Beach, effecting the resale value. "PROTECT" Adaptation options have been provided at a significantly lower cost to other Coastal Management Units. Not exceeding 4 million dollars. This would also remove the need to add "Section 70a notification on Title" saving millions to home owners. Refer to Technical Appendices- Table 3-2 "Cost estimates for adaptation options"	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note the submission
				The Adaptation plans per the report ("Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017") were as follows: Sunset Beach houses - Protect- Seawall, artificial reef, sand nourishment, dune rehabilitation, Geotextile containers.	Noted. These, and other adaptation options were assessed by the consultant to identify sustainable long term adaptation pathways for the assets and values in the coastal zone.	Note the submission



Submission Information				Submission and Comment		
ID	Received	Responded	Submitter	Comment Submission	CGG Comment	Recommendation
				Page 105 -15.1.3 Managed Retreat Pathway Out of the three pathways for managed retreat, in all cases, protect is the least costly and damaging to the city. The First Option "Do Nothing" will incur reputation damage and legal costs to the city. This will detour tourism and investors from coming to Geraldton. Without a legal precedent, legal counsel will need to be sought out, incurring more costs without any benefit to the community. The Second Option 'Planned Retreat' the City would be required to reserve funds to acquire the properties before or at the time of the erosion trigger. Costing over \$35,760,000 for Sunset Beach alone. The Third Option "Protect" has been identified to have the least cost. risk and the biggest reward to the community and stakeholders. The community has recommended a proactive approach to protect the properties and beaches. This would ensure the best benefit to the City of Greater Geraldton, encouraging tourism, investments and showing everyone in WA that Geraldton cares about it's residents	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note the submission
71	28/08/2018	31/08/2018	Private submission	I went to a meeting at Council 20 years ago and nothing has happened about this problem. Seems nothing is going to happen for next 20 years. We pay rates every year you should be protecting our assets	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				3.1.2 Community Coastal Planning Survey and Workshops Page 7. The attached report (Appendix A.2) does not reflect what was reported in "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report,October 2017. The beach and residential properties in Kempton Street are highly valued by the community. In the "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report,October 2017", it was identified that the loss of residential property and community areas would have a catastrophic impact. The results of the workshop were to 'Protect' Kempton Street properties and many of the other properties and beaches that the CHRMAP has changed to 'managed retreat.' Solution: The requirements of the CHRMAP process, state that community valuing and feedback is required in order to be successful. The CHRMAP needs to be updated to reflect what is important to the community by adhering to the Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report. Changing valuable assets to the community, such as properties and beaches, to "PROTECT".	The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops were undertaken to provide the opportunity for the community to identify and prioritise assets and values of importance to them in the coastal zone. The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops also explained the Coastal Adaptation Types and provided the opportunity for the community participants to suggest adaptation measures for each adaptation type. This provided information for the consultant to identify the long term adaptation pathway for the assets and values in the coastal zone.	Note the submission
				See attached Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report October 2017 Summary Page 2-Section 2.1 Purpose "The severity of erosion and inundation impact along Geraldton's coastal areas is determined by a range of factors, and over the next 100-years the coastal region is projected to experience adverse effects from coastal hazard impact at some time." The factors used in this calculation need to be defined. Does it take into account sand replenishing, man made modifications ect. Responsibility for increased erosion has been admitted by the ports. The Geraldton Guardian has also claimed the city is also responsible for the increased erosion due to the works at the foreshore. Is this part of the calculation?	The factors used in the calculation are for coastal erosion and coastal inundation are identified in State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. In additional the Geraldton CHRMAP Report takes into account existing treatments such as the Northern Beaches Stabilisation Programme (NBSP) sand by-passing works undertaken each year by the Port Authority. The Beresford Foreshore project coastal protection structures have been designed not to interrupt the sediment flow northwards from Beresford	Note the submission
				There is sufficient justification to have the properties and community areas classified as "PROTECT" rather than the proposed "Accomodate/Managed Retreat" in Sunset Beach. The costs of managed retreat would amount to \$35,760,000 = (149 homes x \$240,000 (median reported house price per this report) This is the lowest cost as homes located next to the ocean are valued higher. The Adaptation recommendation "Section 70a notification on Title" would devalue 149 residential properties within Sunset Beach, effecting the resale value. "PROTECT" Adaptation options have been provided at a significantly lower cost to other Coastal Management Units. Not exceeding 4 million dollars. This would also remove the need to add "Section 70a notification on Title" saving millions to home owners. Refer to Technical Appendices- Table 3-2 "Cost estimates for adaptation options"	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note the submission
				The Adaptation plans per the report ("Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017") were as follows: Sunset Beach houses - Protect- Seawall, artificial reef, sand nourishment, dune rehabilitation, Geotextile containers.	Noted. These, and other adaptation options were assessed by the consultant to identify sustainable long term adaptation pathways for the assets and values in the coastal zone.	Note the submission
				Page 105 -15.1.3 Managed Retreat Pathway Out of the three pathways for managed retreat, in all cases, protect is the least costly and damaging to the city. The First Option "Do Nothing" will incur reputation damage and legal costs to the city. This will detour tourism and investors from coming to Geraldton. Without a legal precedent, legal counsel will need to be sought out, incurring more costs without any benefit to the community. The Second Option 'Planned Retreat' the City would be required to reserve funds to acquire the properties before or at the time of the erosion trigger. Costing over \$35,760,000 for Sunset Beach alone. The Third Option "Protect" has been identified to have the least cost. risk and the biggest reward to the community and stakeholders. The community has recommended a proactive approach to protect the properties and beaches. This would ensure the best benefit to the City of Greater Geraldton, encouraging tourism, investments and showing everyone in WA that Geraldton cares about it's residents	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note the submission
72	28/08/2018	31/08/2018	Private submission	I would strongly recommend that the CGG consider the use of natural sand bags and revegetation on the dune face at Sunset Beach. The Shire of Northampton Coastal Strategy plan has included the use of sand bagging and revegetation at Horrocks Beach with outstanding success. Please avoid using rocks, rockwalls and artificial or synthetic mesh or products that will not break down in the natural environment	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				3.1.2 Community Coastal Planning Survey and Workshops Page 7. The attached report (Appendix A.2) does not reflect what was reported in "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report,October 2017. The beach and residential properties in Kempton Street are highly valued by the community. In the "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report,October 2017", it was identified that the loss of residential property and community areas would have a catastrophic impact. The results of the workshop were to 'Protect' Kempton Street properties and many of the other properties and beaches that the CHRMAP has changed to 'managed retreat.' Solution: The requirements of the CHRMAP process, state that community valuing and feedback is required in order to be successful. The CHRMAP needs to be updated to reflect what is important to the community by adhering to the Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report. Changing valuable assets to the community, such as properties and beaches, to "PROTECT".	The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops were undertaken to provide the opportunity for the community to identify and prioritise assets and values of importance to them in the coastal zone. The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops also explained the Coastal Adaptation Types and provided the opportunity for the community participants to suggest adaptation measures for each adaptation type. This provided information for the consultant to identify the long term adaptation pathway for the assets and values in the coastal zone.	Note the submission
				See attached Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report October 2017 Summary Page 2-Section 2.1 Purpose "The severity of erosion and inundation impact along Geraldton's coastal areas is determined by a range of factors, and over the next 100-years the coastal region is projected to experience adverse effects from coastal hazard impact at some time." The factors used in this calculation need to be defined. Does it take into account sand replenishing, man made modifications ect. Responsibility for increased erosion has been admitted by the ports. The Geraldton Guardian has also claimed the city is also responsible for the increased erosion due to the works at the foreshore. Is this part of the calculation?	The factors used in the calculation are for coastal erosion and coastal inundation are identified in State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. In additional the Geraldton CHRMAP Report takes into account existing treatments such as the Northern Beaches Stabilisation Programme (NBSP) sand by-passing works undertaken each year by the Port Authority. The Beresford Foreshore project coastal protection structures have been designed not to interrupt the sediment flow northwards from Beresford	Note the submission
				There is sufficient justification to have the properties and community areas classified as "PROTECT" rather than the proposed "Accomodate/Managed Retreat" in Sunset Beach. The costs of managed retreat would amount to \$35,760,000 = (149 homes x \$240,000 (median reported house price per this report) This is the lowest cost as homes located next to the ocean are valued higher. The Adaptation recommendation "Section 70a notification on Title" would devalue 149 residential properties within Sunset Beach, effecting the resale value. "PROTECT" Adaptation options have been provided at a significantly lower cost to other Coastal Management Units. Not exceeding 4 million dollars. This would also remove the need to add "Section 70a notification on Title" saving millions to home owners. Refer to Technical Appendices- Table 3-2 "Cost estimates for adaptation options"	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note the submission
				The Adaptation plans per the report ("Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017") were as follows: Sunset Beach houses - Protect- Seawall, artificial reef, sand nourishment, dune rehabilitation, Geotextile containers.	Noted. These, and other adaptation options were assessed by the consultant to identify sustainable long term adaptation pathways for the assets and values in the coastal zone.	Note the submission
				Page 105 -15.1.3 Managed Retreat Pathway Out of the three pathways for managed retreat, in all cases, protect is the least costly and damaging to the city. The First Option "Do Nothing" will incur reputation damage and legal costs to the city. This will detour tourism and investors from coming to Geraldton. Without a legal precedent, legal counsel will need to be sought out, incurring more costs without any benefit to the community. The Second Option 'Planned Retreat' the City would be required to reserve funds to acquire the properties before or at the time of the erosion trigger. Costing over \$35,760,000 for Sunset Beach alone. The Third Option "Protect" has been identified to have the least cost. risk and the biggest reward to the community and stakeholders. The community has recommended a proactive approach to protect the properties and beaches. This would ensure the best benefit to the City of Greater Geraldton, encouraging tourism, investments and showing everyone in WA that Geraldton cares about it's residents	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note the submission
73	28/08/2018	3/09/2018	Private submission	Sunset Beach should follow the excellent example set by the Shire of Northampton Coastal Strategy Plan. Their plan recommended and used sandbags to tackle erosion at Horrocks Beach with outstanding success.	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				3.1.2 Community Coastal Planning Survey and Workshops Page 7. The attached report (Appendix A.2) does not reflect what was reported in "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report,October 2017. The beach and residential properties in Kempton Street are highly valued by the community. In the "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report,October 2017", it was identified that the loss of residential property and community areas would have a catastrophic impact. The results of the workshop were to 'Protect' Kempton Street properties and many of the other properties and beaches that the CHRMAP has changed to 'managed retreat.' Solution: The requirements of the CHRMAP process, state that community valuing and feedback is required in order to be successful. The CHRMAP needs to be updated to reflect what is important to the community by adhering to the Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report. Changing valuable assets to the community, such as properties and beaches, to "PROTECT".	The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops were undertaken to provide the opportunity for the community to identify and prioritise assets and values of importance to them in the coastal zone. The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops also explained the Coastal Adaptation Types and provided the opportunity for the community participants to suggest adaptation measures for each adaptation type. This provided information for the consultant to identify the long term adaptation pathway for the assets and values in the coastal zone.	Note the submission
				See attached Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report October 2017 Summary Page 2-Section 2.1 Purpose "The severity of erosion and inundation impact along Geraldton's coastal areas is determined by a range of factors, and over the next 100-years the coastal region is projected to experience adverse effects from coastal hazard impact at some time." The factors used in this calculation need to be defined. Does it take into account sand replenishing, man made modifications ect. Responsibility for increased erosion has been admitted by the ports. The Geraldton Guardian has also claimed the city is also responsible for the increased erosion due to the works at the foreshore. Is this part of the calculation?	The factors used in the calculation are for coastal erosion and coastal inundation are identified in State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. In additional the Geraldton CHRMAP Report takes into account existing treatments such as the Northern Beaches Stabilisation Programme (NBSP) sand by-passing works undertaken each year by the Port Authority. The Beresford Foreshore project coastal protection structures have been designed not to interrupt the sediment flow northwards from Beresford	Note the submission
				There is sufficient justification to have the properties and community areas classified as "PROTECT" rather than the proposed "Accomodate/Managed Retreat" in Sunset Beach. The costs of managed retreat would amount to \$35,760,000 = (149 homes x \$240,000 (median reported house price per this report) This is the lowest cost as homes located next to the ocean are valued higher. The Adaptation recommendation "Section 70a notification on Title" would devalue 149 residential properties within Sunset Beach, effecting the resale value. "PROTECT" Adaptation options have been provided at a significantly lower cost to other Coastal Management Units. Not exceeding 4 million dollars. This would also remove the need to add "Section 70a notification on Title" saving millions to home owners. Refer to Technical Appendices- Table 3-2 "Cost estimates for adaptation options"	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note the submission
				The Adaptation plans per the report ("Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017") were as follows: Sunset Beach houses - Protect- Seawall, artificial reef, sand nourishment, dune rehabilitation, Geotextile containers.	Noted. These, and other adaptation options were assessed by the consultant to identify sustainable long term adaptation pathways for the assets and values in the coastal zone.	Note the submission
				Page 105 -15.1.3 Managed Retreat Pathway Out of the three pathways for managed retreat, in all cases, protect is the least costly and damaging to the city. The First Option "Do Nothing" will incur reputation damage and legal costs to the city. This will detour tourism and investors from coming to Geraldton. Without a legal precedent, legal counsel will need to be sought out, incurring more costs without any benefit to the community. The Second Option 'Planned Retreat' the City would be required to reserve funds to acquire the properties before or at the time of the erosion trigger. Costing over \$35,760,000 for Sunset Beach alone. The Third Option "Protect" has been identified to have the least cost. risk and the biggest reward to the community and stakeholders. The community has recommended a proactive approach to protect the properties and beaches. This would ensure the best benefit to the City of Greater Geraldton, encouraging tourism, investments and showing everyone in WA that Geraldton cares about it's residents	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note the submission
				City Council you caused 70% of the problem with the marina and the harbour rocks walls. It only stands to reason when you make the water go another way the current will change. MY father was a lighthouse kepper and a professional fisherman for years I do know a bit about erosion and tidal movements. I have lived in Sunset for close to 40 years. It is a perfect suburb. You should have done your homework before you closed Swan Drive. Why would you allow land to be sold and houses built just to come back years later and offer a petty amount to reclaim it. FIX THE PROBLEM NOW Should have been done 40 years ago.	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission

Submission Information				Submission and Comment		
ID	Received	Responded	Submitter	Comment Submission	CGG Comment	Recommendation
74	28/08/2018	3/09/2018	Private submission	<p>3.1.2 Community Coastal Planning Survey and Workshops Page 7. The attached report (Appendix A.2) does not reflect what was reported in "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017. The beach and residential properties in Kempton Street are highly valued by the community. In the "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017", it was identified that the loss of residential property and community areas would have a catastrophic impact. The results of the workshop were to 'Protect' Kempton Street properties and many of the other properties and beaches that the CHRMAP has changed to 'managed retreat.' Solution: The requirements of the CHRMAP process, state that community valuing and feedback is required in order to be successful. The CHRMAP needs to be updated to reflect what is important to the community by adhering to the Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report. Changing valuable assets to the community, such as properties and beaches, to "PROTECT".</p> <p>See attached Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report October 2017 Summary Page 2-Section 2.1 Purpose "The severity of erosion and inundation impact along Geraldton's coastal areas is determined by a range of factors, and over the next 100-years the coastal region is projected to experience adverse effects from coastal hazard impact at some time." The factors used in this calculation need to be defined. Does it take into account sand replenishing, man made modifications ect. Responsibility for increased erosion has been admitted by the ports. The Geraldton Guardian has also claimed the city is also responsible for the increased erosion due to the works at the foreshore. Is this part of the calculation?</p> <p>There is sufficient justification to have the properties and community areas classified as "PROTECT" rather than the proposed "Accomodate/Managed Retreat" in Sunset Beach. The costs of managed retreat would amount to \$35,760,000 = (149 homes x \$240,000 (median reported house price per this report) This is the lowest cost as homes located next to the ocean are valued higher. The Adaptation recommendation "Section 70a notification on Title" would devalue 149 residential properties within Sunset Beach, effecting the resale value. "PROTECT" Adaptation options have been provided at a significantly lower cost to other Coastal Management Units. Not exceeding 4 million dollars. This would also remove the need to add "Section 70a notification on Title" saving millions to home owners. Refer to Technical Appendices- Table 3-2 "Cost estimates for adaptation options"</p> <p>The Adaptation plans per the report ("Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017") were as follows: Sunset Beach houses - Protect- Seawall, artificial reef, sand nourishment, dune rehabilitation, Geotextile containers.</p> <p>Page 105 -15.1.3 Managed Retreat Pathway Out of the three pathways for managed retreat, in all cases, protect is the least costly and damaging to the city. The First Option "Do Nothing" will incur reputation damage and legal costs to the city. This will detour tourism and investors from coming to Geraldton. Without a legal precedent, legal counsel will need to be sought out, incurring more costs without any benefit to the community. The Second Option 'Planned Retreat' the City would be required to reserve funds to acquire the properties before or at the time of the erosion trigger. Costing over \$35,760,000 for Sunset Beach alone. The Third Option "Protect" has been identified to have the least cost. risk and the biggest reward to the community and stakeholders. The community has recommended a proactive approach to protect the properties and beaches. This would ensure the best benefit to the City of Greater Geraldton, encouraging tourism, investments and showing everyone in WA that Geraldton cares about it's residents</p>	<p>The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops were undertaken to provide the opportunity for the community to identify and prioritise assets and values of importance to them in the coastal zone. The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops also explained the Coastal Adaptation Types and provided the opportunity for the community participants to suggest adaptation measures for each adaptation type. This provided information for the consultant to identify the long term adaptation pathway for the assets and values in the coastal zone.</p> <p>The factors used in the calculation are for coastal erosion and coastal inundation are identified in State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. In additional the Geraldton CHRMAP Report takes into account existing treatments such as the Northern Beaches Stabilisation Programme (NBSP) sand by-passing works undertaken each year by the Port Authority. The Beresford Foreshore project coastal protection structures have been designed not to interrupt the sediment flow northwards from Beresford</p> <p>The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.</p> <p>Noted. These, and other adaptation options were assessed by the consultant to identify sustainable long term adaptation pathways for the assets and values in the coastal zone.</p> <p>The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.</p>	<p>Note the submission</p> <p>Note the submission</p> <p>Note the submission</p> <p>Note the submission</p> <p>Note the submission</p>
75	28/08/2018	30/08/2018	Private submission	<p>In regards to that part of the coastline especially tourist side of thins for windsurfing and caravanning at Bosley Street. It would be sad to see the coastline turn to a unusable state it needs to be addressed</p> <p>3.1.2 Community Coastal Planning Survey and Workshops Page 7. The attached report (Appendix A.2) does not reflect what was reported in "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017. The beach and residential properties in Kempton Street are highly valued by the community. In the "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017", it was identified that the loss of residential property and community areas would have a catastrophic impact. The results of the workshop were to 'Protect' Kempton Street properties and many of the other properties and beaches that the CHRMAP has changed to 'managed retreat.' Solution: The requirements of the CHRMAP process, state that community valuing and feedback is required in order to be successful. The CHRMAP needs to be updated to reflect what is important to the community by adhering to the Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report. Changing valuable assets to the community, such as properties and beaches, to "PROTECT".</p> <p>See attached Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report October 2017 Summary Page 2-Section 2.1 Purpose "The severity of erosion and inundation impact along Geraldton's coastal areas is determined by a range of factors, and over the next 100-years the coastal region is projected to experience adverse effects from coastal hazard impact at some time." The factors used in this calculation need to be defined. Does it take into account sand replenishing, man made modifications ect. Responsibility for increased erosion has been admitted by the ports. The Geraldton Guardian has also claimed the city is also responsible for the increased erosion due to the works at the foreshore. Is this part of the calculation?</p> <p>There is sufficient justification to have the properties and community areas classified as "PROTECT" rather than the proposed "Accomodate/Managed Retreat" in Sunset Beach. The costs of managed retreat would amount to \$35,760,000 = (149 homes x \$240,000 (median reported house price per this report) This is the lowest cost as homes located next to the ocean are valued higher. The Adaptation recommendation "Section 70a notification on Title" would devalue 149 residential properties within Sunset Beach, effecting the resale value. "PROTECT" Adaptation options have been provided at a significantly lower cost to other Coastal Management Units. Not exceeding 4 million dollars. This would also remove the need to add "Section 70a notification on Title" saving millions to home owners. Refer to Technical Appendices- Table 3-2 "Cost estimates for adaptation options"</p> <p>The Adaptation plans per the report ("Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017") were as follows: Sunset Beach houses - Protect- Seawall, artificial reef, sand nourishment, dune rehabilitation, Geotextile containers.</p>	<p>Acknowledgement of submission</p> <p>The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops were undertaken to provide the opportunity for the community to identify and prioritise assets and values of importance to them in the coastal zone. The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops also explained the Coastal Adaptation Types and provided the opportunity for the community participants to suggest adaptation measures for each adaptation type. This provided information for the consultant to identify the long term adaptation pathway for the assets and values in the coastal zone.</p> <p>The factors used in the calculation are for coastal erosion and coastal inundation are identified in State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. In additional the Geraldton CHRMAP Report takes into account existing treatments such as the Northern Beaches Stabilisation Programme (NBSP) sand by-passing works undertaken each year by the Port Authority. The Beresford Foreshore project coastal protection structures have been designed not to interrupt the sediment flow northwards from Beresford</p> <p>The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.</p> <p>Noted. These, and other adaptation options were assessed by the consultant to identify sustainable long term adaptation pathways for the assets and values in the coastal zone.</p>	<p>Note the submission</p> <p>Note the submission</p> <p>Note the submission</p> <p>Note the submission</p>
76	28/08/2018	31/08/2018	Private submission	<p>Page 105 -15.1.3 Managed Retreat Pathway Out of the three pathways for managed retreat, in all cases, protect is the least costly and damaging to the city. The First Option "Do Nothing" will incur reputation damage and legal costs to the city. This will detour tourism and investors from coming to Geraldton. Without a legal precedent, legal counsel will need to be sought out, incurring more costs without any benefit to the community. The Second Option 'Planned Retreat' the City would be required to reserve funds to acquire the properties before or at the time of the erosion trigger. Costing over \$35,760,000 for Sunset Beach alone. The Third Option "Protect" has been identified to have the least cost. risk and the biggest reward to the community and stakeholders. The community has recommended a proactive approach to protect the properties and beaches. This would ensure the best benefit to the City of Greater Geraldton, encouraging tourism, investments and showing everyone in WA that Geraldton cares about it's residents</p> <p>3.1.2 Community Coastal Planning Survey and Workshops Page 7. The attached report (Appendix A.2) does not reflect what was reported in "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017. The beach and residential properties in Kempton Street are highly valued by the community. In the "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017", it was identified that the loss of residential property and community areas would have a catastrophic impact. The results of the workshop were to 'Protect' Kempton Street properties and many of the other properties and beaches that the CHRMAP has changed to 'managed retreat.' Solution: The requirements of the CHRMAP process, state that community valuing and feedback is required in order to be successful. The CHRMAP needs to be updated to reflect what is important to the community by adhering to the Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report. Changing valuable assets to the community, such as properties and beaches, to "PROTECT".</p> <p>See attached Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report October 2017 Summary Page 2-Section 2.1 Purpose "The severity of erosion and inundation impact along Geraldton's coastal areas is determined by a range of factors, and over the next 100-years the coastal region is projected to experience adverse effects from coastal hazard impact at some time." The factors used in this calculation need to be defined. Does it take into account sand replenishing, man made modifications ect. Responsibility for increased erosion has been admitted by the ports. The Geraldton Guardian has also claimed the city is also responsible for the increased erosion due to the works at the foreshore. Is this part of the calculation?</p> <p>There is sufficient justification to have the properties and community areas classified as "PROTECT" rather than the proposed "Accomodate/Managed Retreat" in Sunset Beach. The costs of managed retreat would amount to \$35,760,000 = (149 homes x \$240,000 (median reported house price per this report) This is the lowest cost as homes located next to the ocean are valued higher. The Adaptation recommendation "Section 70a notification on Title" would devalue 149 residential properties within Sunset Beach, effecting the resale value. "PROTECT" Adaptation options have been provided at a significantly lower cost to other Coastal Management Units. Not exceeding 4 million dollars. This would also remove the need to add "Section 70a notification on Title" saving millions to home owners. Refer to Technical Appendices- Table 3-2 "Cost estimates for adaptation options"</p> <p>The Adaptation plans per the report ("Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017") were as follows: Sunset Beach houses - Protect- Seawall, artificial reef, sand nourishment, dune rehabilitation, Geotextile containers.</p>	<p>The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.</p> <p>The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops were undertaken to provide the opportunity for the community to identify and prioritise assets and values of importance to them in the coastal zone. The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops also explained the Coastal Adaptation Types and provided the opportunity for the community participants to suggest adaptation measures for each adaptation type. This provided information for the consultant to identify the long term adaptation pathway for the assets and values in the coastal zone.</p> <p>The factors used in the calculation are for coastal erosion and coastal inundation are identified in State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. In additional the Geraldton CHRMAP Report takes into account existing treatments such as the Northern Beaches Stabilisation Programme (NBSP) sand by-passing works undertaken each year by the Port Authority. The Beresford Foreshore project coastal protection structures have been designed not to interrupt the sediment flow northwards from Beresford</p> <p>The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.</p> <p>Noted. These, and other adaptation options were assessed by the consultant to identify sustainable long term adaptation pathways for the assets and values in the coastal zone.</p>	<p>Note the submission</p> <p>Note the submission</p> <p>Note the submission</p> <p>Note the submission</p>
77	28/08/2018	31/08/2018	Private submission	<p>Page 105 -15.1.3 Managed Retreat Pathway Out of the three pathways for managed retreat, in all cases, protect is the least costly and damaging to the city. The First Option "Do Nothing" will incur reputation damage and legal costs to the city. This will detour tourism and investors from coming to Geraldton. Without a legal precedent, legal counsel will need to be sought out, incurring more costs without any benefit to the community. The Second Option 'Planned Retreat' the City would be required to reserve funds to acquire the properties before or at the time of the erosion trigger. Costing over \$35,760,000 for Sunset Beach alone. The Third Option "Protect" has been identified to have the least cost. risk and the biggest reward to the community and stakeholders. The community has recommended a proactive approach to protect the properties and beaches. This would ensure the best benefit to the City of Greater Geraldton, encouraging tourism, investments and showing everyone in WA that Geraldton cares about it's residents</p> <p>3.1.2 Community Coastal Planning Survey and Workshops Page 7. The attached report (Appendix A.2) does not reflect what was reported in "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017. The beach and residential properties in Kempton Street are highly valued by the community. In the "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017", it was identified that the loss of residential property and community areas would have a catastrophic impact. The results of the workshop were to 'Protect' Kempton Street properties and many of the other properties and beaches that the CHRMAP has changed to 'managed retreat.' Solution: The requirements of the CHRMAP process, state that community valuing and feedback is required in order to be successful. The CHRMAP needs to be updated to reflect what is important to the community by adhering to the Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report. Changing valuable assets to the community, such as properties and beaches, to "PROTECT".</p> <p>See attached Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report October 2017 Summary Page 2-Section 2.1 Purpose "The severity of erosion and inundation impact along Geraldton's coastal areas is determined by a range of factors, and over the next 100-years the coastal region is projected to experience adverse effects from coastal hazard impact at some time." The factors used in this calculation need to be defined. Does it take into account sand replenishing, man made modifications ect. Responsibility for increased erosion has been admitted by the ports. The Geraldton Guardian has also claimed the city is also responsible for the increased erosion due to the works at the foreshore. Is this part of the calculation?</p> <p>There is sufficient justification to have the properties and community areas classified as "PROTECT" rather than the proposed "Accomodate/Managed Retreat" in Sunset Beach. The costs of managed retreat would amount to \$35,760,000 = (149 homes x \$240,000 (median reported house price per this report) This is the lowest cost as homes located next to the ocean are valued higher. The Adaptation recommendation "Section 70a notification on Title" would devalue 149 residential properties within Sunset Beach, effecting the resale value. "PROTECT" Adaptation options have been provided at a significantly lower cost to other Coastal Management Units. Not exceeding 4 million dollars. This would also remove the need to add "Section 70a notification on Title" saving millions to home owners. Refer to Technical Appendices- Table 3-2 "Cost estimates for adaptation options"</p>	<p>The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.</p> <p>The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops were undertaken to provide the opportunity for the community to identify and prioritise assets and values of importance to them in the coastal zone. The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops also explained the Coastal Adaptation Types and provided the opportunity for the community participants to suggest adaptation measures for each adaptation type. This provided information for the consultant to identify the long term adaptation pathway for the assets and values in the coastal zone.</p> <p>The factors used in the calculation are for coastal erosion and coastal inundation are identified in State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. In additional the Geraldton CHRMAP Report takes into account existing treatments such as the Northern Beaches Stabilisation Programme (NBSP) sand by-passing works undertaken each year by the Port Authority. The Beresford Foreshore project coastal protection structures have been designed not to interrupt the sediment flow northwards from Beresford</p> <p>The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.</p> <p>Noted. These, and other adaptation options were assessed by the consultant to identify sustainable long term adaptation pathways for the assets and values in the coastal zone.</p>	<p>Note the submission</p> <p>Note the submission</p> <p>Note the submission</p> <p>Note the submission</p>



Submission Information				Submission and Comment		
ID	Received	Responded	Submitter	Comment Submission	CGG Comment	Recommendation
78	28/08/2018	31/08/2018	Private submission	The Adaptation plans per the report ("Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017") were as follows: Sunset Beach houses - Protect- Seawall, artificial reef, sand nourishment, dune rehabilitation, Geotextile containers.	Noted. These, and other adaptation options were assessed by the consultant to identify sustainable long term adaptation pathways for the assets and values in the coastal zone.	Note the submission
				Page 105 -15.1.3 Managed Retreat Pathway Out of the three pathways for managed retreat, in all cases, protect is the least costly and damaging to the city. The First Option "Do Nothing" will incur reputation damage and legal costs to the city. This will detour tourism and investors from coming to Geraldton. Without a legal precedent, legal counsel will need to be sought out, incurring more costs without any benefit to the community. The Second Option 'Planned Retreat' the City would be required to reserve funds to acquire the properties before or at the time of the erosion trigger. Costing over \$35,760,000 for Sunset Beach alone. The Third Option "Protect" has been identified to have the least cost. risk and the biggest reward to the community and stakeholders. The community has recommended a proactive approach to protect the properties and beaches. This would ensure the best benefit to the City of Greater Geraldton, encouraging tourism, investments and showing everyone in WA that Geraldton cares about it's residents	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note the submission
				3.1.2 Community Coastal Planning Survey and Workshops Page 7. The attached report (Appendix A.2) does not reflect what was reported in "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report,October 2017. The beach and residential properties in Kempton Street are highly valued by the community. In the "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report,October 2017", it was identified that the loss of residential property and community areas would have a catastrophic impact. The results of the workshop were to 'Protect' Kempton Street properties and many of the other properties and beaches that the CHRMAP has changed to 'managed retreat.' Solution: The requirements of the CHRMAP process, state that community valuing and feedback is required in order to be successful. The CHRMAP needs to be updated to reflect what is important to the community by adhering to the Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report. Changing valuable assets to the community, such as properties and beaches, to "PROTECT".	The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops were undertaken to provide the opportunity for the community to identify and prioritise assets and values of importance to them in the coastal zone. The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops also explained the Coastal Adaptation Types and provided the opportunity for the community participants to suggest adaptation measures for each adaptation type. This provided information for the consultant to identify the long term adaptation pathway for the assets and values in the coastal zone.	Note the submission
				See attached Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report October 2017 Summary Page 2-Section 2.1 Purpose "The severity of erosion and inundation impact along Geraldton's coastal areas is determined by a range of factors, and over the next 100-years the coastal region is projected to experience adverse effects from coastal hazard impact at some time." The factors used in this calculation need to be defined. Does it take into account sand replenishing, man made modifications ect. Responsibility for increased erosion has been admitted by the ports. The Geraldton Guardian has also claimed the city is also responsible for the increased erosion due to the works at the foreshore. Is this part of the calculation?	The factors used in the calculation are for coastal erosion and coastal inundation are identified in State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. In additional the Geraldton CHRMAP Report takes into account existing treatments such as the Northern Beaches Stabilisation Programme (NBSP) sand by-passing works undertaken each year by the Port Authority. The Beresford Foreshore project coastal protection structures have been designed not to interrupt the sediment flow northwards from Beresford.	Note the submission
				There is sufficient justification to have the properties and community areas classified as "PROTECT" rather than the proposed "Accomodate/Managed Retreat" in Sunset Beach. The costs of managed retreat would amount to \$35,760,000 = (149 homes x \$240,000 (median reported house price per this report) This is the lowest cost as homes located next to the ocean are valued higher. The Adaptation recommendation "Section 70a notification on Title" would devalue 149 residential properties within Sunset Beach, effecting the resale value. "PROTECT" Adaptation options have been provided at a significantly lower cost to other Coastal Management Units. Not exceeding 4 million dollars. This would also remove the need to add "Section 70a notification on Title" saving millions to home owners. Refer to Technical Appendices- Table 3-2 "Cost estimates for adaptation options."	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note the submission
79	28/08/2018	31/08/2018	Private submission	The Adaptation plans per the report ("Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017") were as follows: Sunset Beach houses - Protect- Seawall, artificial reef, sand nourishment, dune rehabilitation, Geotextile containers.	Noted. These, and other adaptation options were assessed by the consultant to identify sustainable long term adaptation pathways for the assets and values in the coastal zone.	Note the submission
				Page 105 -15.1.3 Managed Retreat Pathway Out of the three pathways for managed retreat, in all cases, protect is the least costly and damaging to the city. The First Option "Do Nothing" will incur reputation damage and legal costs to the city. This will detour tourism and investors from coming to Geraldton. Without a legal precedent, legal counsel will need to be sought out, incurring more costs without any benefit to the community. The Second Option 'Planned Retreat' the City would be required to reserve funds to acquire the properties before or at the time of the erosion trigger. Costing over \$35,760,000 for Sunset Beach alone. The Third Option "Protect" has been identified to have the least cost. risk and the biggest reward to the community and stakeholders. The community has recommended a proactive approach to protect the properties and beaches. This would ensure the best benefit to the City of Greater Geraldton, encouraging tourism, investments and showing everyone in WA that Geraldton cares about it's residents	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note the submission
				3.1.2 Community Coastal Planning Survey and Workshops Page 7. The attached report (Appendix A.2) does not reflect what was reported in "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report,October 2017. The beach and residential properties in Kempton Street are highly valued by the community. In the "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report,October 2017", it was identified that the loss of residential property and community areas would have a catastrophic impact. The results of the workshop were to 'Protect' Kempton Street properties and many of the other properties and beaches that the CHRMAP has changed to 'managed retreat.' Solution: The requirements of the CHRMAP process, state that community valuing and feedback is required in order to be successful. The CHRMAP needs to be updated to reflect what is important to the community by adhering to the Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report. Changing valuable assets to the community, such as properties and beaches, to "PROTECT".	The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops were undertaken to provide the opportunity for the community to identify and prioritise assets and values of importance to them in the coastal zone. The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops also explained the Coastal Adaptation Types and provided the opportunity for the community participants to suggest adaptation measures for each adaptation type. This provided information for the consultant to identify the long term adaptation pathway for the assets and values in the coastal zone.	Note the submission
				See attached Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report October 2017 Summary Page 2-Section 2.1 Purpose "The severity of erosion and inundation impact along Geraldton's coastal areas is determined by a range of factors, and over the next 100-years the coastal region is projected to experience adverse effects from coastal hazard impact at some time." The factors used in this calculation need to be defined. Does it take into account sand replenishing, man made modifications ect. Responsibility for increased erosion has been admitted by the ports. The Geraldton Guardian has also claimed the city is also responsible for the increased erosion due to the works at the foreshore. Is this part of the calculation?	The factors used in the calculation are for coastal erosion and coastal inundation are identified in State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. In additional the Geraldton CHRMAP Report takes into account existing treatments such as the Northern Beaches Stabilisation Programme (NBSP) sand by-passing works undertaken each year by the Port Authority. The Beresford Foreshore project coastal protection structures have been designed not to interrupt the sediment flow northwards from Beresford.	Note the submission
				There is sufficient justification to have the properties and community areas classified as "PROTECT" rather than the proposed "Accomodate/Managed Retreat" in Sunset Beach. The costs of managed retreat would amount to \$35,760,000 = (149 homes x \$240,000 (median reported house price per this report) This is the lowest cost as homes located next to the ocean are valued higher. The Adaptation recommendation "Section 70a notification on Title" would devalue 149 residential properties within Sunset Beach, effecting the resale value. "PROTECT" Adaptation options have been provided at a significantly lower cost to other Coastal Management Units. Not exceeding 4 million dollars. This would also remove the need to add "Section 70a notification on Title" saving millions to home owners. Refer to Technical Appendices- Table 3-2 "Cost estimates for adaptation options."	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note the submission
80	28/08/2018	31/08/2018	Private submission	The Adaptation plans per the report ("Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017") were as follows: Sunset Beach houses - Protect- Seawall, artificial reef, sand nourishment, dune rehabilitation, Geotextile containers.	Noted. These, and other adaptation options were assessed by the consultant to identify sustainable long term adaptation pathways for the assets and values in the coastal zone.	Note the submission
				Page 105 -15.1.3 Managed Retreat Pathway Out of the three pathways for managed retreat, in all cases, protect is the least costly and damaging to the city. The First Option "Do Nothing" will incur reputation damage and legal costs to the city. This will detour tourism and investors from coming to Geraldton. Without a legal precedent, legal counsel will need to be sought out, incurring more costs without any benefit to the community. The Second Option 'Planned Retreat' the City would be required to reserve funds to acquire the properties before or at the time of the erosion trigger. Costing over \$35,760,000 for Sunset Beach alone. The Third Option "Protect" has been identified to have the least cost. risk and the biggest reward to the community and stakeholders. The community has recommended a proactive approach to protect the properties and beaches. This would ensure the best benefit to the City of Greater Geraldton, encouraging tourism, investments and showing everyone in WA that Geraldton cares about it's residents	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note the submission
				3.1.2 Community Coastal Planning Survey and Workshops Page 7. The attached report (Appendix A.2) does not reflect what was reported in "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report,October 2017. The beach and residential properties in Kempton Street are highly valued by the community. In the "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report,October 2017", it was identified that the loss of residential property and community areas would have a catastrophic impact. The results of the workshop were to 'Protect' Kempton Street properties and many of the other properties and beaches that the CHRMAP has changed to 'managed retreat.' Solution: The requirements of the CHRMAP process, state that community valuing and feedback is required in order to be successful. The CHRMAP needs to be updated to reflect what is important to the community by adhering to the Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report. Changing valuable assets to the community, such as properties and beaches, to "PROTECT".	The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops were undertaken to provide the opportunity for the community to identify and prioritise assets and values of importance to them in the coastal zone. The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops also explained the Coastal Adaptation Types and provided the opportunity for the community participants to suggest adaptation measures for each adaptation type. This provided information for the consultant to identify the long term adaptation pathway for the assets and values in the coastal zone.	Note the submission
				See attached Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report October 2017 Summary Page 2-Section 2.1 Purpose "The severity of erosion and inundation impact along Geraldton's coastal areas is determined by a range of factors, and over the next 100-years the coastal region is projected to experience adverse effects from coastal hazard impact at some time." The factors used in this calculation need to be defined. Does it take into account sand replenishing, man made modifications ect. Responsibility for increased erosion has been admitted by the ports. The Geraldton Guardian has also claimed the city is also responsible for the increased erosion due to the works at the foreshore. Is this part of the calculation?	The factors used in the calculation are for coastal erosion and coastal inundation are identified in State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. In additional the Geraldton CHRMAP Report takes into account existing treatments such as the Northern Beaches Stabilisation Programme (NBSP) sand by-passing works undertaken each year by the Port Authority. The Beresford Foreshore project coastal protection structures have been designed not to interrupt the sediment flow northwards from Beresford.	Note the submission
				There is sufficient justification to have the properties and community areas classified as "PROTECT" rather than the proposed "Accomodate/Managed Retreat" in Sunset Beach. The costs of managed retreat would amount to \$35,760,000 = (149 homes x \$240,000 (median reported house price per this report) This is the lowest cost as homes located next to the ocean are valued higher. The Adaptation recommendation "Section 70a notification on Title" would devalue 149 residential properties within Sunset Beach, effecting the resale value. "PROTECT" Adaptation options have been provided at a significantly lower cost to other Coastal Management Units. Not exceeding 4 million dollars. This would also remove the need to add "Section 70a notification on Title" saving millions to home owners. Refer to Technical Appendices- Table 3-2 "Cost estimates for adaptation options."	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note the submission
				The Adaptation plans per the report ("Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017") were as follows: Sunset Beach houses - Protect- Seawall, artificial reef, sand nourishment, dune rehabilitation, Geotextile containers.	Noted. These, and other adaptation options were assessed by the consultant to identify sustainable long term adaptation pathways for the assets and values in the coastal zone.	Note the submission
				Page 105 -15.1.3 Managed Retreat Pathway Out of the three pathways for managed retreat, in all cases, protect is the least costly and damaging to the city. The First Option "Do Nothing" will incur reputation damage and legal costs to the city. This will detour tourism and investors from coming to Geraldton. Without a legal precedent, legal counsel will need to be sought out, incurring more costs without any benefit to the community. The Second Option 'Planned Retreat' the City would be required to reserve funds to acquire the properties before or at the time of the erosion trigger. Costing over \$35,760,000 for Sunset Beach alone. The Third Option "Protect" has been identified to have the least cost. risk and the biggest reward to the community and stakeholders. The community has recommended a proactive approach to protect the properties and beaches. This would ensure the best benefit to the City of Greater Geraldton, encouraging tourism, investments and showing everyone in WA that Geraldton cares about it's residents	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note the submission
				In my opinion the council has been slow to initiate a study to examine the cause of existing waterfront erosion which, more than likely has been caused by the reclamation works near the town centre. The study should also recommend measures to stop and prevent further erosion for the council to implement. It seems to me that on the other hand the council has been far too proactive in pursuing the course of action to highlight the possible future erosion of the foreshore. One action of this illustrated negative attitude is the recent demolition of a perfectly operating toilet block at Sunset Beach, which cost the ratepayer a considerable amount of money to construct. No action has been taken so far to replace it. The publicity of the report has resulted in significant and devastating lowering of property values and caused subsequent anxiety and distress to ratepayers, the majority of whom are battlers having been able to save hard to purchase a home in this premium location. One function of the council is to look after the interests of ratepayers and in this particular case they have failed miserably. One complaint I have heard from ratepayers is that there has been minimal communication and meaningful support in connection with erosion issues	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission



Submission Information				Submission and Comment		
ID	Received	Responded	Submitter	Comment Submission	CGG Comment	Recommendation
81	28/08/2018	31/08/2018	Private submission	<p>3.1.2 Community Coastal Planning Survey and Workshops Page 7. The attached report (Appendix A.2) does not reflect what was reported in "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017. The beach and residential properties in Kempton Street are highly valued by the community. In the "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017", it was identified that the loss of residential property and community areas would have a catastrophic impact. The results of the workshop were to 'Protect' Kempton Street properties and many of the other properties and beaches that the CHRMAP has changed to 'managed retreat.' Solution: The requirements of the CHRMAP process, state that community valuing and feedback is required in order to be successful. The CHRMAP needs to be updated to reflect what is important to the community by adhering to the Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report. Changing valuable assets to the community, such as properties and beaches, to "PROTECT".</p> <p>See attached Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report October 2017 Summary Page 2-Section 2.1 Purpose "The severity of erosion and inundation impact along Geraldton's coastal areas is determined by a range of factors, and over the next 100-years the coastal region is projected to experience adverse effects from coastal hazard impact at some time." The factors used in this calculation need to be defined. Does it take into account sand replenishing, man made modifications ect. Responsibility for increased erosion has been admitted by the ports. The Geraldton Guardian has also claimed the city is also responsible for the increased erosion due to the works at the foreshore. Is this part of the calculation?</p> <p>There is sufficient justification to have the properties and community areas classified as "PROTECT" rather than the proposed "Accomodate/Managed Retreat" in Sunset Beach. The costs of managed retreat would amount to \$35,760,000 = (149 homes x \$240,000 (median reported house price per this report) This is the lowest cost as homes located next to the ocean are valued higher. The Adaptation recommendation "Section 70a notification on Title" would devalue 149 residential properties within Sunset Beach, effecting the resale value. "PROTECT" Adaptation options have been provided at a significantly lower cost to other Coastal Management Units. Not exceeding 4 million dollars. This would also remove the need to add "Section 70a notification on Title" saving millions to home owners. Refer to Technical Appendices- Table 3-2 "Cost estimates for adaptation options"</p> <p>The Adaptation plans per the report ("Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017") were as follows: Sunset Beach houses - Protect- Seawall, artificial reef, sand nourishment, dune rehabilitation, Geotextile containers.</p>	<p>Acknowledgement of submission</p> <p>The factors used in the calculation are for coastal erosion and coastal inundation are identified in State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. In addition the Geraldton CHRMAP Report takes into account existing treatments such as the Northern Beaches Stabilisation Programme (NBSP) sand by-passing works undertaken each year by the Port Authority. The Beresford Foreshore project coastal protection structures have been designed not to interrupt the sediment flow northwards from Beresford</p> <p>The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.</p>	<p>Note the submission</p> <p>Note the submission</p> <p>Note the submission</p>
82	28/08/2018	30/08/2018	Private submission	<p>Page 105 -15.1.3 Managed Retreat Pathway Out of the three pathways for managed retreat, in all cases, protect is the least costly and damaging to the city. The First Option "Do Nothing" will incur reputation damage and legal costs to the city. This will detour tourism and investors from coming to Geraldton. Without a legal precedent, legal counsel will need to be sought out, incurring more costs without any benefit to the community. The Second Option 'Planned Retreat' the City would be required to reserve funds to acquire the properties before or at the time of the erosion trigger. Costing over \$35,760,000 for Sunset Beach alone. The Third Option "Protect" has been identified to have the least cost. risk and the biggest reward to the community and stakeholders. The community has recommended a proactive approach to protect the properties and beaches. This would ensure the best benefit to the City of Greater Geraldton, encouraging tourism, investments and showing everyone in WA that Geraldton cares about it's residents</p> <p>3.1.2 Community Coastal Planning Survey and Workshops Page 7. The attached report (Appendix A.2) does not reflect what was reported in "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017. The beach and residential properties in Kempton Street are highly valued by the community. In the "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017", it was identified that the loss of residential property and community areas would have a catastrophic impact. The results of the workshop were to 'Protect' Kempton Street properties and many of the other properties and beaches that the CHRMAP has changed to 'managed retreat.' Solution: The requirements of the CHRMAP process, state that community valuing and feedback is required in order to be successful. The CHRMAP needs to be updated to reflect what is important to the community by adhering to the Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report. Changing valuable assets to the community, such as properties and beaches, to "PROTECT".</p> <p>See attached Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report October 2017 Summary Page 2-Section 2.1 Purpose "The severity of erosion and inundation impact along Geraldton's coastal areas is determined by a range of factors, and over the next 100-years the coastal region is projected to experience adverse effects from coastal hazard impact at some time." The factors used in this calculation need to be defined. Does it take into account sand replenishing, man made modifications ect. Responsibility for increased erosion has been admitted by the ports. The Geraldton Guardian has also claimed the city is also responsible for the increased erosion due to the works at the foreshore. Is this part of the calculation?</p> <p>There is sufficient justification to have the properties and community areas classified as "PROTECT" rather than the proposed "Accomodate/Managed Retreat" in Sunset Beach. The costs of managed retreat would amount to \$35,760,000 = (149 homes x \$240,000 (median reported house price per this report) This is the lowest cost as homes located next to the ocean are valued higher. The Adaptation recommendation "Section 70a notification on Title" would devalue 149 residential properties within Sunset Beach, effecting the resale value. "PROTECT" Adaptation options have been provided at a significantly lower cost to other Coastal Management Units. Not exceeding 4 million dollars. This would also remove the need to add "Section 70a notification on Title" saving millions to home owners. Refer to Technical Appendices- Table 3-2 "Cost estimates for adaptation options"</p> <p>The Adaptation plans per the report ("Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017") were as follows: Sunset Beach houses - Protect- Seawall, artificial reef, sand nourishment, dune rehabilitation, Geotextile containers.</p> <p>Page 105 -15.1.3 Managed Retreat Pathway Out of the three pathways for managed retreat, in all cases, protect is the least costly and damaging to the city. The First Option "Do Nothing" will incur reputation damage and legal costs to the city. This will detour tourism and investors from coming to Geraldton. Without a legal precedent, legal counsel will need to be sought out, incurring more costs without any benefit to the community. The Second Option 'Planned Retreat' the City would be required to reserve funds to acquire the properties before or at the time of the erosion trigger. Costing over \$35,760,000 for Sunset Beach alone. The Third Option "Protect" has been identified to have the least cost. risk and the biggest reward to the community and stakeholders. The community has recommended a proactive approach to protect the properties and beaches. This would ensure the best benefit to the City of Greater Geraldton, encouraging tourism, investments and showing everyone in WA that Geraldton cares about it's residents</p>	<p>The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.</p> <p>The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops were undertaken to provide the opportunity for the community to identify and prioritise assets and values of importance to them in the coastal zone. The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops also explained the Coastal Adaptation Types and provided the opportunity for the community participants to suggest adaptation measures for each adaptation type. This provided information for the consultant to identify the long term adaptation pathway for the assets and values in the coastal zone</p> <p>The factors used in the calculation are for coastal erosion and coastal inundation are identified in State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. In addition the Geraldton CHRMAP Report takes into account existing treatments such as the Northern Beaches Stabilisation Programme (NBSP) sand by-passing works undertaken each year by the Port Authority. The Beresford Foreshore project coastal protection structures have been designed not to interrupt the sediment flow northwards from Beresford</p> <p>The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.</p> <p>Noted. These, and other adaptation options were assessed by the consultant to identify sustainable long term adaptation pathways for the assets and values in the coastal zone.</p> <p>The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.</p>	<p>Note the submission</p> <p>Note the submission</p> <p>Note the submission</p> <p>Note the submission</p> <p>Note the submission</p>
83	28/08/2018	31/08/2018	Private submission	<p>Protect</p> <p>3.1.2 Community Coastal Planning Survey and Workshops Page 7. The attached report (Appendix A.2) does not reflect what was reported in "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017. The beach and residential properties in Kempton Street are highly valued by the community. In the "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017", it was identified that the loss of residential property and community areas would have a catastrophic impact. The results of the workshop were to 'Protect' Kempton Street properties and many of the other properties and beaches that the CHRMAP has changed to 'managed retreat.' Solution: The requirements of the CHRMAP process, state that community valuing and feedback is required in order to be successful. The CHRMAP needs to be updated to reflect what is important to the community by adhering to the Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report. Changing valuable assets to the community, such as properties and beaches, to "PROTECT".</p> <p>See attached Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report October 2017 Summary Page 2-Section 2.1 Purpose "The severity of erosion and inundation impact along Geraldton's coastal areas is determined by a range of factors, and over the next 100-years the coastal region is projected to experience adverse effects from coastal hazard impact at some time." The factors used in this calculation need to be defined. Does it take into account sand replenishing, man made modifications ect. Responsibility for increased erosion has been admitted by the ports. The Geraldton Guardian has also claimed the city is also responsible for the increased erosion due to the works at the foreshore. Is this part of the calculation?</p> <p>There is sufficient justification to have the properties and community areas classified as "PROTECT" rather than the proposed "Accomodate/Managed Retreat" in Sunset Beach. The costs of managed retreat would amount to \$35,760,000 = (149 homes x \$240,000 (median reported house price per this report) This is the lowest cost as homes located next to the ocean are valued higher. The Adaptation recommendation "Section 70a notification on Title" would devalue 149 residential properties within Sunset Beach, effecting the resale value. "PROTECT" Adaptation options have been provided at a significantly lower cost to other Coastal Management Units. Not exceeding 4 million dollars. This would also remove the need to add "Section 70a notification on Title" saving millions to home owners. Refer to Technical Appendices- Table 3-2 "Cost estimates for adaptation options"</p> <p>The Adaptation plans per the report ("Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017") were as follows: Sunset Beach houses - Protect- Seawall, artificial reef, sand nourishment, dune rehabilitation, Geotextile containers.</p> <p>Page 105 -15.1.3 Managed Retreat Pathway Out of the three pathways for managed retreat, in all cases, protect is the least costly and damaging to the city. The First Option "Do Nothing" will incur reputation damage and legal costs to the city. This will detour tourism and investors from coming to Geraldton. Without a legal precedent, legal counsel will need to be sought out, incurring more costs without any benefit to the community. The Second Option 'Planned Retreat' the City would be required to reserve funds to acquire the properties before or at the time of the erosion trigger. Costing over \$35,760,000 for Sunset Beach alone. The Third Option "Protect" has been identified to have the least cost. risk and the biggest reward to the community and stakeholders. The community has recommended a proactive approach to protect the properties and beaches. This would ensure the best benefit to the City of Greater Geraldton, encouraging tourism, investments and showing everyone in WA that Geraldton cares about it's residents</p> <p>Protect</p>	<p>Acknowledgement of submission</p> <p>The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops were undertaken to provide the opportunity for the community to identify and prioritise assets and values of importance to them in the coastal zone. The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops also explained the Coastal Adaptation Types and provided the opportunity for the community participants to suggest adaptation measures for each adaptation type. This provided information for the consultant to identify the long term adaptation pathway for the assets and values in the coastal zone</p> <p>The factors used in the calculation are for coastal erosion and coastal inundation are identified in State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. In addition the Geraldton CHRMAP Report takes into account existing treatments such as the Northern Beaches Stabilisation Programme (NBSP) sand by-passing works undertaken each year by the Port Authority. The Beresford Foreshore project coastal protection structures have been designed not to interrupt the sediment flow northwards from Beresford</p> <p>The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.</p> <p>Noted. These, and other adaptation options were assessed by the consultant to identify sustainable long term adaptation pathways for the assets and values in the coastal zone.</p> <p>The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.</p>	<p>Note the submission</p> <p>Note the submission</p> <p>Note the submission</p> <p>Note the submission</p> <p>Note the submission</p>
84	28/08/2018	3/09/2018	Private submission	<p>3.1.2 Community Coastal Planning Survey and Workshops Page 7. The attached report (Appendix A.2) does not reflect what was reported in "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017. The beach and residential properties in Kempton Street are highly valued by the community. In the "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017", it was identified that the loss of residential property and community areas would have a catastrophic impact. The results of the workshop were to 'Protect' Kempton Street properties and many of the other properties and beaches that the CHRMAP has changed to 'managed retreat.' Solution: The requirements of the CHRMAP process, state that community valuing and feedback is required in order to be successful. The CHRMAP needs to be updated to reflect what is important to the community by adhering to the Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report. Changing valuable assets to the community, such as properties and beaches, to "PROTECT".</p> <p>See attached Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report October 2017 Summary Page 2-Section 2.1 Purpose "The severity of erosion and inundation impact along Geraldton's coastal areas is determined by a range of factors, and over the next 100-years the coastal region is projected to experience adverse effects from coastal hazard impact at some time." The factors used in this calculation need to be defined. Does it take into account sand replenishing, man made modifications ect. Responsibility for increased erosion has been admitted by the ports. The Geraldton Guardian has also claimed the city is also responsible for the increased erosion due to the works at the foreshore. Is this part of the calculation?</p> <p>There is sufficient justification to have the properties and community areas classified as "PROTECT" rather than the proposed "Accomodate/Managed Retreat" in Sunset Beach. The costs of managed retreat would amount to \$35,760,000 = (149 homes x \$240,000 (median reported house price per this report) This is the lowest cost as homes located next to the ocean are valued higher. The Adaptation recommendation "Section 70a notification on Title" would devalue 149 residential properties within Sunset Beach, effecting the resale value. "PROTECT" Adaptation options have been provided at a significantly lower cost to other Coastal Management Units. Not exceeding 4 million dollars. This would also remove the need to add "Section 70a notification on Title" saving millions to home owners. Refer to Technical Appendices- Table 3-2 "Cost estimates for adaptation options"</p>	<p>The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops were undertaken to provide the opportunity for the community to identify and prioritise assets and values of importance to them in the coastal zone. The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops also explained the Coastal Adaptation Types and provided the opportunity for the community participants to suggest adaptation measures for each adaptation type. This provided information for the consultant to identify the long term adaptation pathway for the assets and values in the coastal zone</p> <p>The factors used in the calculation are for coastal erosion and coastal inundation are identified in State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. In addition the Geraldton CHRMAP Report takes into account existing treatments such as the Northern Beaches Stabilisation Programme (NBSP) sand by-passing works undertaken each year by the Port Authority. The Beresford Foreshore project coastal protection structures have been designed not to interrupt the sediment flow northwards from Beresford</p> <p>The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.</p>	<p>Note the submission</p> <p>Note the submission</p> <p>Note the submission</p>

Submission Information				Submission and Comment		
ID	Received	Responded	Submitter	Comment Submission	CGG Comment	Recommendation
				The Adaptation plans per the report ("Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017") were as follows: Sunset Beach houses - Protect- Seawall, artificial reef, sand nourishment, dune rehabilitation, Geotextile containers. Page 105 -15.1.3 Managed Retreat Pathway Out of the three pathways for managed retreat, in all cases, protect is the least costly and damaging to the city. The First Option "Do Nothing" will incur reputation damage and legal costs to the city. This will detour tourism and investors from coming to Geraldton. Without a legal precedent, legal counsel will need to be sought out, incurring more costs without any benefit to the community. The Second Option "Planned Retreat" the City would be required to reserve funds to acquire the properties before or at the time of the erosion trigger. Costing over \$35,760,000 for Sunset Beach alone. The Third Option "Protect" has been identified to have the least cost. risk and the biggest reward to the community and stakeholders. The community has recommended a proactive approach to protect the properties and beaches. This would ensure the best benefit to the City of Greater Geraldton, encouraging tourism, investments and showing everyone in WA that Geraldton cares about it's residents	Noted. These, and other adaptation options were assessed by the consultant to identify sustainable long term adaptation pathways for the assets and values in the coastal zone. The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note the submission
85	28/08/2018	31/08/2018	Private submission	Protect 3.1.2 Community Coastal Planning Survey and Workshops Page 7. The attached report (Appendix A.2) does not reflect what was reported in "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report,October 2017. The beach and residential properties in Kempton Street are highly valued by the community. In the "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report,October 2017", it was identified that the loss of residential property and community areas would have a catastrophic impact. The results of the workshop were to 'Protect' Kempton Street properties and many of the other properties and beaches that the CHRMAP has changed to 'managed retreat.' Solution: The requirements of the CHRMAP process, state that community valuing and feedback is required in order to be successful. The CHRMAP needs to be updated to reflect what is important to the community by adhering to the Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report. Changing valuable assets to the community, such as properties and beaches, to "PROTECT".  See attached Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report October 2017 Summary Page 2-Section 2.1 Purpose "The severity of erosion and inundation impact along Geraldton's coastal areas is determined by a range of factors, and over the next 100-years the coastal region is projected to experience adverse effects from coastal hazard impact at some time." The factors used in this calculation need to be defined. Does it take into account sand replenishing, man made modifications ect. Responsibility for increased erosion has been admitted by the ports. The Geraldton Guardian has also claimed the city is also responsible for the increased erosion due to the works at the foreshore. Is this part of the calculation?  There is sufficient justification to have the properties and community areas classified as "PROTECT" rather than the proposed "Accomodate/Managed Retreat" in Sunset Beach. The costs of managed retreat would amount to \$35,760,000 = (149 homes x \$240,000 (median reported house price per this report) This is the lowest cost as homes located next to the ocean are valued higher. The Adaptation recommendation "Section 70a notification on Title" would devalue 149 residential properties within Sunset Beach, effecting the resale value. "PROTECT" Adaptation options have been provided at a significantly lower cost to other Coastal Management Units. Not exceeding 4 million dollars. This would also remove the need to add "Section 70a notification on Title" saving millions to home owners. Refer to Technical Appendices- Table 3-2 "Cost estimates for adaptation options" The Adaptation plans per the report ("Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017") were as follows: Sunset Beach houses - Protect- Seawall, artificial reef, sand nourishment, dune rehabilitation, Geotextile containers. Page 105 -15.1.3 Managed Retreat Pathway Out of the three pathways for managed retreat, in all cases, protect is the least costly and damaging to the city. The First Option "Do Nothing" will incur reputation damage and legal costs to the city. This will detour tourism and investors from coming to Geraldton. Without a legal precedent, legal counsel will need to be sought out, incurring more costs without any benefit to the community. The Second Option "Planned Retreat" the City would be required to reserve funds to acquire the properties before or at the time of the erosion trigger. Costing over \$35,760,000 for Sunset Beach alone. The Third Option "Protect" has been identified to have the least cost. risk and the biggest reward to the community and stakeholders. The community has recommended a proactive approach to protect the properties and beaches. This would ensure the best benefit to the City of Greater Geraldton, encouraging tourism, investments and showing everyone in WA that Geraldton cares about it's residents	Acknowledgement of submission The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops were undertaken to provide the opportunity for the community to identify and prioritise assets and values of importance to them in the coastal zone. The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops also explained the Coastal Adaptation Types and provided the opportunity for the community participants to suggest adaptation measures for each adaptation type. This provided information for the consultant to identify the long term adaptation pathway for the assets and values in the coastal zone. The factors used in the calculation are for coastal erosion and coastal inundation are identified in State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. In additional the Geraldton CHRMAP Report takes into account existing treatments such as the Northern Beaches Stabilisation Programme (NBSP) sand by-passing works undertaken each year by the Port Authority. The Beresford Foreshore project coastal protection structures have been designed not to interrupt the sediment flow northwards from Beresford The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note the submission  Note the submission  Note the submission
86	28/08/2018	31/08/2018	Private submission	"PROTECT". This is a viable option. Also look at structures in Port Elizabeth in South Africa. Save the coastline and look after your residents like you have on Chapman Road 3.1.2 Community Coastal Planning Survey and Workshops Page 7. The attached report (Appendix A.2) does not reflect what was reported in "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report,October 2017. The beach and residential properties in Kempton Street are highly valued by the community. In the "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report,October 2017", it was identified that the loss of residential property and community areas would have a catastrophic impact. The results of the workshop were to 'Protect' Kempton Street properties and many of the other properties and beaches that the CHRMAP has changed to 'managed retreat.' Solution: The requirements of the CHRMAP process, state that community valuing and feedback is required in order to be successful. The CHRMAP needs to be updated to reflect what is important to the community by adhering to the Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report. Changing valuable assets to the community, such as properties and beaches, to "PROTECT".  See attached Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report October 2017 Summary Page 2-Section 2.1 Purpose "The severity of erosion and inundation impact along Geraldton's coastal areas is determined by a range of factors, and over the next 100-years the coastal region is projected to experience adverse effects from coastal hazard impact at some time." The factors used in this calculation need to be defined. Does it take into account sand replenishing, man made modifications ect. Responsibility for increased erosion has been admitted by the ports. The Geraldton Guardian has also claimed the city is also responsible for the increased erosion due to the works at the foreshore. Is this part of the calculation?  There is sufficient justification to have the properties and community areas classified as "PROTECT" rather than the proposed "Accomodate/Managed Retreat" in Sunset Beach. The costs of managed retreat would amount to \$35,760,000 = (149 homes x \$240,000 (median reported house price per this report) This is the lowest cost as homes located next to the ocean are valued higher. The Adaptation recommendation "Section 70a notification on Title" would devalue 149 residential properties within Sunset Beach, effecting the resale value. "PROTECT" Adaptation options have been provided at a significantly lower cost to other Coastal Management Units. Not exceeding 4 million dollars. This would also remove the need to add "Section 70a notification on Title" saving millions to home owners. Refer to Technical Appendices- Table 3-2 "Cost estimates for adaptation options" The Adaptation plans per the report ("Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017") were as follows: Sunset Beach houses - Protect- Seawall, artificial reef, sand nourishment, dune rehabilitation, Geotextile containers. Page 105 -15.1.3 Managed Retreat Pathway Out of the three pathways for managed retreat, in all cases, protect is the least costly and damaging to the city. The First Option "Do Nothing" will incur reputation damage and legal costs to the city. This will detour tourism and investors from coming to Geraldton. Without a legal precedent, legal counsel will need to be sought out, incurring more costs without any benefit to the community. The Second Option "Planned Retreat" the City would be required to reserve funds to acquire the properties before or at the time of the erosion trigger. Costing over \$35,760,000 for Sunset Beach alone. The Third Option "Protect" has been identified to have the least cost. risk and the biggest reward to the community and stakeholders. The community has recommended a proactive approach to protect the properties and beaches. This would ensure the best benefit to the City of Greater Geraldton, encouraging tourism, investments and showing everyone in WA that Geraldton cares about it's residents	Acknowledgement of submission The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops were undertaken to provide the opportunity for the community to identify and prioritise assets and values of importance to them in the coastal zone. The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops also explained the Coastal Adaptation Types and provided the opportunity for the community participants to suggest adaptation measures for each adaptation type. This provided information for the consultant to identify the long term adaptation pathway for the assets and values in the coastal zone. The factors used in the calculation are for coastal erosion and coastal inundation are identified in State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. In additional the Geraldton CHRMAP Report takes into account existing treatments such as the Northern Beaches Stabilisation Programme (NBSP) sand by-passing works undertaken each year by the Port Authority. The Beresford Foreshore project coastal protection structures have been designed not to interrupt the sediment flow northwards from Beresford The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note the submission  Note the submission  Note the submission
87	28/08/2018	31/08/2018	Private submission	I bought my property 10 years ago as my forever home. In this time I have seen erosion increase and the council do very little to protect us, the community of Sunset Beach. I would love to have this area in the Option 3 'Protect' as it maintains the value and lifestyle of myself, my children, and the fragile coastline. By having Option 3 we will be protecting this area and the Chapman River mouth and any further erosion. 3.1.2 Community Coastal Planning Survey and Workshops Page 7. The attached report (Appendix A.2) does not reflect what was reported in "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report,October 2017. The beach and residential properties in Kempton Street are highly valued by the community. In the "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report,October 2017", it was identified that the loss of residential property and community areas would have a catastrophic impact. The results of the workshop were to 'Protect' Kempton Street properties and many of the other properties and beaches that the CHRMAP has changed to 'managed retreat.' Solution: The requirements of the CHRMAP process, state that community valuing and feedback is required in order to be successful. The CHRMAP needs to be updated to reflect what is important to the community by adhering to the Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report. Changing valuable assets to the community, such as properties and beaches, to "PROTECT".  See attached Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report October 2017 Summary Page 2-Section 2.1 Purpose "The severity of erosion and inundation impact along Geraldton's coastal areas is determined by a range of factors, and over the next 100-years the coastal region is projected to experience adverse effects from coastal hazard impact at some time." The factors used in this calculation need to be defined. Does it take into account sand replenishing, man made modifications ect. Responsibility for increased erosion has been admitted by the ports. The Geraldton Guardian has also claimed the city is also responsible for the increased erosion due to the works at the foreshore. Is this part of the calculation?  There is sufficient justification to have the properties and community areas classified as "PROTECT" rather than the proposed "Accomodate/Managed Retreat" in Sunset Beach. The costs of managed retreat would amount to \$35,760,000 = (149 homes x \$240,000 (median reported house price per this report) This is the lowest cost as homes located next to the ocean are valued higher. The Adaptation recommendation "Section 70a notification on Title" would devalue 149 residential properties within Sunset Beach, effecting the resale value. "PROTECT" Adaptation options have been provided at a significantly lower cost to other Coastal Management Units. Not exceeding 4 million dollars. This would also remove the need to add "Section 70a notification on Title" saving millions to home owners. Refer to Technical Appendices- Table 3-2 "Cost estimates for adaptation options" The Adaptation plans per the report ("Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017") were as follows: Sunset Beach houses - Protect- Seawall, artificial reef, sand nourishment, dune rehabilitation, Geotextile containers. Page 105 -15.1.3 Managed Retreat Pathway Out of the three pathways for managed retreat, in all cases, protect is the least costly and damaging to the city. The First Option "Do Nothing" will incur reputation damage and legal costs to the city. This will detour tourism and investors from coming to Geraldton. Without a legal precedent, legal counsel will need to be sought out, incurring more costs without any benefit to the community. The Second Option "Planned Retreat" the City would be required to reserve funds to acquire the properties before or at the time of the erosion trigger. Costing over \$35,760,000 for Sunset Beach alone. The Third Option "Protect" has been identified to have the least cost. risk and the biggest reward to the community and stakeholders. The community has recommended a proactive approach to protect the properties and beaches. This would ensure the best benefit to the City of Greater Geraldton, encouraging tourism, investments and showing everyone in WA that Geraldton cares about it's residents	Acknowledgement of submission The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops were undertaken to provide the opportunity for the community to identify and prioritise assets and values of importance to them in the coastal zone. The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops also explained the Coastal Adaptation Types and provided the opportunity for the community participants to suggest adaptation measures for each adaptation type. This provided information for the consultant to identify the long term adaptation pathway for the assets and values in the coastal zone. The factors used in the calculation are for coastal erosion and coastal inundation are identified in State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. In additional the Geraldton CHRMAP Report takes into account existing treatments such as the Northern Beaches Stabilisation Programme (NBSP) sand by-passing works undertaken each year by the Port Authority. The Beresford Foreshore project coastal protection structures have been designed not to interrupt the sediment flow northwards from Beresford The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note the submission  Note the submission  Note the submission
88	28/08/2018	31/08/2018	Private submission	3.1.2 Community Coastal Planning Survey and Workshops Page 7. The attached report (Appendix A.2) does not reflect what was reported in "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report,October 2017. The beach and residential properties in Kempton Street are highly valued by the community. In the "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report,October 2017", it was identified that the loss of residential property and community areas would have a catastrophic impact. The results of the workshop were to 'Protect' Kempton Street properties and many of the other properties and beaches that the CHRMAP has changed to 'managed retreat.' Solution: The requirements of the CHRMAP process, state that community valuing and feedback is required in order to be successful. The CHRMAP needs to be updated to reflect what is important to the community by adhering to the Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report. Changing valuable assets to the community, such as properties and beaches, to "PROTECT".	The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops were undertaken to provide the opportunity for the community to identify and prioritise assets and values of importance to them in the coastal zone. The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops also explained the Coastal Adaptation Types and provided the opportunity for the community participants to suggest adaptation measures for each adaptation type. This provided information for the consultant to identify the long term adaptation pathway for the assets and values in the coastal zone.	Note the submission



Submission Information				Submission and Comment		
ID	Received	Responded	Submitter	Comment Submission	CGG Comment	Recommendation
				See attached Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report October 2017 Summary Page 2-Section 2.1 Purpose "The severity of erosion and inundation impact along Geraldton's coastal areas is determined by a range of factors, and over the next 100-years the coastal region is projected to experience adverse effects from coastal hazard impact at some time." The factors used in this calculation need to be defined. Does it take into account sand replenishing, man made modifications ect. Responsibility for increased erosion has been admitted by the ports. The Geraldton Guardian has also claimed the city is also responsible for the increased erosion due to the works at the foreshore. Is this part of the calculation?	The factors used in the calculation are for coastal erosion and coastal inundation are identified in State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. In additional the Geraldton CHRMAP Report takes into account existing treatments such as the Northern Beaches Stabilisation Programme (NBSPP) sand by-passing works undertaken each year by the Port Authority. The Beresford Foreshore project coastal protection structures have been designed not to interrupt the sediment flow northwards from Beresford	Note the submission
				There is sufficient justification to have the properties and community areas classified as "PROTECT" rather than the proposed "Accomodate/Managed Retreat" in Sunset Beach. The costs of managed retreat would amount to \$35,760,000 = (149 homes x \$240,000 (median reported house price per this report) This is the lowest cost as homes located next to the ocean are valued higher. The Adaptation recommendation "Section 70a notification on Title" would devalue 149 residential properties within Sunset Beach, effecting the resale value. "PROTECT" Adaptation options have been provided at a significantly lower cost to other Coastal Management Units. Not exceeding 4 million dollars. This would also remove the need to add "Section 70a notification on Title" saving millions to home owners. Refer to Technical Appendices- Table 3-2 "Cost estimates for adaptation options"	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note the submission
				The Adaptation plans per the report ("Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017") were as follows: Sunset Beach houses - Protect- Seawall, artificial reef, sand nourishment, dune rehabilitation, Geotextile containers.	Noted. These, and other adaptation options were assessed by the consultant to identify sustainable long term adaptation pathways for the assets and values in the coastal zone.	Note the submission
				Page 105 -15.1.3 Managed Retreat Pathway Out of the three pathways for managed retreat, in all cases, protect is the least costly and damaging to the city. The First Option "Do Nothing" will incur reputation damage and legal costs to the city. This will detour tourism and investors from coming to Geraldton. Without a legal precedent, legal counsel will need to be sought out, incurring more costs without any benefit to the community. The Second Option "Planned Retreat" the City would be required to reserve funds to acquire the properties before or at the time of the erosion trigger. Costing over \$35,760,000 for Sunset Beach alone. The Third Option "Protect" has been identified to have the least cost. risk and the biggest reward to the community and stakeholders. The community has recommended a proactive approach to protect the properties and beaches. This would ensure the best benefit to the City of Greater Geraldton, encouraging tourism, investments and showing everyone in WA that Geraldton cares about it's residents	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note the submission
				I would suggest to build a groin at Triton Place for sand to build up from Rivermouth in front of Caravan Park and other mentioned restoration work to be carried out including: sea walls, artificial reefs, sand nourishment, dune rehabilitation, geotextile containers etc. It is negletgent to fo nothing	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
89	28/08/2018	3/09/2018	Private submission	3.1.2 Community Coastal Planning Survey and Workshops Page 7. The attached report (Appendix A.2) does not reflect what was reported in "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report,October 2017. The beach and residential properties in Kempton Street are highly valued by the community. In the "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report,October 2017", it was identified that the loss of residential property and community areas would have a catastrophic impact. The results of the workshop were to 'Protect' Kempton Street properties and many of the other properties and beaches that the CHRMAP has changed to 'managed retreat.' Solution: The requirements of the CHRMAP process, state that community valuing and feedback is required in order to be successful. The CHRMAP needs to be updated to reflect what is important to the community by adhering to the Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report. Changing valuable assets to the community, such as properties and beaches, to "PROTECT".	The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops were undertaken to provide the opportunity for the community to identify and prioritise assets and values of importance to them in the coastal zone. The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops also explained the Coastal Adaptation Types and provided the opportunity for the community participants to suggest adaptation measures for each adaptation type. This provided information for the consultant to identify the long term adaptation pathway for the assets and values in the coastal zone.	Note the submission
				See attached Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report October 2017 Summary Page 2-Section 2.1 Purpose "The severity of erosion and inundation impact along Geraldton's coastal areas is determined by a range of factors, and over the next 100-years the coastal region is projected to experience adverse effects from coastal hazard impact at some time." The factors used in this calculation need to be defined. Does it take into account sand replenishing, man made modifications ect. Responsibility for increased erosion has been admitted by the ports. The Geraldton Guardian has also claimed the city is also responsible for the increased erosion due to the works at the foreshore. Is this part of the calculation?	The factors used in the calculation are for coastal erosion and coastal inundation are identified in State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. In additional the Geraldton CHRMAP Report takes into account existing treatments such as the Northern Beaches Stabilisation Programme (NBSPP) sand by-passing works undertaken each year by the Port Authority. The Beresford Foreshore project coastal protection structures have been designed not to interrupt the sediment flow northwards from Beresford	Note the submission
				There is sufficient justification to have the properties and community areas classified as "PROTECT" rather than the proposed "Accomodate/Managed Retreat" in Sunset Beach. The costs of managed retreat would amount to \$35,760,000 = (149 homes x \$240,000 (median reported house price per this report) This is the lowest cost as homes located next to the ocean are valued higher. The Adaptation recommendation "Section 70a notification on Title" would devalue 149 residential properties within Sunset Beach, effecting the resale value. "PROTECT" Adaptation options have been provided at a significantly lower cost to other Coastal Management Units. Not exceeding 4 million dollars. This would also remove the need to add "Section 70a notification on Title" saving millions to home owners. Refer to Technical Appendices- Table 3-2 "Cost estimates for adaptation options"	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note the submission
				The Adaptation plans per the report ("Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017") were as follows: Sunset Beach houses - Protect- Seawall, artificial reef, sand nourishment, dune rehabilitation, Geotextile containers.	Noted. These, and other adaptation options were assessed by the consultant to identify sustainable long term adaptation pathways for the assets and values in the coastal zone.	Note the submission
				Page 105 -15.1.3 Managed Retreat Pathway Out of the three pathways for managed retreat, in all cases, protect is the least costly and damaging to the city. The First Option "Do Nothing" will incur reputation damage and legal costs to the city. This will detour tourism and investors from coming to Geraldton. Without a legal precedent, legal counsel will need to be sought out, incurring more costs without any benefit to the community. The Second Option "Planned Retreat" the City would be required to reserve funds to acquire the properties before or at the time of the erosion trigger. Costing over \$35,760,000 for Sunset Beach alone. The Third Option "Protect" has been identified to have the least cost. risk and the biggest reward to the community and stakeholders. The community has recommended a proactive approach to protect the properties and beaches. This would ensure the best benefit to the City of Greater Geraldton, encouraging tourism, investments and showing everyone in WA that Geraldton cares about it's residents	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note the submission
90	28/08/2018	31/08/2018	Private submission	3.1.2 Community Coastal Planning Survey and Workshops Page 7. The attached report (Appendix A.2) does not reflect what was reported in "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report,October 2017. The beach and residential properties in Kempton Street are highly valued by the community. In the "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report,October 2017", it was identified that the loss of residential property and community areas would have a catastrophic impact. The results of the workshop were to 'Protect' Kempton Street properties and many of the other properties and beaches that the CHRMAP has changed to 'managed retreat.' Solution: The requirements of the CHRMAP process, state that community valuing and feedback is required in order to be successful. The CHRMAP needs to be updated to reflect what is important to the community by adhering to the Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report. Changing valuable assets to the community, such as properties and beaches, to "PROTECT".	The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops were undertaken to provide the opportunity for the community to identify and prioritise assets and values of importance to them in the coastal zone. The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops also explained the Coastal Adaptation Types and provided the opportunity for the community participants to suggest adaptation measures for each adaptation type. This provided information for the consultant to identify the long term adaptation pathway for the assets and values in the coastal zone.	Note the submission
				See attached Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report October 2017 Summary Page 2-Section 2.1 Purpose "The severity of erosion and inundation impact along Geraldton's coastal areas is determined by a range of factors, and over the next 100-years the coastal region is projected to experience adverse effects from coastal hazard impact at some time." The factors used in this calculation need to be defined. Does it take into account sand replenishing, man made modifications ect. Responsibility for increased erosion has been admitted by the ports. The Geraldton Guardian has also claimed the city is also responsible for the increased erosion due to the works at the foreshore. Is this part of the calculation?	The factors used in the calculation are for coastal erosion and coastal inundation are identified in State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. In additional the Geraldton CHRMAP Report takes into account existing treatments such as the Northern Beaches Stabilisation Programme (NBSPP) sand by-passing works undertaken each year by the Port Authority. The Beresford Foreshore project coastal protection structures have been designed not to interrupt the sediment flow northwards from Beresford	Note the submission
				There is sufficient justification to have the properties and community areas classified as "PROTECT" rather than the proposed "Accomodate/Managed Retreat" in Sunset Beach. The costs of managed retreat would amount to \$35,760,000 = (149 homes x \$240,000 (median reported house price per this report) This is the lowest cost as homes located next to the ocean are valued higher. The Adaptation recommendation "Section 70a notification on Title" would devalue 149 residential properties within Sunset Beach, effecting the resale value. "PROTECT" Adaptation options have been provided at a significantly lower cost to other Coastal Management Units. Not exceeding 4 million dollars. This would also remove the need to add "Section 70a notification on Title" saving millions to home owners. Refer to Technical Appendices- Table 3-2 "Cost estimates for adaptation options"	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note the submission
				The Adaptation plans per the report ("Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017") were as follows: Sunset Beach houses - Protect- Seawall, artificial reef, sand nourishment, dune rehabilitation, Geotextile containers.	Noted. These, and other adaptation options were assessed by the consultant to identify sustainable long term adaptation pathways for the assets and values in the coastal zone.	Note the submission
				Page 105 -15.1.3 Managed Retreat Pathway Out of the three pathways for managed retreat, in all cases, protect is the least costly and damaging to the city. The First Option "Do Nothing" will incur reputation damage and legal costs to the city. This will detour tourism and investors from coming to Geraldton. Without a legal precedent, legal counsel will need to be sought out, incurring more costs without any benefit to the community. The Second Option "Planned Retreat" the City would be required to reserve funds to acquire the properties before or at the time of the erosion trigger. Costing over \$35,760,000 for Sunset Beach alone. The Third Option "Protect" has been identified to have the least cost. risk and the biggest reward to the community and stakeholders. The community has recommended a proactive approach to protect the properties and beaches. This would ensure the best benefit to the City of Greater Geraldton, encouraging tourism, investments and showing everyone in WA that Geraldton cares about it's residents	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note the submission
91	28/08/2018	3/09/2018	Private submission (x2)	I am responding to this report as a very concerned property owner whos house is only just outside the 2110 erosion line. As a small business owner and someone who spends a lot of time working to make the business successful, and as a family / parents with 2 school age children, we do not have a lot of time to keep abreast of the council happenings. As such we have missed the initial stages of the Community Coastal Planning Survey and Workshops. We also must be outside of the zone residential/homeowners that received the Flyers that were hand delivered to residents/homeowners residing on the ocean side of coastal roads. I am disappointed not too have received a letter in the post notifying us of all the workshops etc as some of the senarios and consequences of this report will have an enormous economic impact on us indiviually as well as an enormous social and economic impact on the local community of drummond cove. I would agree with the report that there is Extreme Immediate action required to eliminate or reduce the Unacceptable / Intolerable risk to acceptable levels for Key Assets at Risk in the Drummond Cove (CMU1) affecting Houses and Properties, Beaches, John Batten Hall, Sand Dunes and Vegetation. Drummond Cove is a very beautiful part of the world to live in and raise a family, but recently with the extream erosion thats occurred it has become very hazardous to launch a boat at the gravel boat ramp and all the beaches have become much shorter in length and also much steeper and on a whole less user friendly for young families. The Geraldton community at large values the beaches and foreshore of the municipality of Geraldton above all other assets. This view must expand to include all people in the entire region of the CofGG jurisdiction. Including, residents from the Shire of Chapman Valley who also enjoy the foreshore areas, particularly the connection to Drummond Cove. It is too narrow a perspective to view this CHRMAP report through the lens of only those residents living within coastal processes setback lines as affected.	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission



Submission Information				Submission and Comment		
ID	Received	Responded	Submitter	Comment Submission	CGG Comment	Recommendation
				<p>If all properties within the SCA will require a Section 70A notification to be placed on title to alert prospective purchasers to the risk of coastal erosion and /or coastal inundation, this will massively devalue every property both inside the SCA as well as all properties near the line will also be effected and this will have a flow on effect as it will become very difficult to sell any property in or around the 2110 SCA line. We have worked hard over our lives and have saved and planned with the aim of owning our house in a great suburb (drummond cove). The prospect of now having all houses inside the 2110 SCA now having a section 70 notice being put on the title will effectively mean that our existing house will now be valued so low that it will not be economic to sell and we will effectively have to stay put. We will not be able to borrow any money against the value of our house in the future and hence will be at a great disadvantage in investing for our families future. We have brought a vacant block of land off the city greater Geraldton in the land swap deal to get rid of the old beach houses on the west side of Whitehill road. It now seems very unlikely that this block of land will ever be allowed to be built on and as such has been an enormous waste of money. It is important to consider the uncertainty in relation to future sea level rise projections and also shoreline response in each coastal compartment. If there is continued uncertainty along the coast of Geraldton regarding the erosion risk then there will be very low rates of investment in these areas which in turn will not be good for the local economy. Recalculation of shoreline position in future revisions of the CHRMAP, will further increase investor uncertainty in the area going forward unless steps are taken to ensure that erosion is not going to be a factor into the future. If a managed retreat position is taken by the City I believe it will incur reputational damage as a place to live. The values of the properties within the report are significantly understated given current market value, this needs to be clarified. Second, sufficient justification exists for permanent solutions of development on coastal land areas that are available to buffer areas 'at risk from coastal erosion and inundation. I propose coastal protection works in zone 1 &amp; 2 as there is a need to preserve the Drummond Cove foreshore areas for all people in the CofGG. The CofGG should explore, with the direct involvement of community, protection works that consider public access, public safety, property and infrastructure as our coastal lifestyle is not expendable. I recommend that the CofGG undertake immediately Geophysical studies of all the shoreline areas to examine presence of rock strata that could reduce the erodibility of critical sections over the longer term (estimate \$25,000) and apply that data to the setback lines to create an accurate representation of setback lines. The current setbacks are not accurate, specific height differences in adjacent areas not affected by setback lines indicate a broad-brush approach with significant perceived financial implications at stake.</p>	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				<p>I would be in favour of the development of a boat launch ramp in Drummond Cove as a multi benefit solution to the erosion risk. There is no boat launch facility north of the city centre and hence a new facility in Drummond Cove would take the pressure off the use on the existing one. This would become a large asset to the area and there would be many unquantified benefits the report has not factored in such as: Increasing values for the beach and parkland saved from erosion; Improved usage values for the boat ramp; Environmental values.</p>	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				<p>Can the council please ensure that Geraldton remains a great place to live and work and stop the risk of erosion from negatively impacting on our futures. A managed retreat is not an option. Again, I urge the CofGG to consider the tourism impacts to the region and future economic consequences of any policy, particularly the consequences of a purely Managed Retreat paradigm. Some of the recommended actions will inevitably bring about the outcome of 'protection' at future trigger points. The CofGG needs to acknowledge that we are well past trigger points along Whitehill Rd, Drummond Cove. It is my opinion that the scope of options and actions need to be fully explored with community, any action/response also include a thorough search for alternative/innovative approaches beyond the list of recommendations PR1-6. I strongly advise the CofGG look to other adopted approaches in other states and countries where the amenity of the coastal asset has been the highest priority. Options such as off-shore artificial reefs to mitigate wave action as the driver of coastal erosion, being just one example. As per State Planning Policy 2.6, Community consultation at every step of the way is recommended. The CofGG should seek to preserve the natural amenity and improve tourism potential wherever possible as this is the community priority. I ask the CofGG to put on a tourism lens as they view options and consider the CBA (Cost Benefit Analysis).</p>	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				<p>In response to the economic analysis below: 3.4 Economic Analysis – Adaptation options for Erosion Protection for Whitehill Rd and Community Centre. I seek further clarification as to how the fundamentals were calculated to rank these options. Of note, I am of the opinion that Boat Launch Stage 1&amp;2 has a much higher possibility of economic return by introducing a scope of works that has on-going revenue potential and tourism benefits for the whole region that have not been considered in this report. For example, an elevated rock sea wall significantly reduces the amenity and could have a negative impact on the community. Tourism potential will be diminished and real-estate investment impacted. However, such an approach will deliver coastal protection. This is an example where the CBA is presented too narrowly through the lens of economic rationalism and does not consider other data to support the building of a boat ramp into associated protection works. Abrohos Island access and northern boat launching access appears not to have been taken into consideration in this analysis by the Baird report and therefore should be re-evaluated to more accurately reflect BCR values.</p>	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				<p>In summary, Coastal erosion and the CofGG's responses over the years indicate a knowledge of CHRMAP and from the Drummond Cove perspective, we are now well past the beginning of the journey that this Baird CHRMAP report represents. In closing, The significant underspend at Beresford for coastal protection works should be re-directed into coastal protection works at Drummond Cove, Bluff Point and Sunset Beach. It is State Govt. money (our taxes) that paid for Beresford, there were no rate rises recommended for them in the Baird report.</p>	Unfortunately, the State will not allow savings from the Beresford Foreshore Project to be transferred to other City projects	Note the submission
				<p>Furthermore, there are no recommendations for 70A's clauses to be put on titles and no user pays scheme recommended for those land-owners. Any policy that adopts the Baird recommendations will need to consider this carefully.</p>	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
92	31/08/2018	3/09/2018	Private submission	<p>Referencing the Coastal Planning Community Survey Report January 2018, particularly pages 4 and 5, the whole of our community and tourists alike considers the beaches and associated coastal strip of paramount importance to their lifestyle and enjoyment. Living in close proximity of the beach, I see on a daily basis the number of cars both local and towing campers and caravans stopping at Drummonds to enjoy the beach areas and those tourism potentials into the economics that benefit community benefit everyone. During the community consultation phase of CHRMAP, the data clearly demonstrates that the Geraldton community at large values the beaches and foreshore of the municipality of Geraldton above all other assets. This view must expand to include all people in the entire region of the CofGG jurisdiction. Including, residents from the Shire of Chapman Valley who also enjoy the foreshore areas, particularly the connection to Drummond Cove. It is too narrow a perspective to view this CHRMAP report through a lens of only those residents living within coastal processes setback lines as affected.</p>	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				<p>In response to the overall recommendations: 1. I, _____ reject some of the recommendations of Managed Retreat. The CofGG has adopted the strategy of Managed Retreat for many years now in the absence of a hazard mapping and CHRMAP reports. It has passed trigger points resulting in lost assets in Drummond Cove and must now act. It is not acceptable that the CHRMAP report is a justification for adopting Managed Retreat from this point forward as the CofGG has been aware and has obligations under the Planning Act to land owners. We recommend that the CofGG explore with the DCPA via community consultation the CBA (Cost Benefit Analysis) of strategies now, short term and long term. Considering Under the Western Australian legislative framework voluntary or compulsory acquisition is based on the value of the land and its improvements. Case law pertaining to compulsory acquisition judgments indicates that values paid usually far exceed current market value due to Courts also awarding on-costs like removal expenses and legal costs. 2. I recommend a 'Protect' approach (Pr1-7): The values of the properties within the report are significantly understated given current market value. Second, sufficient justification exists for permanent solutions development on coastal land areas that are available to buffer areas 'at risk from coastal erosion and inundation. I, Barbara Varney propose coastal protection works as there is an enormous need to preserve the Drummond Cove foreshore areas for all people in the CofGG. The CofGG should explore, with the direct involvement of community, protection works that consider public access, public safety, property and infrastructure as our coastal lifestyle is not expendable.</p>	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				<p>In response to the following recommendations: Require Section 70A notification to be placed on titles to alert prospective purchasers to the risk of coastal erosion and / or inundation. I recommend that the CofGG undertake immediately Geophysical studies of all the shoreline areas to examine presence of rock strata that could reduce the erodibility of critical sections over the longer term (estimate \$25,000) and apply that data to the setback lines to create an accurate representation of setback lines. The current setbacks do not fit with specific height differences in adjacent areas not affected by setback lines indicating a broad-brush approach with significant financial implications at stake. I understand that the purpose of this study is to provide scope of works recommendations. However, more detailed information is necessary that includes analysis of rock strata within the setbacks and accurate elevations to be included. This is essential before any 70A notifications be placed on titles. I advise caution to the CofGG to avoid possible class action under the state planning act. Which will be triggered by a broad-based policy approach that de-values land by placing 70A notifications on titles. Such action as applying 70A's will require the CofGG to consider the legal costs associated with lengthy process of legal action. This will need to be taken into consideration as part of the CBA (Cost Benefit Analysis).</p>	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				<p>I agree with the recommendations of continued immediate Monitoring and Management outlined below: Recommend a geophysical study of the shoreline areas is undertaken to examine presence of rock strata that could reduce the erodibility of critical sections over the longer term; The foreshore reserve area offers a crucial natural buffer against coastal erosion and inundation for coastal assets located landward (houses, roads etc), as well as providing highly valued public amenity. Active monitoring and nature-based approaches (e.g. coastal revegetation, sand trapping fences) to increase resilience of this foreshore reserve from erosion are strongly recommended. Community groups and local organisations should be included / supported in the delivery of these programs, to provide opportunity to raise awareness and build ownership of the coastal adaptation requirements. Again, I urge the CofGG to consider the tourism impacts to the region and future economic consequences of any policy, particularly the consequences of a Managed Retreat paradigm. Some of the recommended actions will bring about the outcome of 'protection' at a trigger point. The CofGG needs to acknowledge that we are well past trigger points at Whitehill Rd, Drummond Cove. It is my opinion that the scope of options and actions need to be fully explored, any action/response also include a thorough search for alternative/innovative approaches beyond the list of recommendations. I strongly advise the CofGG look to other adopted approaches in other states where the amenity of the coastal asset is the highest priority. Options such as off-shore artificial reefs to mitigate wave action as the driver of coastal erosion, being just one example. I implore the CofGG seek to preserve the natural amenity and improve tourism potential wherever possible. I ask the CofGG to put on a tourism lens as they view options and consider the CBA (Cost Benefit Analysis).</p>	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				<p>In response to the statement below: 1. "The initial stages of the Geraldton CHRMAP project involved community and stakeholder engagement and a risk-based assessment, which examined coastal assets under threat from erosion and inundation in future planning timeframes. The outcomes of this initial CHRMAP phase were reported in the Coastal Hazard and Risk Assessment report (Baird 2018)". It is important that the CofGG continues to engage with community going forward with the view to avoid at all costs, a fracturing of community. It is an unacceptable outcome that the city takes an approach that 'we know better' and pushes ahead with projects without community buy in and seek to avoid repeating it's past mistakes. The DCPA community is well versed in understanding the CHRMAP process and seeking action. This is evidenced by holding the Geraldton Coastal Adaptation Planning Forum in 2014, a partnership between the Drummonds Cove Progress Association and Sunset Beach Coastcare groups. Followed by Application A15220 in 2015 by the Drummond Cove Progress Association (DCPA) for works north of the John Batten Hall. A community action grant in partnership with the CofGG and NACC for the coastal zone north of the John Batten Hall. It needs to be acknowledged that the CofGG has been well aware of the issues north of John Batten Hall/Whitehill Rd. and now need to act to comply with State Planning requirements.</p>	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				<p>Following on from the above data, it is my position to explore specifically the following recommendations from the Baird report: Section 1 &amp; Section 2. Drummond Cove Road to Community Centre &amp; Community Centre to Seacrest Way – We agree with the following: "A coastal protection approach for Drummond Cove north of the Community Hall in front of the closed section of Whitehill Rd warrants further assessment. MCA and CBA analysis of options considered show a net return on investment on the value of assets protected on the landside is possible. The high value of property at risk of erosion in future planning periods and the values of the coast noted in the Community Engagement process underline the importance of this issue." Following on from the above, I would like to see the CofGG re-visit the foredune re-build strategy (Application A15220) for section 1 &amp; 2 to implement a foredune re-build for both sections 1 &amp; 2. This course of action is reinforced by the Baird report which states: "Nature based approaches to increase resilience of shorelines and foreshore areas (eg sand trapping fences, revegetation). Recommended for section north of the Community Hall. CGG led programs supported through grant funding (estimated \$10,000 annually)."</p>	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				<p>"We do not want a new reconnecting link placed in front of our homes." By reconnecting the "existing road or part of" we will have no increased negative impact on our lives. Protection works have to be carried out to prevent loss or damage to our homes or further infrastructure damage so utilizing the existing road is the best option. There is talk about putting sand dunes in between our homes and the ocean, this will be just another playground for the hoons. The police and the city have no real ability to control these people. We have repeatedly asked for cameras to be set up around the area but the city refuses to provide this.</p>	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission

Submission Information				Submission and Comment		
ID	Received	Responded	Submitter	Comment Submission	CGG Comment	Recommendation
				In response to the economic analysis below: 3.4 Economic Analysis – Adaptation options for Erosion Protection for Whitehill Rd and Community Centre. I seek further clarification as to how the fundamentals were calculated to rank these options. Of note, I am of the opinion that Boat Launch Stage 1&2 has a much higher possibility of economic return by introducing a scope of works that has on-going revenue potential and tourism benefits for the whole region more than the other options. For example, an elevated rock sea wall significantly reduces the amenity and could have a negative impact for the community, tourism potential and real-estate investment. However, it will deliver coastal protection. This is an example where the CBA is presented through the lens of economic rationalism and does not consider the data to support the building of a boat ramp and associated protection works. This data appears not to have been taken into consideration in this analysis by Baird and therefore should be re-evaluated to more accurately reflect BCR values.	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				In summary, Coastal erosion and the CofGG's responses over the years indicate a knowledge of CHRMAP and that we are now well past the beginning of the journey that this Baird CHRMAP report represents. Our home on _____ DRUMMOND COVE. For 5 decades we have been working long hours paying rates and taxes. All this hard work was carried out to enable us to fully fund our retirement and not rely on the government for a pension. I am due for retirement and ready to enjoy the magnificent views of the parkland, trees, ocean and beach, to enjoy the beach walks, beach fishing and hopefully be able to launch my boat from here. We invested a lot of money in two properties in Drummond Cove. Please be reminded that the city approved development of these building blocks and approved us to build our dream home. We plan to build a smaller home on our adjacent block or purchase a smaller home in the Drummond Cove area and fund this and retirement costs by being "able to sell" our current home at a "good market price". [Our properties value is well above \$1.6 million even in this depressed market— something worth defending] All this uncertainty has put all our plans at risk. If the city makes decisions that encourages the devaluation of our home/properties then we will have no option but to seek legal advice. Not something we want to do but due to these circumstances and the stress all this has created in our lives, it will force us to pursue this avenue. In closing, the significant underspend at Beresford for coastal protection works should be re-directed into coastal protection works at Drummond Cove, Bluff Point and Sunset Beach. It is State Govt. money (our taxes) that paid for Beresford, there were no rate rises recommended for them in the Baird report. Furthermore, there are no recommendations for 70A's clauses to be put on titles and no user pays scheme recommended for those land- owners. Any policy that adopts the Baird recommendations will need to consider this carefully.	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
93	28/08/2018	3/09/2018	Private submission	3.1.2 Community Coastal Planning Survey and Workshops Page 7. The attached report (Appendix A.2) does not reflect what was reported in "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017. The beach and residential properties in Kempton Street are highly valued by the community. In the "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017", it was identified that the loss of residential property and community areas would have a catastrophic impact. The results of the workshop were to 'Protect' Kempton Street properties and many of the other properties and beaches that the CHRMAP has changed to 'managed retreat.' Solution: The requirements of the CHRMAP process, state that community valuing and feedback is required in order to be successful. The CHRMAP needs to be updated to reflect what is important to the community by adhering to the Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report. Changing valuable assets to the community, such as properties and beaches, to "PROTECT".	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				See attached Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report October 2017 Summary Page 2-Section 2.1 Purpose "The severity of erosion and inundation impact along Geraldton's coastal areas is determined by a range of factors, and over the next 100-years the coastal region is projected to experience adverse effects from coastal hazard impact at some time." The factors used in this calculation need to be defined. Does it take into account sand replenishing, man made modifications ect. Responsibility for increased erosion has been admitted by the ports. The Geraldton Guardian has also claimed the city is also responsible for the increased erosion due to the works at the foreshore. Is this part of the calculation?	The factors used in the calculation are for coastal erosion and coastal inundation are identified in State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. In addition the Geraldton CHRMAP Report takes into account existing treatments such as the Northern Beaches Stabilisation Programme (NBSP) sand by-passing works undertaken each year by the Port Authority. The Beresford Foreshore project coastal protection structures have been designed not to interrupt the sediment flow northwards from Beresford	Note the submission
				There is sufficient justification to have the properties and community areas classified as "PROTECT" rather than the proposed "Accomodate/Managed Retreat" in Sunset Beach. The costs of managed retreat would amount to \$35,760,000 = (149 homes x \$240,000 (median reported house price per this report) This is the lowest cost as homes located next to the ocean are valued higher. The Adaptation recommendation "Section 70a notification on Title" would devalue 149 residential properties within Sunset Beach, effecting the resale value. "PROTECT" Adaptation options have been provided at a significantly lower cost to other Coastal Management Units. Not exceeding 4 million dollars. This would also remove the need to add "Section 70a notification on Title" saving millions to home owners. Refer to Technical Appendices- Table 3-2 "Cost estimates for adaptation options"	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note the submission
				The Adaptation plans per the report ("Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017") were as follows: Sunset Beach houses - Protect- Seawall, artificial reef, sand nourishment, dune rehabilitation, Geotextile containers.	Noted. These, and other adaptation options were assessed by the consultant to identify sustainable long term adaptation pathways for the assets and values in the coastal zone.	Note the submission
				Page 105 -15.1.3 Managed Retreat Pathway Out of the three pathways for managed retreat, in all cases, protect is the least costly and damaging to the city. The First Option "Do Nothing" will incur reputation damage and legal costs to the city. This will detour tourism and investors from coming to Geraldton. Without a legal precedent, legal counsel will need to be sought out, incurring more costs without any benefit to the community. The Second Option 'Planned Retreat' the City would be required to reserve funds to acquire the properties before or at the time of the erosion trigger. Costing over \$35,760,000 for Sunset Beach alone. The Third Option "Protect" has been identified to have the least cost. risk and the biggest reward to the community and stakeholders. The community has recommended a proactive approach to protect the properties and beaches. This would ensure the best benefit to the City of Greater Geraldton, encouraging tourism, investments and showing everyone in WA that Geraldton cares about it's residents	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note the submission
94	28/08/2018	3/09/2018	Private submission	3.1.2 Community Coastal Planning Survey and Workshops Page 7. The attached report (Appendix A.2) does not reflect what was reported in "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017. The beach and residential properties in Kempton Street are highly valued by the community. In the "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017", it was identified that the loss of residential property and community areas would have a catastrophic impact. The results of the workshop were to 'Protect' Kempton Street properties and many of the other properties and beaches that the CHRMAP has changed to 'managed retreat.' Solution: The requirements of the CHRMAP process, state that community valuing and feedback is required in order to be successful. The CHRMAP needs to be updated to reflect what is important to the community by adhering to the Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report. Changing valuable assets to the community, such as properties and beaches, to "PROTECT".	The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops were undertaken to provide the opportunity for the community to identify and prioritise assets and values of importance to them in the coastal zone. The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops also explained the Coastal Adaptation Types and provided the opportunity for the community participants to suggest adaptation measures for each adaptation type. This provided information for the consultant to identify the long term adaptation pathway for the assets and values in the coastal zone.	Note the submission
				See attached Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report October 2017 Summary Page 2-Section 2.1 Purpose "The severity of erosion and inundation impact along Geraldton's coastal areas is determined by a range of factors, and over the next 100-years the coastal region is projected to experience adverse effects from coastal hazard impact at some time." The factors used in this calculation need to be defined. Does it take into account sand replenishing, man made modifications ect. Responsibility for increased erosion has been admitted by the ports. The Geraldton Guardian has also claimed the city is also responsible for the increased erosion due to the works at the foreshore. Is this part of the calculation?	The factors used in the calculation are for coastal erosion and coastal inundation are identified in State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. In addition the Geraldton CHRMAP Report takes into account existing treatments such as the Northern Beaches Stabilisation Programme (NBSP) sand by-passing works undertaken each year by the Port Authority. The Beresford Foreshore project coastal protection structures have been designed not to interrupt the sediment flow northwards from Beresford	Note the submission
				There is sufficient justification to have the properties and community areas classified as "PROTECT" rather than the proposed "Accomodate/Managed Retreat" in Sunset Beach. The costs of managed retreat would amount to \$35,760,000 = (149 homes x \$240,000 (median reported house price per this report) This is the lowest cost as homes located next to the ocean are valued higher. The Adaptation recommendation "Section 70a notification on Title" would devalue 149 residential properties within Sunset Beach, effecting the resale value. "PROTECT" Adaptation options have been provided at a significantly lower cost to other Coastal Management Units. Not exceeding 4 million dollars. This would also remove the need to add "Section 70a notification on Title" saving millions to home owners. Refer to Technical Appendices- Table 3-2 "Cost estimates for adaptation options"	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note the submission
				The Adaptation plans per the report ("Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017") were as follows: Sunset Beach houses - Protect- Seawall, artificial reef, sand nourishment, dune rehabilitation, Geotextile containers.	Noted. These, and other adaptation options were assessed by the consultant to identify sustainable long term adaptation pathways for the assets and values in the coastal zone.	Note the submission
				Page 105 -15.1.3 Managed Retreat Pathway Out of the three pathways for managed retreat, in all cases, protect is the least costly and damaging to the city. The First Option "Do Nothing" will incur reputation damage and legal costs to the city. This will detour tourism and investors from coming to Geraldton. Without a legal precedent, legal counsel will need to be sought out, incurring more costs without any benefit to the community. The Second Option 'Planned Retreat' the City would be required to reserve funds to acquire the properties before or at the time of the erosion trigger. Costing over \$35,760,000 for Sunset Beach alone. The Third Option "Protect" has been identified to have the least cost. risk and the biggest reward to the community and stakeholders. The community has recommended a proactive approach to protect the properties and beaches. This would ensure the best benefit to the City of Greater Geraldton, encouraging tourism, investments and showing everyone in WA that Geraldton cares about it's residents	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note the submission
				This exercise by the Shire has dropped our house price by approximately \$300,000. Someone needs to be held responsible for this. This is families lives you are dealing with	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report property values were based on the median price index for the locality from https://www.realestate.com.au/buy at the time of accessing the site. The report notes that there may be variation in property values within the locality.	Note the submission
95	31/08/2018	31/08/2018	Private submission	3.1.2 Community Coastal Planning Survey and Workshops Page 7. The attached report (Appendix A.2) does not reflect what was reported in "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017. The beach and residential properties in Kempton Street are highly valued by the community. In the "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017", it was identified that the loss of residential property and community areas would have a catastrophic impact. The results of the workshop were to 'Protect' Kempton Street properties and many of the other properties and beaches that the CHRMAP has changed to 'managed retreat.' Solution: The requirements of the CHRMAP process, state that community valuing and feedback is required in order to be successful. The CHRMAP needs to be updated to reflect what is important to the community by adhering to the Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report. Changing valuable assets to the community, such as properties and beaches, to "PROTECT".	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				See attached Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report October 2017 Summary Page 2-Section 2.1 Purpose "The severity of erosion and inundation impact along Geraldton's coastal areas is determined by a range of factors, and over the next 100-years the coastal region is projected to experience adverse effects from coastal hazard impact at some time." The factors used in this calculation need to be defined. Does it take into account sand replenishing, man made modifications ect. Responsibility for increased erosion has been admitted by the ports. The Geraldton Guardian has also claimed the city is also responsible for the increased erosion due to the works at the foreshore. Is this part of the calculation?	The factors used in the calculation are for coastal erosion and coastal inundation are identified in State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. In addition the Geraldton CHRMAP Report takes into account existing treatments such as the Northern Beaches Stabilisation Programme (NBSP) sand by-passing works undertaken each year by the Port Authority. The Beresford Foreshore project coastal protection structures have been designed not to interrupt the sediment flow northwards from Beresford	Note the submission
				There is sufficient justification to have the properties and community areas classified as "PROTECT" rather than the proposed "Accomodate/Managed Retreat" in Sunset Beach. The costs of managed retreat would amount to \$35,760,000 = (149 homes x \$240,000 (median reported house price per this report) This is the lowest cost as homes located next to the ocean are valued higher. The Adaptation recommendation "Section 70a notification on Title" would devalue 149 residential properties within Sunset Beach, effecting the resale value. "PROTECT" Adaptation options have been provided at a significantly lower cost to other Coastal Management Units. Not exceeding 4 million dollars. This would also remove the need to add "Section 70a notification on Title" saving millions to home owners. Refer to Technical Appendices- Table 3-2 "Cost estimates for adaptation options"	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note the submission
				The Adaptation plans per the report ("Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017") were as follows: Sunset Beach houses - Protect- Seawall, artificial reef, sand nourishment, dune rehabilitation, Geotextile containers.	Noted. These, and other adaptation options were assessed by the consultant to identify sustainable long term adaptation pathways for the assets and values in the coastal zone.	Note the submission
				Page 105 -15.1.3 Managed Retreat Pathway Out of the three pathways for managed retreat, in all cases, protect is the least costly and damaging to the city. The First Option "Do Nothing" will incur reputation damage and legal costs to the city. This will detour tourism and investors from coming to Geraldton. Without a legal precedent, legal counsel will need to be sought out, incurring more costs without any benefit to the community. The Second Option 'Planned Retreat' the City would be required to reserve funds to acquire the properties before or at the time of the erosion trigger. Costing over \$35,760,000 for Sunset Beach alone. The Third Option "Protect" has been identified to have the least cost. risk and the biggest reward to the community and stakeholders. The community has recommended a proactive approach to protect the properties and beaches. This would ensure the best benefit to the City of Greater Geraldton, encouraging tourism, investments and showing everyone in WA that Geraldton cares about it's residents	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note the submission

Submission Information				Submission and Comment		
ID	Received	Responded	Submitter	Comment Submission	CGG Comment	Recommendation
				I feel that GCC has already set a precedent in regard to adopting a protect strategy of the city's coastline-The approximately 35 million dollars spent on the protection of the Beresford foreshore is the prime example of this strategy. GCC cannot pick and choose to protect some parts of town's coastline and not others.GCC should be prepared to do whatever it can to protect the assets of its ratepayers. To use Climate Change as the reason for not trying to protect our coastline from erosion is like using Climate Change as a reason not to protect people's houses from bush fires or to bother with flood mitigation.	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				The overriding consensus coming out of the Draft CHRMAP report is that a 'managed retreat 'would be the best option for the GCC to adopt.This option should be as a last resort once GCC has undertaken worlds best practice to protect the assets of its ratepayers.Any hard protection options should be investigated and designed by marine engineers,not civil engineers.Options to protect our coast will be expensive so they should be done wisely and done properly the first time. GCC should adopt a protect strategy at all costs.	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
96	31/08/2018	3/09/2018	Private submission	3.1.2 Community Coastal Planning Survey and Workshops Page 7. The attached report (Appendix A.2) does not reflect what was reported in "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report,October 2017. The beach and residential properties in Kempton Street are highly valued by the community. In the "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report,October 2017", it was identified that the loss of residential property and community areas would have a catastrophic impact. The results of the workshop were to 'Protect' Kempton Street properties and many of the other properties and beaches that the CHRMAP has changed to 'managed retreat.' Solution: The requirements of the CHRMAP process, state that community valuing and feedback is required in order to be successful. The CHRMAP needs to be updated to reflect what is important to the community by adhering to the Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report. Changing valuable assets to the community, such as properties and beaches, to "PROTECT".	The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops were undertaken to provide the opportunity for the community to identify and prioritise assets and values of importance to them in the coastal zone. The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops also explained the Coastal Adaptation Types and provided the opportunity for the community participants to suggest adaptation measures for each adaptation type. This provided information for the consultant to identify the long term adaptation pathway for the assets and values in the coastal zone.	Note the submission
				See attached Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report October 2017 Summary Page 2-Section 2.1 Purpose "The severity of erosion and inundation impact along Geraldton's coastal areas is determined by a range of factors, and over the next 100-years the coastal region is projected to experience adverse effects from coastal hazard impact at some time." The factors used in this calculation need to be defined. Does it take into account sand replenishing, man made modifications ect. Responsibility for increased erosion has been admitted by the ports. The Geraldton Guardian has also claimed the city is also responsible for the increased erosion due to the works at the foreshore. Is this part of the calculation?	The factors used in the calculation are for coastal erosion and coastal inundation are identified in State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. In additional the Geraldton CHRMAP Report takes into account existing treatments such as the Northern Beaches Stabilisation Programme (NBSP) sand by-passing works undertaken each year by the Port Authority. The Beresford Foreshore project coastal protection structures have been designed not to interrupt the sediment flow northwards from Beresford	Note the submission
				There is sufficient justification to have the properties and community areas classified as "PROTECT" rather than the proposed "Accomodate/Managed Retreat" in Sunset Beach. The costs of managed retreat would amount to \$35,760,000 = (149 homes x \$240,000 (median reported house price per this report) This is the lowest cost as homes located next to the ocean are valued higher. The Adaptation recommendation "Section 70a notification on Title" would devalue 149 residential properties within Sunset Beach, effecting the resale value. "PROTECT" Adaptation options have been provided at a significantly lower cost to other Coastal Management Units. Not exceeding 4 million dollars. This would also remove the need to add "Section 70a notification on Title" saving millions to home owners. Refer to Technical Appendices- Table 3-2 "Cost estimates for adaptation options"	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note the submission
				The Adaptation plans per the report ("Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017") were as follows: Sunset Beach houses - Protect- Seawall, artificial reef, sand nourishment, dune rehabilitation. Geotextile containers.	Noted. These, and other adaptation options were assessed by the consultant to identify sustainable long term adaptation pathways for the assets and values in the coastal zone.	Note the submission
				Page 105 -15.1.3 Managed Retreat Pathway Out of the three pathways for managed retreat, in all cases, protect is the least costly and damaging to the city. The First Option "Do Nothing" will incur reputation damage and legal costs to the city. This will detour tourism and investors from coming to Geraldton. Without a legal precedent, legal counsel will need to be sought out, incurring more costs without any benefit to the community. The Second Option 'Planned Retreat' the City would be required to reserve funds to acquire the properties before or at the time of the erosion trigger. Costing over \$35,760,000 for Sunset Beach alone. The Third Option "Protect" has been identified to have the least cost. risk and the biggest reward to the community and stakeholders. The community has recommended a proactive approach to protect the properties and beaches. This would ensure the best benefit to the City of Greater Geraldton, encouraging tourism, investments and showing everyone in WA that Geraldton cares about it's residents	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note the submission
				I think its absolutely crapy to not PROTECT the Beach, Reisdents Houses and even parks. As Geraldton is getting bigger (and we want it to get bigger) I think we should deffinity be looking at a solution to allow that to happen. I think an artificial reef of some sort along sunset beach would be great, and cost effective, and a tourist attraction. Theres way too much money spent by locals in Sunset to let it be washed away and property ruin peoples lives.	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
97	28/08/2018	3/09/2018	Private submission	3.1.2 Community Coastal Planning Survey and Workshops Page 7. The attached report (Appendix A.2) does not reflect what was reported in "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report,October 2017. The beach and residential properties in Kempton Street are highly valued by the community. In the "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report,October 2017", it was identified that the loss of residential property and community areas would have a catastrophic impact. The results of the workshop were to 'Protect' Kempton Street properties and many of the other properties and beaches that the CHRMAP has changed to 'managed retreat.' Solution: The requirements of the CHRMAP process, state that community valuing and feedback is required in order to be successful. The CHRMAP needs to be updated to reflect what is important to the community by adhering to the Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report. Changing valuable assets to the community, such as properties and beaches, to "PROTECT".	The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops were undertaken to provide the opportunity for the community to identify and prioritise assets and values of importance to them in the coastal zone. The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops also explained the Coastal Adaptation Types and provided the opportunity for the community participants to suggest adaptation measures for each adaptation type. This provided information for the consultant to identify the long term adaptation pathway for the assets and values in the coastal zone.	Note the submission
				See attached Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report October 2017 Summary Page 2-Section 2.1 Purpose "The severity of erosion and inundation impact along Geraldton's coastal areas is determined by a range of factors, and over the next 100-years the coastal region is projected to experience adverse effects from coastal hazard impact at some time." The factors used in this calculation need to be defined. Does it take into account sand replenishing, man made modifications ect. Responsibility for increased erosion has been admitted by the ports. The Geraldton Guardian has also claimed the city is also responsible for the increased erosion due to the works at the foreshore. Is this part of the calculation?	The factors used in the calculation are for coastal erosion and coastal inundation are identified in State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. In additional the Geraldton CHRMAP Report takes into account existing treatments such as the Northern Beaches Stabilisation Programme (NBSP) sand by-passing works undertaken each year by the Port Authority. The Beresford Foreshore project coastal protection structures have been designed not to interrupt the sediment flow northwards from Beresford	Note the submission
				There is sufficient justification to have the properties and community areas classified as "PROTECT" rather than the proposed "Accomodate/Managed Retreat" in Sunset Beach. The costs of managed retreat would amount to \$35,760,000 = (149 homes x \$240,000 (median reported house price per this report) This is the lowest cost as homes located next to the ocean are valued higher. The Adaptation recommendation "Section 70a notification on Title" would devalue 149 residential properties within Sunset Beach, effecting the resale value. "PROTECT" Adaptation options have been provided at a significantly lower cost to other Coastal Management Units. Not exceeding 4 million dollars. This would also remove the need to add "Section 70a notification on Title" saving millions to home owners. Refer to Technical Appendices- Table 3-2 "Cost estimates for adaptation options"	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note the submission
				The Adaptation plans per the report ("Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017") were as follows: Sunset Beach houses - Protect- Seawall, artificial reef, sand nourishment, dune rehabilitation. Geotextile containers.	Noted. These, and other adaptation options were assessed by the consultant to identify sustainable long term adaptation pathways for the assets and values in the coastal zone.	Note the submission
				Page 105 -15.1.3 Managed Retreat Pathway Out of the three pathways for managed retreat, in all cases, protect is the least costly and damaging to the city. The First Option "Do Nothing" will incur reputation damage and legal costs to the city. This will detour tourism and investors from coming to Geraldton. Without a legal precedent, legal counsel will need to be sought out, incurring more costs without any benefit to the community. The Second Option 'Planned Retreat' the City would be required to reserve funds to acquire the properties before or at the time of the erosion trigger. Costing over \$35,760,000 for Sunset Beach alone. The Third Option "Protect" has been identified to have the least cost. risk and the biggest reward to the community and stakeholders. The community has recommended a proactive approach to protect the properties and beaches. This would ensure the best benefit to the City of Greater Geraldton, encouraging tourism, investments and showing everyone in WA that Geraldton cares about it's residents	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note the submission
				I consider the Chief Executive Officer to be the person ultimately managing the assets and affairs of the City on behalf of the Residents and ratepayers. I first visited Geraldton as a tourist in 1995. The properties on Sunset Coast were pointed out as the premiere residential area in the region. When my stepson and his family purchased their property, we were delighted on their behalf. If the decision is to make a token effort to manage this priceless asset I consider it complete negligence and an appalling abrogation of responsibility toward a case of the people when the City of Greater Geraldton are charged with serving	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
98	28/08/2018	3/09/2018	Private submission	3.1.2 Community Coastal Planning Survey and Workshops Page 7. The attached report (Appendix A.2) does not reflect what was reported in "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report,October 2017. The beach and residential properties in Kempton Street are highly valued by the community. In the "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report,October 2017", it was identified that the loss of residential property and community areas would have a catastrophic impact. The results of the workshop were to 'Protect' Kempton Street properties and many of the other properties and beaches that the CHRMAP has changed to 'managed retreat.' Solution: The requirements of the CHRMAP process, state that community valuing and feedback is required in order to be successful. The CHRMAP needs to be updated to reflect what is important to the community by adhering to the Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report. Changing valuable assets to the community, such as properties and beaches, to "PROTECT".	The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops were undertaken to provide the opportunity for the community to identify and prioritise assets and values of importance to them in the coastal zone. The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops also explained the Coastal Adaptation Types and provided the opportunity for the community participants to suggest adaptation measures for each adaptation type. This provided information for the consultant to identify the long term adaptation pathway for the assets and values in the coastal zone.	Note the submission
				See attached Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report October 2017 Summary Page 2-Section 2.1 Purpose "The severity of erosion and inundation impact along Geraldton's coastal areas is determined by a range of factors, and over the next 100-years the coastal region is projected to experience adverse effects from coastal hazard impact at some time." The factors used in this calculation need to be defined. Does it take into account sand replenishing, man made modifications ect. Responsibility for increased erosion has been admitted by the ports. The Geraldton Guardian has also claimed the city is also responsible for the increased erosion due to the works at the foreshore. Is this part of the calculation?	The factors used in the calculation are for coastal erosion and coastal inundation are identified in State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. In additional the Geraldton CHRMAP Report takes into account existing treatments such as the Northern Beaches Stabilisation Programme (NBSP) sand by-passing works undertaken each year by the Port Authority. The Beresford Foreshore project coastal protection structures have been designed not to interrupt the sediment flow northwards from Beresford	Note the submission
				There is sufficient justification to have the properties and community areas classified as "PROTECT" rather than the proposed "Accomodate/Managed Retreat" in Sunset Beach. The costs of managed retreat would amount to \$35,760,000 = (149 homes x \$240,000 (median reported house price per this report) This is the lowest cost as homes located next to the ocean are valued higher. The Adaptation recommendation "Section 70a notification on Title" would devalue 149 residential properties within Sunset Beach, effecting the resale value. "PROTECT" Adaptation options have been provided at a significantly lower cost to other Coastal Management Units. Not exceeding 4 million dollars. This would also remove the need to add "Section 70a notification on Title" saving millions to home owners. Refer to Technical Appendices- Table 3-2 "Cost estimates for adaptation options"	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note the submission
				The Adaptation plans per the report ("Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017") were as follows: Sunset Beach houses - Protect- Seawall, artificial reef, sand nourishment, dune rehabilitation. Geotextile containers.	Noted. These, and other adaptation options were assessed by the consultant to identify sustainable long term adaptation pathways for the assets and values in the coastal zone.	Note the submission
				Page 105 -15.1.3 Managed Retreat Pathway Out of the three pathways for managed retreat, in all cases, protect is the least costly and damaging to the city. The First Option "Do Nothing" will incur reputation damage and legal costs to the city. This will detour tourism and investors from coming to Geraldton. Without a legal precedent, legal counsel will need to be sought out, incurring more costs without any benefit to the community. The Second Option 'Planned Retreat' the City would be required to reserve funds to acquire the properties before or at the time of the erosion trigger. Costing over \$35,760,000 for Sunset Beach alone. The Third Option "Protect" has been identified to have the least cost. risk and the biggest reward to the community and stakeholders. The community has recommended a proactive approach to protect the properties and beaches. This would ensure the best benefit to the City of Greater Geraldton, encouraging tourism, investments and showing everyone in WA that Geraldton cares about it's residents	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note the submission
99	31/08/2018	3/09/2018	Private submission	Referencing the Coastal Planning Community Survey Report January 2018, particularly pages 4 and 5, the whole of our community and tourists alike considers the beaches and associated coastal strip of paramount importance to their lifestyle and enjoyment. Living in close proximity of the beach, I see on a daily basis the number of cars both local and towing campers and caravans stopping at Drummonds to enjoy the beach areas and those tourism potentials into the economics that benefit community benefit everyone. During the community consultation phase of CHRMAP, the data clearly demonstrates that the Geraldton community at large values the beaches and foreshore of the municipality of Geraldton above all other assets. This view must expand to include all people in the entire region of the CofGG jurisdiction. Including, residents from the Shire of Chapman Valley who also enjoy the foreshore areas, particularly the connection to Drummond Cove. It is too narrow a perspective to view this CHRMAP report through a lens of only those residents living within coastal processes setback lines as affected.	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission



Submission Information				Submission and Comment		
ID	Received	Responded	Submitter	Comment Submission	CGG Comment	Recommendation
				<p>In response to the overall recommendations: 1. I, _____ reject some of the recommendations of Managed Retreat. The CofGG has adopted the strategy of Managed Retreat for many years now in the absence of a hazard mapping and CHRMAP reports. It has passed trigger points resulting in lost assets in Drummond Cove and must now act. It is not acceptable that the CHRMAP report is a justification for adopting Managed Retreat from this point forward as the CofGG has been aware and has obligations under the Planning Act to land owners.</p> <p>We recommend that the CofGG explore with the DCPA via community consultation the CBA (Cost Benefit Analysis) of strategies now, short term and long term. Considering Under the Western Australian legislative framework voluntary or compulsory acquisition is based on the value of the land and its improvements. Case law pertaining to compulsory acquisition judgments indicates that values paid usually far exceed current market value due to Courts also awarding on-costs like removal expenses and legal costs. 2. I recommend a 'Protect' approach (Pr1-7): The values of the properties within the report are significantly understated given current market value. Second, sufficient justification exists for permanent solutions development on coastal land areas that are available to buffer areas 'at risk from coastal erosion and inundation. I, Barbara Varney propose coastal protection works as there is an enormous need to preserve the Drummond Cove foreshore areas for all people in the CofGG. The CofGG should explore, with the direct involvement of community, protection works that consider public access, public safety, property and infrastructure as our coastal lifestyle is not expendable.</p>	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				<p>In response to the following recommendations: Require Section 70A notification to be placed on titles to alert prospective purchasers to the risk of coastal erosion and / or inundation. I recommend that the CofGG undertake immediately Geophysical studies of all the shoreline areas to examine presence of rock strata that could reduce the erodibility of critical sections over the longer term (estimate \$25,000) and apply that data to the setback lines to create an accurate representation of setback lines. The current setbacks do not fit with specific height differences in adjacent areas not affected by setback lines indicating a broad-brush approach with significant financial implications at stake. I understand that the purpose of this study is to provide scope of works recommendations. However, more detailed information is necessary that includes analysis of rock strata within the setbacks and accurate elevations to be included. This is essential before any 70A notifications be placed on titles. I advise caution to the CofGG to avoid possible class action under the state planning act. Which will be triggered by a broad-based policy approach that de-values land by placing 70A notifications on titles. Such action as applying 70A's will require the CofGG to consider the legal costs associated with lengthy process of legal action. This will need to be taken into consideration as part of the CBA (Cost Benefit Analysis).</p>	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				<p>I agree with the recommendations of continued immediate Monitoring and Management outlined below: Recommend a geophysical study of the shoreline areas is undertaken to examine presence of rock strata that could reduce the erodibility of critical sections over the longer term; The foreshore reserve area offers a crucial natural buffer against coastal erosion and inundation for coastal assets located landward (houses, roads etc), as well as providing highly valued public amenity. Active monitoring and nature-based approaches (e.g. coastal revegetation, sand trapping fences) to increase resilience of this foreshore reserve from erosion are strongly recommended. Community groups and local organisations should be included / supported in the delivery of these programs, to provide opportunity to raise awareness and build ownership of the coastal adaptation requirements. Again, I urge the CofGG to consider the tourism impacts to the region and future economic consequences of any policy, particularly the consequences of a Managed Retreat paradigm. Some of the recommended actions will bring about the outcome of 'protection' at a trigger point. The CofGG needs to acknowledge that we are well past trigger points at Whitehill Rd, Drummond Cove. It is my opinion that the scope of options and actions need to be fully explored, any action/response also include a thorough search for alternative/innovative approaches beyond the list of recommendations. I strongly advise the CofGG look to other adopted approaches in other states where the amenity of the coastal asset is the highest priority. Options such as off-shore artificial reefs to mitigate wave action as the driver of coastal erosion, being just one example. I implore the CofGG seek to preserve the natural amenity and improve tourism potential wherever possible. I ask the CofGG to put on a tourism lens as they view options and consider the CBA (Cost Benefit Analysis).</p>	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				<p>In response to the statement below: 1. "The initial stages of the Geraldton CHRMAP project involved community and stakeholder engagement and a risk-based assessment, which examined coastal assets under threat from erosion and inundation in future planning timeframes. The outcomes of this initial CHRMAP phase were reported in the Coastal Hazard and Risk Assessment report (Baird 2018)" It is important that the CofGG continues to engage with community going forward with the view to avoid at all costs, a fracturing of community. It is an unacceptable outcome that the city takes an approach that 'we know better' and pushes ahead with projects without community buy in and seek to avoid repeating it's past mistakes. The DCPA community is well versed in understanding the CHRMAP process and seeking action. This is evidenced by holding the Geraldton Coastal Adaptation Planning Forum in 2014, a partnership between the Drummonds Cove Progress Association and Sunset Beach Coastcare groups. Followed by Application A15220 in 2015 by the Drummond Cove Progress Association (DCPA) for works north of the John Batten Hall. A community action grant in partnership with the CofGG and NACC for the coastal zone north of the John Batten Hall. It needs to be acknowledged that the CofGG has been well aware of the issues north of John Batten Hall/Whitehill Rd. and now need to act to comply with State Planning requirements.</p>	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				<p>Following on from the above data, it is my position to explore specifically the following recommendations from the Baird report: Section 1 &amp; Section 2. Drummond Cove Road to Community Centre &amp; Community Centre to Seacrest Way – I agree with the following: "The high value of property at risk of erosion in future planning periods and the values of the coast noted in the Community Engagement process underline the importance of this issue. " The erosion was not natural, as the actions of the city created the problems on Whitehill Road. WE have lots of evidence of this 4 year destruction. Following on from the above, I would like to see the CofGG re-visit the foredune re-build strategy (Application A15220) for section 1 &amp; 2 to implement a foredune re-build for both sections 1 &amp; 2. This course of action is reinforced by the Baird report which states: "Nature based approaches to increase resilience of shorelines and foreshore areas (eg sand trapping fences, revegetation). Recommended for section north of the Community Hall. CGG led programs supported through grant funding (estimated \$10,000 annually)."</p>	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				<p>I would like the City of Greater Geraldton to consider a future seawall structure. I do feel that the city could reclaim the beach lost where Whitegill road use of be. Future proofing this area by building a below ground seawall will provide the necessary peace of mind to the entire community. Second, adjust the detailed plans to include creation of a natural buffer as planned in A15220 by the DCAP Coastcare group, NACC and the CofGG from 2015. Implement the above as a short/medium/long term approach. It is time to improve the amenity, provide confidence and the recommendations are there to do so. This scope of works can be acted on immediately.</p>	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				<p>3.4 Economic Analysis – Adaptation options for Erosion Protection for Whitehill Rd and Community Centre. I seek further clarification as to how the fundamentals were calculated to rank these options. Of note, I am of the opinion that Boat Launch Stage 1&amp;2 has a much higher possibility of economic return by introducing a scope of works that has on-going revenue potential and tourism benefits for the whole region more than the other options. For example, an elevated rock sea wall significantly reduces the amenity and could have a negative impact for the community, tourism potential and real-estate investment. However, it will deliver coastal protection. This is an example where the CBA is presented through the lens of economic rationalism and does not consider the data to support the building of a boat ramp and associated protection works. This data appears not to have been taken into consideration in this analysis by Baird and therefore should be re-evaluated to more accurately reflect BCR values.</p>	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				<p>In summary, Coastal erosion and the CofGG's responses over the years indicate a knowledge of CHRMAP and that we are now well past the beginning of the journey that this Baird CHRMAP report represents. In closing, The significant underspend at Beresford for coastal protection works should be re-directed into coastal protection works at Drummond Cove, Bluff Point and Sunset Beach. It is State Govt. money (our taxes) that paid for Beresford, there were no rate rises recommended for them in the Baird report. Furthermore, there are no recommendations for 70A's clauses to be put on titles and no users pays scheme recommended for those land-owners. Any policy that adopts the Baird recommendations will need to consider this carefully. I would like to thank all the people that have applied their attention to this coastal issue. I appreciate the energy that will have to occur to make the situation right. I believe the city responded to saving a historical shed, John Batten Hall and lost an asset of Whitehill Road, which connected north and south. Aloha</p>	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
100	28/08/2018	31/08/2018	Private submission	<p>3.1.2 Community Coastal Planning Survey and Workshops Page 7. The attached report (Appendix A.2) does not reflect what was reported in "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017. The beach and residential properties in Kempton Street are highly valued by the community. In the "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017", it was identified that the loss of residential property and community areas would have a catastrophic impact. The results of the workshop were to 'Protect' Kempton Street properties and many of the other properties and beaches that the CHRMAP has changed to 'managed retreat.' Solution: The requirements of the CHRMAP process, state that community valuing and feedback is required in order to be successful. The CHRMAP needs to be updated to reflect what is important to the community by adhering to the Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report. Changing valuable assets to the community, such as properties and beaches, to "PROTECT".</p>	The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops were undertaken to provide the opportunity for the community to identify and prioritise assets and values of importance to them in the coastal zone. The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops also explained the Coastal Adaptation Types and provided the opportunity for the community participants to suggest adaptation measures for each adaptation type. This provided information for the consultant to identify the long term adaptation pathway for the assets and values in the coastal zone.	Note the submission
				<p>See attached Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report October 2017 Summary Page 2-Section 2.1 Purpose "The severity of erosion and inundation impact along Geraldton's coastal areas is determined by a range of factors, and over the next 100-years the coastal region is projected to experience adverse effects from coastal hazard impact at some time." The factors used in this calculation need to be defined. Does it take into account sand replenishing, man made modifications ect. Responsibility for increased erosion has been admitted by the ports. The Geraldton Guardian has also claimed the city is also responsible for the increased erosion due to the works at the foreshore. Is this part of the calculation?</p>	The factors used in the calculation are for coastal erosion and coastal inundation are identified in State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. In addition the Geraldton CHRMAP Report takes into account existing treatments such as the Northern Beaches Stabilisation Programme (NBSP) sand by-passing works undertaken each year by the Port Authority. The Beresford Foreshore project coastal protection structures have been designed not to interrupt the sediment flow northwards from Beresford.	Note the submission
				<p>There is sufficient justification to have the properties and community areas classified as "PROTECT" rather than the proposed "Accomodate/Managed Retreat" in Sunset Beach. The costs of managed retreat would amount to \$35,760,000 = (149 homes x \$240,000 (median reported house price per this report) This is the lowest cost as homes located next to the ocean are valued higher. The Adaptation recommendation "Section 70a notification on Title" would devalue 149 residential properties within Sunset Beach, effecting the resale value. "PROTECT" Adaptation options have been provided at a significantly lower cost to other Coastal Management Units. Not exceeding 4 million dollars. This would also remove the need to add "Section 70a notification on Title" saving millions to home owners. Refer to Technical Appendices- Table 3-2 "Cost estimates for adaptation options"</p>	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note the submission
				<p>The Adaptation plans per the report ("Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017") were as follows: Sunset Beach houses - Protect- Seawall, artificial reef, sand nourishment, dune rehabilitation, Geotextile containers.</p>	Noted. These, and other adaptation options were assessed by the consultant to identify sustainable long term adaptation pathways for the assets and values in the coastal zone.	Note the submission
				<p>Page 105 -15.1.3 Managed Retreat Pathway Out of the three pathways for managed retreat, in all cases, protect is the least costly and damaging to the city. The First Option "Do Nothing" will incur reputation damage and legal costs to the city. This will detour tourism and investors from coming to Geraldton. Without a legal precedent, legal counsel will need to be sought out, incurring more costs without any benefit to the community. The Second Option "Planned Retreat" the City would be required to reserve funds to acquire the properties before or at the time of the erosion trigger. Costing over \$35,760,000 for Sunset Beach alone. The Third Option "Protect" has been identified to have the least cost. risk and the biggest reward to the community and stakeholders. The community has recommended a proactive approach to protect the properties and beaches. This would ensure the best benefit to the City of Greater Geraldton, encouraging tourism, investments and showing everyone in WA that Geraldton cares about it's residents</p>	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note the submission
101	28/08/2018	3/09/2018	Private submission	<p>3.1.2 Community Coastal Planning Survey and Workshops Page 7. The attached report (Appendix A.2) does not reflect what was reported in "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017". The beach and residential properties in Sunset Beach are highly valued by the community. In the "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017", it was identified that the loss of residential property and community areas would have a catastrophic impact. The results of the workshop were to "Protect" Sunset Beach properties and many of the other properties and beaches that the CHRMAP has changed to "managed retreat." Solution: The requirements of the CHRMAP process, state that community valuing and feedback is required in order to be successful. The CHRMAP needs to be updated to reflect what is important to the community by adhering to the Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report. Changing valuable assets to the community, such as properties and beaches, to "PROTECT".</p>	The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops were undertaken to provide the opportunity for the community to identify and prioritise assets and values of importance to them in the coastal zone. The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops also explained the Coastal Adaptation Types and provided the opportunity for the community participants to suggest adaptation measures for each adaptation type. This provided information for the consultant to identify the long term adaptation pathway for the assets and values in the coastal zone.	Note the submission

Submission Information				Submission and Comment		
ID	Received	Responded	Submitter	Comment Submission	CGG Comment	Recommendation
				See attached Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report October 2017 Summary Page 2- Section 2.1 Purpose. "The severity of erosion and inundation impact along Geraldton's coastal areas is determined by a range of factors, and over the next 100-years the coastal region is projected to experience adverse effects from coastal hazard impact at some time." The factors used in this calculation need to be defined. Does it take into account sand replenishing, man made modifications ect. Responsibility for increased erosion has been admitted by the ports. The Geraldton Guardian has also claimed the city is also responsible for the increased erosion due to the works at the foreshore. Is this part of the calculation?	The factors used in the calculation are for coastal erosion and coastal inundation are identified in State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. In additional the Geraldton CHRMAP Report takes into account existing treatments such as the Northern Beaches Stabilisation Programme (NBSP) sand by-passing works undertaken each year by the Port Authority. The Beresford Foreshore project coastal protection structures have been designed not to interrupt the sediment flow northwards from Beresford	Note the submission
				There is sufficient justification to have the properties and community areas classified as "PROTECT" rather than the proposed "Accomodate/Managed Retreat" in Sunset Beach. The costs of managed retreat would amount to \$35,760,000 = (149 homes x \$240,000 (median reported house price per this report) This is the lowest cost as homes located next to the ocean are valued higher. The Adaptation recommendation "Section 70a notification on Title" would devalue 149 residential properties within Sunset Beach, effecting [sic] the resale value. "PROTECT" Adaptation options have been provided at a significantly lower cost to other Coastal Management Units. Not exceeding 4 million dollars. This would also remove the need to add "Section 70a notification on Title" saving millions to home owners. Refer to Technical Appendices- Table 3-2 "Cost estimates for adaptation options"	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note the submission
				The Adaptation plans per the report ("Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017") were as follows: Sunset Beach houses - Protect- Seawall, artificial reef, sand nourishment, dune rehabilitation, Geotextile containers.	Noted. These, and other adaptation options were assessed by the consultant to identify sustainable long term adaptation pathways for the assets and values in the coastal zone.	Note the submission
				Page 105 -15.1.3 Managed Retreat Pathway. Out of the three pathways for managed retreat, in all cases, protect is the least costly and damaging to the city. The First Option "Do Nothing" will incur reputation damage and legal costs to the city. This will detour tourism and investors from coming to Geraldton. Without a legal precedent, legal counsel will need to be sought out, incurring more costs without any benefit to the community. The Second Option "Planned Retreat" the City would be required to reserve funds to acquire the properties before or at the time of the erosion trigger. Costing over \$35,760,000 for Sunset Beach alone. The Third Option "Protect" has been identified to have the least cost, risk and the biggest reward to the community and stakeholders. The community has recommended a proactive approach to protect the properties and beaches. This would ensure the best benefit to the City of Greater Geraldton, encouraging tourism, investments and showing everyone in WA that Geraldton cares about it's residents.	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note the submission
102	28/08/2018	3/09/2018	Private submission	3.1.2 Community Coastal Planning Survey and Workshops Page 7. The attached report (Appendix A.2) does not reflect what was reported in "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report,October 2017". The beach and residential properties in Sunset Beach are highly valued by the community. In the "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report,October 2017", it was identified that the loss of residential property and community areas would have a catastrophic impact. The results of the workshop were to "Protect" Sunset Beach properties and many of the other properties and beaches that the CHRMAP has changed to "managed retreat." Solution: The requirements of the CHRMAP process, state that community valuing and feedback is required in order to be successful. The CHRMAP needs to be updated to reflect what is important to the community by adhering to the Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report. Changing valuable assets to the community, such as properties and beaches, to "PROTECT"	The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops were undertaken to provide the opportunity for the community to identify and prioritise assets and values of importance to them in the coastal zone. The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops also explained the Coastal Adaptation Types and provided the opportunity for the community participants to suggest adaptation measures for each adaptation type. This provided information for the consultant to identify the long term adaptation pathway for the assets and values in the coastal zone.	Note the submission
				See attached Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report October 2017 Summary Page 2- Section 2.1 Purpose. "The severity of erosion and inundation impact along Geraldton's coastal areas is determined by a range of factors, and over the next 100-years the coastal region is projected to experience adverse effects from coastal hazard impact at some time." The factors used in this calculation need to be defined. Does it take into account sand replenishing, man made modifications ect. Responsibility for increased erosion has been admitted by the ports. The Geraldton Guardian has also claimed the city is also responsible for the increased erosion due to the works at the foreshore. Is this part of the calculation?	The factors used in the calculation are for coastal erosion and coastal inundation are identified in State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. In additional the Geraldton CHRMAP Report takes into account existing treatments such as the Northern Beaches Stabilisation Programme (NBSP) sand by-passing works undertaken each year by the Port Authority. The Beresford Foreshore project coastal protection structures have been designed not to interrupt the sediment flow northwards from Beresford	Note the submission
				There is sufficient justification to have the properties and community areas classified as "PROTECT" rather than the proposed "Accomodate/Managed Retreat" in Sunset Beach. The costs of managed retreat would amount to \$35,760,000 = (149 homes x \$240,000 (median reported house price per this report) This is the lowest cost as homes located next to the ocean are valued higher. The Adaptation recommendation "Section 70a notification on Title" would devalue 149 residential properties within Sunset Beach, effecting [sic] the resale value. "PROTECT" Adaptation options have been provided at a significantly lower cost to other Coastal Management Units. Not exceeding 4 million dollars. This would also remove the need to add "Section 70a notification on Title" saving millions to home owners. Refer to Technical Appendices- Table 3-2 "Cost estimates for adaptation options"	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note the submission
				The Adaptation plans per the report ("Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017") were as follows: Sunset Beach houses - Protect- Seawall, artificial reef, sand nourishment, dune rehabilitation, Geotextile containers.	Noted. These, and other adaptation options were assessed by the consultant to identify sustainable long term adaptation pathways for the assets and values in the coastal zone.	Note the submission
				Page 105 -15.1.3 Managed Retreat Pathway. Out of the three pathways for managed retreat, in all cases, protect is the least costly and damaging to the city. The First Option "Do Nothing" will incur reputation damage and legal costs to the city. This will detour tourism and investors from coming to Geraldton. Without a legal precedent, legal counsel will need to be sought out, incurring more costs without any benefit to the community. The Second Option "Planned Retreat" the City would be required to reserve funds to acquire the properties before or at the time of the erosion trigger. Costing over \$35,760,000 for Sunset Beach alone. The Third Option "Protect" has been identified to have the least cost, risk and the biggest reward to the community and stakeholders. The community has recommended a proactive approach to protect the properties and beaches. This would ensure the best benefit to the City of Greater Geraldton, encouraging tourism, investments and showing everyone in WA that Geraldton cares about it's residents.	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note the submission
103	28/08/2018	3/09/2018	Private submission	3.1.2 Community Coastal Planning Survey and Workshops Page 7. The attached report (Appendix A.2) does not reflect what was reported in "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report,October 2017". The beach and residential properties in Sunset Beach are highly valued by the community. In the "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report,October 2017", it was identified that the loss of residential property and community areas would have a catastrophic impact. The results of the workshop were to "Protect" Sunset Beach properties and many of the other properties and beaches that the CHRMAP has changed to "managed retreat." Solution: The requirements of the CHRMAP process, state that community valuing and feedback is required in order to be successful. The CHRMAP needs to be updated to reflect what is important to the community by adhering to the Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report. Changing valuable assets to the community, such as properties and beaches, to "PROTECT"	The factors used in the calculation are for coastal erosion and coastal inundation are identified in State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. In additional the Geraldton CHRMAP Report takes into account existing treatments such as the Northern Beaches Stabilisation Programme (NBSP) sand by-passing works undertaken each year by the Port Authority. The Beresford Foreshore project coastal protection structures have been designed not to interrupt the sediment flow northwards from Beresford	Note the submission
				See attached Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report October 2017 Summary Page 2- Section 2.1 Purpose. "The severity of erosion and inundation impact along Geraldton's coastal areas is determined by a range of factors, and over the next 100-years the coastal region is projected to experience adverse effects from coastal hazard impact at some time." The factors used in this calculation need to be defined. Does it take into account sand replenishing, man made modifications ect. Responsibility for increased erosion has been admitted by the ports. The Geraldton Guardian has also claimed the city is also responsible for the increased erosion due to the works at the foreshore. Is this part of the calculation?	The factors used in the calculation are for coastal erosion and coastal inundation are identified in State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. In additional the Geraldton CHRMAP Report takes into account existing treatments such as the Northern Beaches Stabilisation Programme (NBSP) sand by-passing works undertaken each year by the Port Authority. The Beresford Foreshore project coastal protection structures have been designed not to interrupt the sediment flow northwards from Beresford	Note the submission
				There is sufficient justification to have the properties and community areas classified as "PROTECT" rather than the proposed "Accomodate/Managed Retreat" in Sunset Beach. The costs of managed retreat would amount to \$35,760,000 = (149 homes x \$240,000 (median reported house price per this report) This is the lowest cost as homes located next to the ocean are valued higher. The Adaptation recommendation "Section 70a notification on Title" would devalue 149 residential properties within Sunset Beach, effecting [sic] the resale value. "PROTECT" Adaptation options have been provided at a significantly lower cost to other Coastal Management Units. Not exceeding 4 million dollars. This would also remove the need to add "Section 70a notification on Title" saving millions to home owners. Refer to Technical Appendices- Table 3-2 "Cost estimates for adaptation options"	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note the submission
				The Adaptation plans per the report ("Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017") were as follows: Sunset Beach houses - Protect- Seawall, artificial reef, sand nourishment, dune rehabilitation, Geotextile containers.	Noted. These, and other adaptation options were assessed by the consultant to identify sustainable long term adaptation pathways for the assets and values in the coastal zone.	Note the submission
				Page 105 -15.1.3 Managed Retreat Pathway. Out of the three pathways for managed retreat, in all cases, protect is the least costly and damaging to the city. The First Option "Do Nothing" will incur reputation damage and legal costs to the city. This will detour tourism and investors from coming to Geraldton. Without a legal precedent, legal counsel will need to be sought out, incurring more costs without any benefit to the community. The Second Option "Planned Retreat" the City would be required to reserve funds to acquire the properties before or at the time of the erosion trigger. Costing over \$35,760,000 for Sunset Beach alone. The Third Option "Protect" has been identified to have the least cost, risk and the biggest reward to the community and stakeholders. The community has recommended a proactive approach to protect the properties and beaches. This would ensure the best benefit to the City of Greater Geraldton, encouraging tourism, investments and showing everyone in WA that Geraldton cares about it's residents.	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note the submission
104	28/08/2018	3/09/2018	Private submission	3.1.2 Community Coastal Planning Survey and Workshops Page 7. The attached report (Appendix A.2) does not reflect what was reported in "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report,October 2017". The beach and residential properties in Sunset Beach are highly valued by the community. In the "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report,October 2017", it was identified that the loss of residential property and community areas would have a catastrophic impact. The results of the workshop were to "Protect" Sunset Beach properties and many of the other properties and beaches that the CHRMAP has changed to "managed retreat." Solution: The requirements of the CHRMAP process, state that community valuing and feedback is required in order to be successful. The CHRMAP needs to be updated to reflect what is important to the community by adhering to the Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report. Changing valuable assets to the community, such as properties and beaches, to "PROTECT"	The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops were undertaken to provide the opportunity for the community to identify and prioritise assets and values of importance to them in the coastal zone. The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops also explained the Coastal Adaptation Types and provided the opportunity for the community participants to suggest adaptation measures for each adaptation type. This provided information for the consultant to identify the long term adaptation pathway for the assets and values in the coastal zone.	Note the submission
				See attached Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report October 2017 Summary Page 2- Section 2.1 Purpose. "The severity of erosion and inundation impact along Geraldton's coastal areas is determined by a range of factors, and over the next 100-years the coastal region is projected to experience adverse effects from coastal hazard impact at some time." The factors used in this calculation need to be defined. Does it take into account sand replenishing, man made modifications ect. Responsibility for increased erosion has been admitted by the ports. The Geraldton Guardian has also claimed the city is also responsible for the increased erosion due to the works at the foreshore. Is this part of the calculation?	The factors used in the calculation are for coastal erosion and coastal inundation are identified in State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. In additional the Geraldton CHRMAP Report takes into account existing treatments such as the Northern Beaches Stabilisation Programme (NBSP) sand by-passing works undertaken each year by the Port Authority. The Beresford Foreshore project coastal protection structures have been designed not to interrupt the sediment flow northwards from Beresford	Note the submission
				There is sufficient justification to have the properties and community areas classified as "PROTECT" rather than the proposed "Accomodate/Managed Retreat" in Sunset Beach. The costs of managed retreat would amount to \$35,760,000 = (149 homes x \$240,000 (median reported house price per this report) This is the lowest cost as homes located next to the ocean are valued higher. The Adaptation recommendation "Section 70a notification on Title" would devalue 149 residential properties within Sunset Beach, effecting the resale value. "PROTECT" Adaptation options have been provided at a significantly lower cost to other Coastal Management Units. Not exceeding 4 million dollars. This would also remove the need to add "Section 70a notification on Title" saving millions to home owners. Refer to Technical Appendices- Table 3-2 "Cost estimates for adaptation options"	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note the submission
				The Adaptation plans per the report ("Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017") were as follows: Sunset Beach houses - Protect- Seawall, artificial reef, sand nourishment, dune rehabilitation, Geotextile containers.	Noted. These, and other adaptation options were assessed by the consultant to identify sustainable long term adaptation pathways for the assets and values in the coastal zone.	Note the submission
				Page 105 -15.1.3 Managed Retreat Pathway. Out of the three pathways for managed retreat, in all cases, protect is the least costly and damaging to the city. The First Option "Do Nothing" will incur reputation damage and legal costs to the city. This will detour tourism and investors from coming to Geraldton. Without a legal precedent, legal counsel will need to be sought out, incurring more costs without any benefit to the community. The Second Option "Planned Retreat" the City would be required to reserve funds to acquire the properties before or at the time of the erosion trigger. Costing over \$35,760,000 for Sunset Beach alone. The Third Option "Protect" has been identified to have the least cost, risk and the biggest reward to the community and stakeholders. The community has recommended a proactive approach to protect the properties and beaches. This would ensure the best benefit to the City of Greater Geraldton, encouraging tourism, investments and showing everyone in WA that Geraldton cares about it's residents.	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note the submission

Submission Information				Submission and Comment		
ID	Received	Responded	Submitter	Comment Submission	CGG Comment	Recommendation
105	28/08/2018	3/09/2018	Private submission	3.1.2 Community Coastal Planning Survey and Workshops Page 7. The attached report (Appendix A.2) does not reflect what was reported in "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017". The beach and residential properties in Sunset Beach are highly valued by the community. In the "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017", it was identified that the loss of residential property and community areas would have a catastrophic impact. The results of the workshop were to "Protect" Sunset Beach properties and many of the other properties and beaches that the CHRMAP has changed to "managed retreat." Solution: The requirements of the CHRMAP process, state that community valuing and feedback is required in order to be successful. The CHRMAP needs to be updated to reflect what is important to the community by adhering to the Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report. Changing valuable assets to the community, such as properties and beaches, to "PROTECT".	The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops were undertaken to provide the opportunity for the community to identify and prioritise assets and values of importance to them in the coastal zone. The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops also explained the Coastal Adaptation Types and provided the opportunity for the community participants to suggest adaptation measures for each adaptation type. This provided information for the consultant to identify the long term adaptation pathway for the assets and values in the coastal zone.	Note the submission
				See attached Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report October 2017 Summary Page 2- Section 2.1 Purpose. "The severity of erosion and inundation impact along Geraldton's coastal areas is determined by a range of factors, and over the next 100-years the coastal region is projected to experience adverse effects from coastal hazard impact at some time." The factors used in this calculation need to be defined. Does it take into account sand replenishing, man made modifications ect. Responsibility for increased erosion has been admitted by the ports. The Geraldton Guardian has also claimed the city is also responsible for the increased erosion due to the works at the foreshore. Is this part of the calculation?	The factors used in the calculation are for coastal erosion and coastal inundation are identified in State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. In addition the Geraldton CHRMAP Report takes into account existing treatments such as the Northern Beaches Stabilisation Programme (NBSP) sand by-passing works undertaken each year by the Port Authority. The Beresford Foreshore project coastal protection structures have been designed not to interrupt the sediment flow northwards from Beresford.	Note the submission
				There is sufficient justification to have the properties and community areas classified as "PROTECT" rather than the proposed "Accomodate/Managed Retreat" in Sunset Beach. The costs of managed retreat would amount to \$35,760,000 = (149 homes x \$240,000 (median reported house price per this report) This is the lowest cost as homes located next to the ocean are valued higher. The Adaptation recommendation "Section 70a notification on Title" would devalue 149 residential properties within Sunset Beach, effecting the resale value. "PROTECT" Adaptation options have been provided at a significantly lower cost to other Coastal Management Units. Not exceeding 4 million dollars. This would also remove the need to add "Section 70a notification on Title" saving millions to home owners. Refer to Technical Appendices- Table 3-2 "Cost estimates for adaptation options"	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note the submission
				The Adaptation plans per the report ("Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017") were as follows: Sunset Beach houses - Protect- Seawall, artificial reef, sand nourishment, dune rehabilitation, Geotextile containers.	Noted. These, and other adaptation options were assessed by the consultant to identify sustainable long term adaptation pathways for the assets and values in the coastal zone.	Note the submission
				Page 105 -15.1.3 Managed Retreat Pathway. Out of the three pathways for managed retreat, in all cases, protect is the least costly and damaging to the city. The First Option "Do Nothing" will incur reputation damage and legal costs to the city. This will detour tourism and investors from coming to Geraldton. Without a legal precedent, legal counsel will need to be sought out, incurring more costs without any benefit to the community. The Second Option 'Planned Retreat' the City would be required to reserve funds to acquire the properties before or at the time of the erosion trigger. Costing over \$35,760,000 for Sunset Beach alone. The Third Option "Protect" has been identified to have the least cost, risk and the biggest reward to the community and stakeholders. The community has recommended a proactive approach to protect the properties and beaches. This would ensure the best benefit to the City of Greater Geraldton, encouraging tourism, investments and showing everyone in WA that Geraldton cares about it's residents.	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note the submission
				The Federal Government national policy to protect coastal dunes and threatened species has been wilfully and consistently ignored by GCC. In 2007, the Sunset Action Group referred Council to several key documents, including the State Coastal Planning Policy 2003. The Quality Foreshore Management Plan 2004 noted the need to stabilise and revegetate 'highly disturbed' frontal dune areas (Maunsell AECOM Revision B, January 2007). Approved by council, the Management Plan committed o a five year rehabilitation program. Within two years, the paths on the frontal dunes had collapsed and the deeper, taller vegetation that previously held the dunes together was never replaced. The herbicides used to remove boxthorn also killed surrounding bushes. The frontal dune plantings outlined in the plan did not happen, nor the reticulation in some areas. In August 2008, Gondiniland advised that they had 'briefed' the new owners of the Sunset Beach Estate on the need to manage foreshore rehabilitation and revegetation. During this decade, ancient Aboriginal middens on the foreshore and artefact strewn limestone formations were destroyed by earthworks and erosion. The erosion was obvious, with the loss of large trees and further lengths of waste pipes at Triton Place and the strategic removal of the toilet block in 2017. It appears that Council did not supervise the continuation of the rehabilitation required under the Management Plan. Our Sunset Beach community attended meetings, cleaned and planted, gave our time and energy to support your 'consultations'. In all community consultations, the priority to protect the dunes was maintained and Council's commitment to revegetate, rehabilitate and preserve was restated in key Council messages to our community (eg: The Community Charter: 2029 and Beyond, 2010). Without notifying residents, Council has determined that this commitment to some beachfront areas no longer applies and a decision has been made to 'manage a planned retreat'. Your Community Charter 2029 and Beyond fails to mention this critical decision.	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
106	30/08/2018	3/09/2018	Private submission (x2)	Each of the reports, Coastal Hazard and Risk Assessment and Adaption reports have been developed without any recommendations for the City for action. It is my belief that the City has not yet identified a course of action or yet calculated the cost into their long term financial plan.	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note the submission
				All the comments below are firstly covered by the fact the City should not have allowed developments throughout the local government area be developed if correct duty of care has been taken in engineering and environmental studies. This is more specific to the newer areas of Sunset and Drummond Cove. I believe the City has not carried out due diligence in this area and any of the following comments are somewhat an <u>afterthought however much required and thus the City remains liable for all actions.</u>	The Sunset Beach and Drummond Cove developments are based on the State Coastal Planning Policy in place at the time of the sub-division. The most recent State Coastal Planning Policy came into effect in 2013	Note the submission
				The individual '12 units' that have been costed for the managed retreat option needs to be calculated at real market value and not averaged. This will help residents such as us gain a better understanding from the City of their intent to financially recompense owners at the correct rate as our home is worth far more than the costed average price of \$240,000.	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				I do not believe it is option to do nothing. The preferred option would be to protect, if these methods have been proven effective and cost efficient. Otherwise substantial funds would be depleted that could otherwise fund the second option of planned retreat. Can the City give a time frame and be specific about the trigger points and values that will be used for this option?	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note the submission
107	28/08/2018	3/09/2018	Private submission	3.1.2 Community Coastal Planning Survey and Workshops Page 7. The attached report (Appendix A.2) does not reflect what was reported in "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017". The beach and residential properties in Sunset Beach are highly valued by the community. In the "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017", it was identified that the loss of residential property and community areas would have a catastrophic impact. The results of the workshop were to "Protect" Sunset Beach properties and many of the other properties and beaches that the CHRMAP has changed to "managed retreat." Solution: The requirements of the CHRMAP process, state that community valuing and feedback is required in order to be successful. The CHRMAP needs to be updated to reflect what is important to the community by adhering to the Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report. Changing valuable assets to the community, such as properties and beaches, to "PROTECT".	The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops were undertaken to provide the opportunity for the community to identify and prioritise assets and values of importance to them in the coastal zone. The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops also explained the Coastal Adaptation Types and provided the opportunity for the community participants to suggest adaptation measures for each adaptation type. This provided information for the consultant to identify the long term adaptation pathway for the assets and values in the coastal zone.	Note the submission
				See attached Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report October 2017 Summary Page 2- Section 2.1 Purpose. "The severity of erosion and inundation impact along Geraldton's coastal areas is determined by a range of factors, and over the next 100-years the coastal region is projected to experience adverse effects from coastal hazard impact at some time." The factors used in this calculation need to be defined. Does it take into account sand replenishing, man made modifications ect. Responsibility for increased erosion has been admitted by the ports. The Geraldton Guardian has also claimed the city is also responsible for the increased erosion due to the works at the foreshore. Is this part of the calculation?	The factors used in the calculation are for coastal erosion and coastal inundation are identified in State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. In addition the Geraldton CHRMAP Report takes into account existing treatments such as the Northern Beaches Stabilisation Programme (NBSP) sand by-passing works undertaken each year by the Port Authority. The Beresford Foreshore project coastal protection structures have been designed not to interrupt the sediment flow northwards from Beresford.	Note the submission
				There is sufficient justification to have the properties and community areas classified as "PROTECT" rather than the proposed "Accomodate/Managed Retreat" in Sunset Beach. The costs of managed retreat would amount to \$35,760,000 = (149 homes x \$240,000 (median reported house price per this report) This is the lowest cost as homes located next to the ocean are valued higher. The Adaptation recommendation "Section 70a notification on Title" would devalue 149 residential properties within Sunset Beach, effecting the resale value. "PROTECT" Adaptation options have been provided at a significantly lower cost to other Coastal Management Units. Not exceeding 4 million dollars. This would also remove the need to add "Section 70a notification on Title" saving millions to home owners. Refer to Technical Appendices- Table 3-2 "Cost estimates for adaptation options"	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note the submission
				The Adaptation plans per the report ("Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017") were as follows: Sunset Beach houses - Protect- Seawall, artificial reef, sand nourishment, dune rehabilitation, Geotextile containers.	Noted. These, and other adaptation options were assessed by the consultant to identify sustainable long term adaptation pathways for the assets and values in the coastal zone.	Note the submission
				Page 105 -15.1.3 Managed Retreat Pathway. Out of the three pathways for managed retreat, in all cases, protect is the least costly and damaging to the city. The First Option "Do Nothing" will incur reputation damage and legal costs to the city. This will detour tourism and investors from coming to Geraldton. Without a legal precedent, legal counsel will need to be sought out, incurring more costs without any benefit to the community. The Second Option 'Planned Retreat' the City would be required to reserve funds to acquire the properties before or at the time of the erosion trigger. Costing over \$35,760,000 for Sunset Beach alone. The Third Option "Protect" has been identified to have the least cost, risk and the biggest reward to the community and stakeholders. The community has recommended a proactive approach to protect the properties and beaches. This would ensure the best benefit to the City of Greater Geraldton, encouraging tourism, investments and showing everyone in WA that Geraldton cares about it's residents.	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note the submission
				1. Responsibility for increasing erosion must be accepted at least in part by the Port Authority related to extensive reclamation and alteration of natural topography and also the City related to the foreshore modifications over the years. 2. I do not believe the City and the Port Authority should have the ability to lake the easy way out via managed retreat. 3. When asked, the City replied that the recent protection works in Beresford were undertaken to protect infrastructure. Such infrastructure is also present along the old (now missing) northern section of Swan Drive west of the caravan park and the rear of western Volute St houses. Thus the area of Sunset Beach is entitled to expect 'Protect' as its management strategy. Owners/Residents of the threatened houses in Sunset Beach deserve the right not to have their land & house asset devalued by the section 70a note on title and rather expect the City to support them by opting to protect this area, with the added bonus that it seems this would cost the City less. SUNSET BEACH REQUIRES AND DESERVES MANAGEMENT BY "PROTECTION" NOT RETREAT AND LOOKS TO THE CITY FOR SUPPORT IN THIS	In line with State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy, the Beresford Foreshore Project, as new coastal protection works has progressed only after all other options for avoiding and adapting to coastal hazards had been fully explored, as part of a comprehensive coastal hazard risk management process	Note the submission
108	31/08/2018	3/09/2018	Private submission	Referencing the Coastal Planning Community Survey Report January 2018, particularly pages 4 and 5, the whole of our community and tourists alike considers the beaches and associated coastal strip of paramount importance to their lifestyle and enjoyment. Our attraction to tourists both internationally and locally in WA is our outdoor orientated climate, wind, fishing, walking and surf and those tourism potentials into the economics that benefit community benefit everyone. During the community consultation phase of CHRMAP, the data clearly demonstrates that the Geraldton community at large values the beaches and foreshore of the municipality of Geraldton above all other assets. This view must expand to include all people in the entire region of the CofGG jurisdiction. Including residents from the Shire of Chapman Valley who also enjoy the foreshore areas, particularly the connection to Drummond Cove. It is too narrow a perspective to view this CHRMAP report through the lens of only those residents living within coastal processes setback lines as affected.	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission



Submission Information				Submission and Comment		
ID	Received	Responded	Submitter	Comment Submission	CGG Comment	Recommendation
				In response to the overall recommendations: I _____ reject some of the recommendations of Managed Retreat. The CofGG has adopted the strategy of Managed Retreat for many years now in the absence of hazard mapping and CHRMAP reports and policy. This has resulted in trigger points being passed that have lost assets in Drummond Cove and I urge the CofGG to now act. It is not acceptable to me that the CHRMAP report is a justification for adopting Managed Retreat from this point forward as the CofGG has been well aware and has obligations under the Planning Act to land owners. We recommend that the CofGG explore with the DCPA and Drummond Cove Community via community consultation the CBA (Cost Benefit Analysis) of immediate strategies now, and longer term. Community consultation is essential to prevent further fracturing of community over the issue of coastal erosion. It is important to consider the Western Australian legislative framework that would result from voluntary or compulsory acquisition. Case law pertaining to compulsory acquisition judgments indicates that values paid usually far exceed current market value due to Courts also awarding on-costs like removal expenses and legal costs. I recommend a 'Protect' approach (Pr1-7): The values of the properties within the report are significantly understated given current market value, this needs to be clarified. Second, sufficient justification exists for permanent solutions of development on coastal land areas that are available to buffer areas 'at risk from coastal erosion and inundation. I _____ propose coastal protection works in zone 1 & 2 as there is a need to preserve the Drummond Cove foreshore areas for all people in the CofGG. The CofGG should explore, with the direct involvement of community, protection works that consider public access, public safety, property and infrastructure as our coastal lifestyle is not expendable.	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				In response to the following recommendation: Require Section 70A notification to be placed on titles to alert prospective purchasers to the risk of coastal erosion and / or inundation. I recommend that the CofGG undertake immediately Geophysical studies of all the shoreline areas to examine presence of rock strata that could reduce the erodibility of critical sections over the longer term (estimate \$25,000) and apply that data to the setback lines to create an accurate representation of setback lines. The current setbacks are not accurate, specific height differences in adjacent areas not affected by setback lines indicate a broad-brush approach with significant perceived financial implications at stake. I understand that the purpose of this study is to provide 'scope of works' recommendations. However, more detailed data gathering is necessary that includes analysis of rock strata within the setbacks and accurate elevations to be included. This is essential before any 70A notifications be placed on titles as a policy directive. I advise caution to the CofGG to avoid possible class action from residents under the state planning act. It is a risk that 70A clauses on titles as recommended by such a broad-based 110 year timeframe and policy approach, the historical data doesn't even exist to provide certainty to the lines as they are currently presented. This will need to be taken into consideration as part of the CBA (Cost Benefit Analysis).	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				I agree with the recommendations of continued immediate Monitoring and Management outlined below: Recommend a geophysical study of the shoreline areas is undertaken to examine presence of rock strata that could reduce the erodibility of critical sections over the longer term; • The foreshore reserve area offers a crucial natural buffer against coastal erosion and inundation for coastal assets located landward (houses, roads etc), as well as providing highly valued public amenity. Active monitoring and nature-based approaches (e.g. coastal revegetation, sand trapping fences) to increase resilience of this foreshore reserve from erosion are strongly recommended. Community groups and local organisations should be included / supported in the delivery of these programs, to provide opportunity to raise awareness and build ownership of the coastal adaptation requirements. Again, I urge the CofGG to consider the tourism impacts to the region and future economic consequences of any policy, particularly the consequences of a purely Managed Retreat paradigm. Some of the recommended actions will inevitably bring about the outcome of 'protection' at future trigger points. The CofGG needs to acknowledge that we are well past trigger points along Whitehill Rd, Drummond Cove. It is my opinion that the scope of options and actions need to be fully explored with community, any action/response also include a thorough search for alternative/innovative approaches beyond the list of recommendations PR1-6. I strongly advise the CofGG look to other adopted approaches in other states and countries where the amenity of the coastal asset has been the highest priority. Options such as off-shore artificial reefs to mitigate wave action as the driver of coastal erosion, being just one example. As per State Planning Policy 2.6, Community consultation at every step of the way is recommended. The CofGG should seek to preserve the natural amenity and improve tourism potential wherever possible as this is the community priority. I ask the CofGG to put on a tourism lens as they view options and consider the CBA (Cost Benefit Analysis).	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				In response to the statement below: 1. "The initial stages of the Geraldton CHRMAP project involved community and stakeholder engagement and a risk-based assessment, which examined coastal assets under threat from erosion and inundation in future planning timeframes. The outcomes of this initial CHRMAP phase were reported in the Coastal Hazard and Risk Assessment report (Baird 2018)" It is important that the CofGG continues to engage with community going forward with the view to avoid at all costs, a fracturing of community. It is an unacceptable outcome that the city takes an approach that 'we know better' and pushes ahead with projects without community buy in and seek to avoid repeating its past mistakes at Drummond Cove. The DCPA community is well versed in understanding the CHRMAP process and seeking action. This is evidenced by holding the Geraldton Coastal Adaptation Planning Forum in 2014, a partnership between the Drummonds Cove Progress Association and Sunset Beach Coastcare groups. Followed by Application A15220 in 2015 by the Drummond Cove Progress Association (DCPA) for works north of the John Batten Hall to respond to coastal erosion. A community action grant was applied for to the Dept. of Transport in partnership with the CofGG and NACC for the coastal zone north of the John Batten Hall. It needs to be acknowledged that the CofGG has been well aware of the issues north of John Batten Hall/Whitehill Rd. and now need to act. Following on from the above data, it is my position to explore specifically the following recommendations from the Baird report: Section 1 & Section 2. Drummond Cove Road to Community Centre & Community Centre to Seacrest Way - I agree with the following: "A coastal protection approach for Drummond Cove north of the Community Hall in front of the closed section of Whitehill Rd warrants further assessment. MCA and CBA analysis of options considered show a net return on investment on the value of assets protected on the landside is possible. The high value of property at risk of erosion in future planning periods and the values of the coast noted in the Community Engagement process underline the importance of this issue."	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				Following on from the above, I would like to see the CofGG re-visit the foreshore re-build strategy (Application A15220) for section 1 & 2. This course of action is reinforced by the Baird report which states: "Nature based approaches to increase resilience of shorelines and foreshore areas (eg sand trapping fences, revegetation). Recommended for section north of the Community Hall. CGG led programs supported through grant funding (estimated \$10,000 annually)." I would like the CofGG to put in place a more permanent fixture of building a below ground seawall which will provide the necessary peace of mind to the entire community. If connectivity is absolutely necessary then utilize the existing road with a seawall to protect.	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				In response to the economic analysis below: 3.4 Economic Analysis - Adaptation options for Erosion Protection for Whitehill Rd and Community Centre I seek further clarification as to how the fundamentals were calculated to rank these options. Of note, I am of the opinion that Boat Launch Stage 1&2 has a much higher possibility of economic return by introducing a scope of works that has on-going revenue potential and tourism benefits for the whole region that have not been considered in this report. For example, an elevated rock sea wall significantly reduces the amenity and could have a negative impact on the community. Tourism potential will be diminished and real-estate investment impacted. However, such an approach will deliver coastal protection. This is an example where the CBA is presented too narrowly through the lens of economic rationalism and does not consider other data to support the building of a boat ramp into associated protection works. Abrohlos Island access and northern boat launching access appears not to have been taken into consideration in this analysis by the Baird report and therefore should be re-evaluated to more accurately reflect BCR values. In summary, Coastal erosion and the CofGG's responses over the years indicate a knowledge of CHRMAP and from the Drummond Cove perspective, we are now well past the beginning of the journey that this Baird CHRMAP report represents.	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				I am deeply concerned by the recommendation to put a 70A clause on our homes. We have spent our whole lives working hard to enjoy our retirement and purchasing this land at a very, very high price and equally building a beautiful home which we enjoy living in immensely then to be told our home is unsealable. All that hard work for nothing. I am truly disheartened that someone can make that call. When we built there was no knowledge of our home or other homes in our area were in danger of erosion. We can thank the local council for rocking the John Batten Hall for the erosion to begin. Saving a \$20 000.00 shed was a very poor decision amongst council. In closing the significant underspend at Beresford for coastal protection works should be re- directed into coastal protection works at Drummond Cove, Bluff Point and Sunset Beach. It is State Govt. money (our taxes) that paid for Beresford, there were no rate rises recommended for them in the Baird report. Furthermore, there are no recommendations for 70A's clauses to be put on titles and no user pays scheme recommended for those land- owners. Any policy that adopts the Baird recommendations will need to consider this carefully. I will be very interested to seeing and reading the final CHRMAP report. I hope you take into consideration a lot of what we as home owners are experiencing and would like this resolved.	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
109	28/08/2018	3/09/2018	Private submission	3.1.2 Community Coastal Planning Survey and Workshops Page 7. The attached report (Appendix A.2) does not reflect what was reported in "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017". The beach and residential properties in Sunset Beach are highly valued by the community. In the "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017", it was identified that the loss of residential property and community areas would have a catastrophic impact. The results of the workshop were to "Protect" Sunset Beach properties and many of the other properties and beaches that the CHRMAP has changed to "managed retreat." Solution: The requirements of the CHRMAP process, state that community valuing and feedback is required in order to be successful. The CHRMAP needs to be updated to reflect what is important to the community by adhering to the Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report. Changing valuable assets to the community, such as properties and beaches, to "PROTECT".	The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops were undertaken to provide the opportunity for the community to identify and prioritise assets and values of importance to them in the coastal zone. The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops also explained the Coastal Adaptation Types and provided the opportunity for the community participants to suggest adaptation measures for each adaptation type. This provided information for the consultant to identify the long term adaptation pathway for the assets and values in the coastal zone.	Note the submission
				See attached Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report October 2017 Summary Page 2- Section 2.1 Purpose. "The severity of erosion and inundation impact along Geraldton's coastal areas is determined by a range of factors, and over the next 100-years the coastal region is projected to experience adverse effects from coastal hazard impact at some time." The factors used in this calculation need to be defined. Does it take into account sand replenishing, man made modifications ect. Responsibility for increased erosion has been admitted by the ports. The Geraldton Guardian has also claimed the city is also responsible for the increased erosion due to the works at the foreshore. Is this part of the calculation?	The factors used in the calculation are for coastal erosion and coastal inundation are identified in State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. In addition the Geraldton CHRMAP Report takes into account existing treatments such as the Northern Beaches Stabilisation Programme (NBSPP) sand by-passing works undertaken each year by the Port Authority. The Beresford Foreshore project coastal protection structures have been designed not to interrupt the sediment flow northwards from Beresford.	Note the submission
				There is sufficient justification to have the properties and community areas classified as "PROTECT" rather than the proposed "Accomodate/Managed Retreat" in Sunset Beach. The costs of managed retreat would amount to \$35,760,000 = (149 homes x \$240,000 (median reported house price per this report) This is the lowest cost as homes located next to the ocean are valued higher. The Adaptation recommendation "Section 70a notification on Title" would devalue 149 residential properties within Sunset Beach, effecting the resale value. "PROTECT" Adaptation options have been provided at a significantly lower cost to other Coastal Management Units. Not exceeding 4 million dollars. This would also remove the need to add "Section 70a notification on Title" saving millions to home owners. Refer to Technical Appendices- Table 3-2 "Cost estimates for adaptation options."	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note the submission
				The Adaptation plans per the report ("Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017") were as follows: Sunset Beach houses - Protect- Seawall, artificial reef, sand nourishment, dune rehabilitation, Geotextile containers.	Noted. These, and other adaptation options were assessed by the consultant to identify sustainable long term adaptation pathways for the assets and values in the coastal zone.	Note the submission
				Page 105 -15.1.3 Managed Retreat Pathway. Out of the three pathways for managed retreat, in all cases, protect is the least costly and damaging to the city. The First Option "Do Nothing" will incur reputation damage and legal costs to the city. This will detour tourism and investors from coming to Geraldton. Without a legal precedent, legal counsel will need to be sought out, incurring more costs without any benefit to the community. The Second Option "Planned Retreat" the city would be required to reserve funds to acquire the properties before or at the time of the erosion trigger. Costing over \$35,760,000 for Sunset Beach alone. The Third Option "Protect" has been identified to have the least cost, risk and the biggest reward to the community and stakeholders. The community has recommended a proactive approach to protect the properties and beaches. This would ensure the best benefit to the City of Greater Geraldton, encouraging tourism, investments and showing everyone in WA that Geraldton cares about it's residents.	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note the submission
110	28/08/2018	3/09/2018	Private submission	3.1.2 Community Coastal Planning Survey and Workshops Page 7. The attached report (Appendix A.2) does not reflect what was reported in "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017". The beach and residential properties in Sunset Beach are highly valued by the community. In the "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017", it was identified that the loss of residential property and community areas would have a catastrophic impact. The results of the workshop were to "Protect" Sunset Beach properties and many of the other properties and beaches that the CHRMAP has changed to "managed retreat." Solution: The requirements of the CHRMAP process, state that community valuing and feedback is required in order to be successful. The CHRMAP needs to be updated to reflect what is important to the community by adhering to the Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report. Changing valuable assets to the community, such as properties and beaches, to "PROTECT".	The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops were undertaken to provide the opportunity for the community to identify and prioritise assets and values of importance to them in the coastal zone. The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops also explained the Coastal Adaptation Types and provided the opportunity for the community participants to suggest adaptation measures for each adaptation type. This provided information for the consultant to identify the long term adaptation pathway for the assets and values in the coastal zone.	Note the submission

Submission Information				Submission and Comment		
ID	Received	Responded	Submitter	Comment Submission	CGG Comment	Recommendation
				See attached Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report October 2017 Summary Page 2- Section 2.1 Purpose. "The severity of erosion and inundation impact along Geraldton's coastal areas is determined by a range of factors, and over the next 100-years the coastal region is projected to experience adverse effects from coastal hazard impact at some time." The factors used in this calculation need to be defined. Does it take into account sand replenishing, man made modifications ect. Responsibility for increased erosion has been admitted by the ports. The Geraldton Guardian has also claimed the city is also responsible for the increased erosion due to the works at the foreshore. Is this part of the calculation?	The factors used in the calculation are for coastal erosion and coastal inundation are identified in State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. In additional the Geraldton CHRMAP Report takes into account existing treatments such as the Northern Beaches Stabilisation Programme (NBSPP) sand by-passing works undertaken each year by the Port Authority. The Beresford Foreshore project coastal protection structures have been designed not to interrupt the sediment flow northwards from Beresford	Note the submission
				There is sufficient justification to have the properties and community areas classified as "PROTECT" rather than the proposed "Accomodate/Managed Retreat" in Sunset Beach. The costs of managed retreat would amount to \$35,760,000 = (149 homes x \$240,000 (median reported house price per this report) This is the lowest cost as homes located next to the ocean are valued higher. The Adaptation recommendation "Section 70a notification on Title" would devalue 149 residential properties within Sunset Beach, effecting the resale value. "PROTECT" Adaptation options have been provided at a significantly lower cost to other Coastal Management Units. Not exceeding 4 million dollars. This would also remove the need to add "Section 70a notification on Title" saving millions to home owners. Refer to Technical Appendices- Table 3-2 "Cost estimates for adaptation options"	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note the submission
				The Adaptation plans per the report ("Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017") were as follows: Sunset Beach houses - Protect- Seawall, artificial reef, sand nourishment, dune rehabilitation, Geotextile containers.	Noted. These, and other adaptation options were assessed by the consultant to identify sustainable long term adaptation pathways for the assets and values in the coastal zone.	Note the submission
				Page 105 -15.1.3 Managed Retreat Pathway. Out of the three pathways for managed retreat, in all cases, protect is the least costly and damaging to the city. The First Option "Do Nothing" will incur reputation damage and legal costs to the city. This will detour tourism and investors from coming to Geraldton. Without a legal precedent, legal counsel will need to be sought out, incurring more costs without any benefit to the community. The Second Option "Planned Retreat" the City would be required to reserve funds to acquire the properties before or at the time of the erosion trigger. Costing over \$35,760,000 for Sunset Beach alone. The Third Option "Protect" has been identified to have the least cost, risk and the biggest reward to the community and stakeholders. The community has recommended a proactive approach to protect the properties and beaches. This would ensure the best benefit to the City of Greater Geraldton, encouraging tourism, investments and showing everyone in WA that Geraldton cares about it's residents.	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note the submission
111	31/08/2018	5/09/2018	Private submission (x2)	I am writing to express our strong disappointment in the release of the above-mentioned report and the proposed solutions. Furthermore, that such a detrimental issue was brought to our attention by a well-informed neighbour and not the council itself, such as via a personal letter to the effected residents. We believe that the procedure in releasing the report was very irresponsible, as well as the projected damaging consequences that have been presented. As longstanding rate payers, that care for the economic and community development of Geraldton, we hope that this letter and the overwhelming outcry from the public is taken very seriously by all parties involved. Releasing such a report and expecting the general public to have time to process it in the deadline given could be seen as almost deliberate. This alone has created a loss in confidence for many residents. Begs to ask the question, why would we continue to support a City that we have spent a lifetime living, working and contributing to, that does not return the same duty of care? Why would we continue or encourage our children to commit to a council that has no regard for the wellbeing of its residents? We would like to take this opportunity to present the following flaws in the mentioned report & recent strategy; Potential for a covenant to be placed on land/ property owners title; Council has been approving land development, particularly in Sunset Beach and Glenfield areas in recent years; then to inform the now owners that their property could be near worthless in the not-so-distant future is just not acceptable. Opportunity for the property and/or land to be repurchased for a median rate; It is extremely offensive that the council see it fit for a lifestyle and years of memories that comes with living on the coast can be compensated for a calculated amount. Coastal work to be completed at the cost of the property owners; Unbelievably ratepayers are expected to recoup this cost, however never been given the proper knowledge to recognise a future problem and its detrimental effects. Recent development of groynes within the City Centre; We think it would be naive for the council to assume the recent works along Chapman Road Beresford have not had a flow on effect for the surrounding coastline or at least contributed to the coastal erosion we now foresee. We feel this requires further investigation and explanation. In conclusion, we cannot highlight enough the effect that this has had on not only our family, but dozens of growing families that reside or are planning on residing in the affected areas. We strongly suggest that the solutions be reevaluated if you have any consideration for the residents that have built their life around this amazing coastal City that has so much potential. We would like to see the council take steps to protect the coastline as they have done along the Chapman Road Beresford section, and believe in doing this can secure a bright and prosperous future for Geraldton as whole. We look forward to being kept properly notified of council's intentions in the future and hope we can continue to enjoy our beautiful city and beaches	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
112	28/08/2018	3/09/2018	Private submission	3.1.2 Community Coastal Planning Survey and Workshops Page 7. The attached report (Appendix A.2) does not reflect what was reported in "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017". The beach and residential properties in Sunset Beach are highly valued by the community. In the "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017", it was identified that the loss of residential property and community areas would have a catastrophic impact. The results of the workshop were to "Protect" Sunset Beach properties and many of the other properties and beaches that the CHRMAP has changed to "managed retreat." Solution: The requirements of the CHRMAP process, state that community valuing and feedback is required in order to be successful. The CHRMAP needs to be updated to reflect what is important to the community by adhering to the Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report. Changing valuable assets to the community, such as properties and beaches, to "PROTECT".	The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops were undertaken to provide the opportunity for the community to identify and prioritise assets and values of importance to them in the coastal zone. The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops also explained the Coastal Adaptation Types and provided the opportunity for the community participants to suggest adaptation measures for each adaptation type. This provided information for the consultant to identify the long term adaptation pathway for the assets and values in the coastal zone.	Note the submission
				See attached Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report October 2017 Summary Page 2- Section 2.1 Purpose. "The severity of erosion and inundation impact along Geraldton's coastal areas is determined by a range of factors, and over the next 100-years the coastal region is projected to experience adverse effects from coastal hazard impact at some time." The factors used in this calculation need to be defined. Does it take into account sand replenishing, man made modifications ect. Responsibility for increased erosion has been admitted by the ports. The Geraldton Guardian has also claimed the city is also responsible for the increased erosion due to the works at the foreshore. Is this part of the calculation?	The factors used in the calculation are for coastal erosion and coastal inundation are identified in State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. In additional the Geraldton CHRMAP Report takes into account existing treatments such as the Northern Beaches Stabilisation Programme (NBSPP) sand by-passing works undertaken each year by the Port Authority. The Beresford Foreshore project coastal protection structures have been designed not to interrupt the sediment flow northwards from Beresford	Note the submission
				There is sufficient justification to have the properties and community areas classified as "PROTECT" rather than the proposed "Accomodate/Managed Retreat" in Sunset Beach. The costs of managed retreat would amount to \$35,760,000 = (149 homes x \$240,000 (median reported house price per this report) This is the lowest cost as homes located next to the ocean are valued higher. The Adaptation recommendation "Section 70a notification on Title" would devalue 149 residential properties within Sunset Beach, effecting the resale value. "PROTECT" Adaptation options have been provided at a significantly lower cost to other Coastal Management Units. Not exceeding 4 million dollars. This would also remove the need to add "Section 70a notification on Title" saving millions to home owners. Refer to Technical Appendices- Table 3-2 "Cost estimates for adaptation options"	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note the submission
				The Adaptation plans per the report ("Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017") were as follows: Sunset Beach houses - Protect- Seawall, artificial reef, sand nourishment, dune rehabilitation, Geotextile containers.	Noted. These, and other adaptation options were assessed by the consultant to identify sustainable long term adaptation pathways for the assets and values in the coastal zone.	Note the submission
				Page 105 -15.1.3 Managed Retreat Pathway. Out of the three pathways for managed retreat, in all cases, protect is the least costly and damaging to the city. The First Option "Do Nothing" will incur reputation damage and legal costs to the city. This will detour tourism and investors from coming to Geraldton. Without a legal precedent, legal counsel will need to be sought out, incurring more costs without any benefit to the community. The Second Option "Planned Retreat" the City would be required to reserve funds to acquire the properties before or at the time of the erosion trigger. Costing over \$35,760,000 for Sunset Beach alone. The Third Option "Protect" has been identified to have the least cost, risk and the biggest reward to the community and stakeholders. The community has recommended a proactive approach to protect the properties and beaches. This would ensure the best benefit to the City of Greater Geraldton, encouraging tourism, investments and showing everyone in WA that Geraldton cares about it's residents.	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note the submission
				It seems that there is a need for pro-active people in the Shire	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
113	28/08/2018	3/09/2018	Private submission	3.1.2 Community Coastal Planning Survey and Workshops Page 7. The attached report (Appendix A.2) does not reflect what was reported in "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017". The beach and residential properties in Sunset Beach are highly valued by the community. In the "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017", it was identified that the loss of residential property and community areas would have a catastrophic impact. The results of the workshop were to "Protect" Sunset Beach properties and many of the other properties and beaches that the CHRMAP has changed to "managed retreat." Solution: The requirements of the CHRMAP process, state that community valuing and feedback is required in order to be successful. The CHRMAP needs to be updated to reflect what is important to the community by adhering to the Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report. Changing valuable assets to the community, such as properties and beaches, to "PROTECT".	The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops were undertaken to provide the opportunity for the community to identify and prioritise assets and values of importance to them in the coastal zone. The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops also explained the Coastal Adaptation Types and provided the opportunity for the community participants to suggest adaptation measures for each adaptation type. This provided information for the consultant to identify the long term adaptation pathway for the assets and values in the coastal zone.	Note the submission
				See attached Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report October 2017 Summary Page 2- Section 2.1 Purpose. "The severity of erosion and inundation impact along Geraldton's coastal areas is determined by a range of factors, and over the next 100-years the coastal region is projected to experience adverse effects from coastal hazard impact at some time." The factors used in this calculation need to be defined. Does it take into account sand replenishing, man made modifications ect. Responsibility for increased erosion has been admitted by the ports. The Geraldton Guardian has also claimed the city is also responsible for the increased erosion due to the works at the foreshore. Is this part of the calculation?	The factors used in the calculation are for coastal erosion and coastal inundation are identified in State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. In additional the Geraldton CHRMAP Report takes into account existing treatments such as the Northern Beaches Stabilisation Programme (NBSPP) sand by-passing works undertaken each year by the Port Authority. The Beresford Foreshore project coastal protection structures have been designed not to interrupt the sediment flow northwards from Beresford	Note the submission
				There is sufficient justification to have the properties and community areas classified as "PROTECT" rather than the proposed "Accomodate/Managed Retreat" in Sunset Beach. The costs of managed retreat would amount to \$35,760,000 = (149 homes x \$240,000 (median reported house price per this report) This is the lowest cost as homes located next to the ocean are valued higher. The Adaptation recommendation "Section 70a notification on Title" would devalue 149 residential properties within Sunset Beach, effecting the resale value. "PROTECT" Adaptation options have been provided at a significantly lower cost to other Coastal Management Units. Not exceeding 4 million dollars. This would also remove the need to add "Section 70a notification on Title" saving millions to home owners. Refer to Technical Appendices- Table 3-2 "Cost estimates for adaptation options"	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note the submission
				The Adaptation plans per the report ("Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017") were as follows: Sunset Beach houses - Protect- Seawall, artificial reef, sand nourishment, dune rehabilitation, Geotextile containers.	Noted. These, and other adaptation options were assessed by the consultant to identify sustainable long term adaptation pathways for the assets and values in the coastal zone.	Note the submission
				Page 105 -15.1.3 Managed Retreat Pathway. Out of the three pathways for managed retreat, in all cases, protect is the least costly and damaging to the city. The First Option "Do Nothing" will incur reputation damage and legal costs to the city. This will detour tourism and investors from coming to Geraldton. Without a legal precedent, legal counsel will need to be sought out, incurring more costs without any benefit to the community. The Second Option "Planned Retreat" the City would be required to reserve funds to acquire the properties before or at the time of the erosion trigger. Costing over \$35,760,000 for Sunset Beach alone. The Third Option "Protect" has been identified to have the least cost, risk and the biggest reward to the community and stakeholders. The community has recommended a proactive approach to protect the properties and beaches. This would ensure the best benefit to the City of Greater Geraldton, encouraging tourism, investments and showing everyone in WA that Geraldton cares about it's residents.	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note the submission
114	28/08/2018	3/09/2018	Private submission	3.1.2 Community Coastal Planning Survey and Workshops Page 7. The attached report (Appendix A.2) does not reflect what was reported in "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017". The beach and residential properties in Sunset Beach are highly valued by the community. In the "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017", it was identified that the loss of residential property and community areas would have a catastrophic impact. The results of the workshop were to "Protect" Sunset Beach properties and many of the other properties and beaches that the CHRMAP has changed to "managed retreat." Solution: The requirements of the CHRMAP process, state that community valuing and feedback is required in order to be successful. The CHRMAP needs to be updated to reflect what is important to the community by adhering to the Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report. Changing valuable assets to the community, such as properties and beaches, to "PROTECT".	The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops were undertaken to provide the opportunity for the community to identify and prioritise assets and values of importance to them in the coastal zone. The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops also explained the Coastal Adaptation Types and provided the opportunity for the community participants to suggest adaptation measures for each adaptation type. This provided information for the consultant to identify the long term adaptation pathway for the assets and values in the coastal zone.	Note the submission

Submission Information				Submission and Comment		
ID	Received	Responded	Submitter	Comment Submission	CGG Comment	Recommendation
				See attached Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report October 2017 Summary Page 2- Section 2.1 Purpose. "The severity of erosion and inundation impact along Geraldton's coastal areas is determined by a range of factors, and over the next 100-years the coastal region is projected to experience adverse effects from coastal hazard impact at some time." The factors used in this calculation need to be defined. Does it take into account sand replenishing, man made modifications ect. Responsibility for increased erosion has been admitted by the ports. The Geraldton Guardian has also claimed the city is also responsible for the increased erosion due to the works at the foreshore. Is this part of the calculation?	The factors used in the calculation are for coastal erosion and coastal inundation are identified in State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. In additional the Geraldton CHRMAP Report takes into account existing treatments such as the Northern Beaches Stabilisation Programme (NBSPP) sand by-passing works undertaken each year by the Port Authority. The Beresford Foreshore project coastal protection structures have been designed not to interrupt the sediment flow northwards from Beresford	Note the submission
				There is sufficient justification to have the properties and community areas classified as "PROTECT" rather than the proposed "Accomodate/Managed Retreat" in Sunset Beach. The costs of managed retreat would amount to \$35,760,000 = (149 homes x \$240,000 (median reported house price per this report) This is the lowest cost as homes located next to the ocean are valued higher. The Adaptation recommendation "Section 70a notification on Title" would devalue 149 residential properties within Sunset Beach, effecting the resale value. "PROTECT" Adaptation options have been provided at a significantly lower cost to other Coastal Management Units. Not exceeding 4 million dollars. This would also remove the need to add "Section 70a notification on Title" saving millions to home owners. Refer to Technical Appendices- Table 3-2 "Cost estimates for adaptation options"	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note the submission
				The Adaptation plans per the report ("Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017") were as follows: Sunset Beach houses - Protect- Seawall, artificial reef, sand nourishment, dune rehabilitation, Geotextile containers.	Noted. These, and other adaptation options were assessed by the consultant to identify sustainable long term adaptation pathways for the assets and values in the coastal zone.	Note the submission
				Page 105 -15.1.3 Managed Retreat Pathway. Out of the three pathways for managed retreat, in all cases, protect is the least costly and damaging to the city. The First Option "Do Nothing" will incur reputation damage and legal costs to the city. This will detour tourism and investors from coming to Geraldton. Without a legal precedent, legal counsel will need to be sought out, incurring more costs without any benefit to the community. The Second Option "Planned Retreat" the City would be required to reserve funds to acquire the properties before or at the time of the erosion trigger. Costing over \$35,760,000 for Sunset Beach alone. The Third Option "Protect" has been identified to have the least cost, risk and the biggest reward to the community and stakeholders. The community has recommended a proactive approach to protect the properties and beaches. This would ensure the best benefit to the City of Greater Geraldton, encouraging tourism, investments and showing everyone in WA that Geraldton cares about it's residents.	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note the submission
				You mob fixed up the foreshore in front of Mitchell and Brown. Why not Sunset Beach?	In line with State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy, the Beresford Foreshore Project, as new coastal protection works has progressed only after all other options for avoiding and adapting to coastal hazards had been fully explored, as part of a comprehensive coastal hazard risk management process	Note the submission
115	28/08/2018	5/09/2018	Private submission	3.1.2 Community Coastal Planning Survey and Workshops Page 7. The attached report (Appendix A.2) does not reflect what was reported in "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017". The beach and residential properties in Sunset Beach are highly valued by the community. In the "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017", it was identified that the loss of residential property and community areas would have a catastrophic impact. The results of the workshop were to "Protect" Sunset Beach properties and many of the other properties and beaches that the CHRMAP has changed to "managed retreat." Solution: The requirements of the CHRMAP process, state that community valuing and feedback is required in order to be successful. The CHRMAP needs to be updated to reflect what is important to the community by adhering to the Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report. Changing valuable assets to the community, such as properties and beaches, to "PROTECT".	The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops were undertaken to provide the opportunity for the community to identify and prioritise assets and values of importance to them in the coastal zone. The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops also explained the Coastal Adaptation Types and provided the opportunity for the community participants to suggest adaptation measures for each adaptation type. This provided information for the consultant to identify the long term adaptation pathway for the assets and values in the coastal zone	Note the submission
				See attached Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report October 2017 Summary Page 2- Section 2.1 Purpose. "The severity of erosion and inundation impact along Geraldton's coastal areas is determined by a range of factors, and over the next 100-years the coastal region is projected to experience adverse effects from coastal hazard impact at some time." The factors used in this calculation need to be defined. Does it take into account sand replenishing, man made modifications ect. Responsibility for increased erosion has been admitted by the ports. The Geraldton Guardian has also claimed the city is also responsible for the increased erosion due to the works at the foreshore. Is this part of the calculation?	The factors used in the calculation are for coastal erosion and coastal inundation are identified in State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. In additional the Geraldton CHRMAP Report takes into account existing treatments such as the Northern Beaches Stabilisation Programme (NBSPP) sand by-passing works undertaken each year by the Port Authority. The Beresford Foreshore project coastal protection structures have been designed not to interrupt the sediment flow northwards from Beresford	Note the submission
				There is sufficient justification to have the properties and community areas classified as "PROTECT" rather than the proposed "Accomodate/Managed Retreat" in Sunset Beach. The costs of managed retreat would amount to \$35,760,000 = (149 homes x \$240,000 (median reported house price per this report) This is the lowest cost as homes located next to the ocean are valued higher. The Adaptation recommendation "Section 70a notification on Title" would devalue 149 residential properties within Sunset Beach, effecting the resale value. "PROTECT" Adaptation options have been provided at a significantly lower cost to other Coastal Management Units. Not exceeding 4 million dollars. This would also remove the need to add "Section 70a notification on Title" saving millions to home owners. Refer to Technical Appendices- Table 3-2 "Cost estimates for adaptation options"	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note the submission
				The Adaptation plans per the report ("Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017") were as follows: Sunset Beach houses - Protect- Seawall, artificial reef, sand nourishment, dune rehabilitation, Geotextile containers.	Noted. These, and other adaptation options were assessed by the consultant to identify sustainable long term adaptation pathways for the assets and values in the coastal zone.	Note the submission
				Page 105 -15.1.3 Managed Retreat Pathway. Out of the three pathways for managed retreat, in all cases, protect is the least costly and damaging to the city. The First Option "Do Nothing" will incur reputation damage and legal costs to the city. This will detour tourism and investors from coming to Geraldton. Without a legal precedent, legal counsel will need to be sought out, incurring more costs without any benefit to the community. The Second Option "Planned Retreat" the City would be required to reserve funds to acquire the properties before or at the time of the erosion trigger. Costing over \$35,760,000 for Sunset Beach alone. The Third Option "Protect" has been identified to have the least cost, risk and the biggest reward to the community and stakeholders. The community has recommended a proactive approach to protect the properties and beaches. This would ensure the best benefit to the City of Greater Geraldton, encouraging tourism, investments and showing everyone in WA that Geraldton cares about it's residents.	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note the submission
				Born and bred in Geraldton, I have used all the amazing beaches that the city had to offer. It was why we lived here and again what brought me back in 2015 when my wife and I bought our first house in Sunset Beach. I live on the West side of Volute St and since purchasing the property we have added \$130,000 worth of upgrades to the property. At the time of buying our property we did our due diligence to ensure this house was a good investment and there was no warning from the local council about the effects erosion could have on our property. I am asking the council to listen to the views of the local rate payers and take a proactive approach to the coastal erosion issue by ensuring that saving homes is the up most priority. Please don't just employ a contractor to develop a CHRMAP, do nothing and hope the state government will do something. From the financial figures within the CHRMAP a managed retreat process is exponentially more expensive then a protect method, inclusive of the required ongoing works for upkeep. This is not to mention the possible legal implications the city may face The city's biggest drawn card for tourism and new corners is that we are a city that lives on the ocean. The Mayor and the city has recognized this as they have made a major effort to beautify the beaches close to town. Please don't allow the city to drop its standard as it will not go unnoticed if the northern areas are neglected and not treated fairly like the rest of residents closer the CBD. My wife and I attended the Community works shops in October last year and it was identified then that saving homes was the up most priority and losing such an asset would be catastrophic. I ask that the council take notice of what the community hold high in there values Please save our homes	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
116	3/09/2018	4/09/2018	Private submission (x2)	Unfortunately, despite the report stating that the opportunity to comment was widely advertised, we were completely unaware of its existence until today when a friend advised us. We do not read the papers and have not seen any advertising on this matter. Surely a letter from the council should be mailed to our home address to ensure we were aware of the proposed recommendations that may significantly impact on our some, its resale and insurance values plus the many homes aroundus? Due to this late notification, our ability to respond comprehensively is unfortunately limited by time.	The development of the Geraldton CHRMAP report has had extensive community consultation. Community consultation will continue throughout the CHRMAP process.	Note the submission
				As residents living at 2 Upton Court, Tarcoola Beach, we strongly object to the proposed 70a notification on our title. According to the Councils own "Coastal Hazard Mapping: 2070 Erosion Likelihood, Tarcoola Beach" the chance of erosion that impacts our residences on Upton Court is considered "Low risk and Rare up until 2030, unlikely to 2070. Our home is set back on an elevated sand dune in Tarcoola Beach and is located at a higher altitude than other areas noted to be at higher risk, so we suggest individual property assessments would be more appropriate in this case. However, regardless, we do not believe the current outlined approach is the answer to managed this projected issue	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				The rates paid by Geraldton Residents have contributed to the sea wall development for erosion prevention along the Bluff Point walkway [aka Beresford Foreshore]. This has assisted the protection of nearby properties from erosion which is commndable, however it should be equitable -across th board, for all properties at risk, not just one area of the community	The primary driver for the Beresford Foreshore Project was to protect State and Local Government assets and utilities at risk from coastal erosion. The project was funded through the Royalties for Regions funding. The City committed \$1.85M to improvement of the amenity to address a deficiency in POS amenity for the Beresford locality	Note the submission
				Within the Ocean Beaches Strategy 2013-2023, the City of Gold Coasta is underatking the Palm Beach Shoreline Project to provide a sustainable solution for the ongoing protection of the beach and beachfront infrastrucure. This is a possible solution for Geraldton's potential erosion issue that would be sustainable. may enhance the coastaline, attract further tourim and will not devalue coastal properties.	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				We believe it is incredibly premature to label propoerties with a devaluing caveat based on the evidence presented to date. It is important that alternative options such as the above - mentioed projects area further explored before such a potentially damaged approach to managing this issue is implemented. As long-time residents and ratepayers in Geraldton, we ask that the council seriously consider the concerns of all residetns that are set to be disadvantaged by proposals such as the 70a notification before making any decisions that will greatly affect many families within this community	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
117	3/09/2018	3/09/2018	Private submission	Referencing the Coastal Planning Community Survey Report January 2018, particularly pages 4 and 5, the whole of our community and tourists alike considers the beaches and associated coastal strip of paramount importance to their lifestyle and enjoyment. Living in close proximity of the beach, I see on a daily basis the number of cars both local and towing campers and caravans stopping at Drummonds to enjoy the beach areas and those tourism potentials into the economics that benefit community benefit everyone. During the community consultation phase of CHRMAP, the data clearly demonstrates that the Geraldton community at large values the beaches and foreshore of the municipality of Geraldton above all other assets. This view must expand to include all people in the entire region of the CofGG jurisdiction. Including, residents from the Shire of Chapman Valley who also enjoy the foreshore areas, particularly the connection to Drummond Cove. It is too narrow a perspective to view this CHRMAP report through a lens of only those residents living within coastal processes setback lines as affected.	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				In response to the overall recommendations: 1. I, _____reject some of the recommendations of Managed Retreat. The CofGG has adopted the strategy of Managed Retreat for many years now in the absence of a hazard mapping and CHRMAP reports. It has passed trigger points resulting in lost assets in Drummond Cove and must now act. It is not acceptable that the CHRMAP report is a justification for adopting Managed Retreat from this point forward as the CofGG has been aware and has obligations under the Planning Act to land owners. We recommend that the CofGG explore with the DCPA via community consultation the CBA (Cost Benefit Analysis) of strategies now, short term and long term. Considering Under the Western Australian legislative framework voluntary or compulsory acquisition is based on the value of the land and its improvements. Case law pertaining to compulsory acquisition judgments indicates that values paid usually far exceed current market value due to Courts also awarding on-costs like removal expenses and legal costs. 2. I recommend a 'Protect' approach (Pr1-7): The values of the properties within the report are significantly understated given current market value. Second, sufficient justification exists for permanent solutions development on coastal land areas that are available to buffer areas 'at risk from coastal erosion and inundation. I, propose coastal protection works as there is an enormous need to preserve the Drummond Cove foreshore areas for all people in the CofGG. The CofGG should explore, with the direct involvement of community, protection works that consider public access, public safety, property and infrastructure as our coastal lifestyle is not expendable.	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission



Submission Information				Submission and Comment		
ID	Received	Responded	Submitter	Comment Submission	CGG Comment	Recommendation
				In response to the following recommendations: Require Section 70A notification to be placed on titles to alert prospective purchasers to the risk of coastal erosion and / or inundation. I recommend that the CofGG undertake immediately Geophysical studies of all the shoreline areas to examine presence of rock strata that could reduce the erodibility of critical sections over the longer term (estimate \$25,000) and apply that data to the setback lines to create an accurate representation of setback lines. The current setbacks do not fit with specific height differences in adjacent areas not affected by setback lines indicating a broad-brush approach with significant financial implications at stake. I understand that the purpose of this study is to provide scope of works recommendations. However, more detailed information is necessary that includes analysis of rock strata within the setbacks and accurate elevations to be included. This is essential before any 70A notifications be placed on titles. I advise caution to the CofGG to avoid possible class action under the state planning act. Which will be triggered by a broad-based policy approach that de-values land by placing 70A notifications on titles. Such action as applying 70A's will require the CofGG to consider the legal costs associated with lengthy process of legal action. This will need to be taken into consideration as part of the CBA (Cost Benefit Analysis).	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				I agree with the recommendations of continued immediate Monitoring and Management outlined below: Recommend a geophysical study of the shoreline areas is undertaken to examine presence of rock strata that could reduce the erodibility of critical sections over the longer term; The foreshore reserve area offers a crucial natural buffer against coastal erosion and inundation for coastal assets located landward (houses, roads etc), as well as providing highly valued public amenity. Active monitoring and nature-based approaches (e.g. coastal revegetation, sand trapping fences) to increase resilience of this foreshore reserve from erosion are strongly recommended. Community groups and local organisations should be included / supported in the delivery of these programs, to provide opportunity to raise awareness and build ownership of the coastal adaptation requirements. Again, I urge the CofGG to consider the tourism impacts to the region and future economic consequences of any policy, particularly the consequences of a Managed Retreat paradigm. Some of the recommended actions will bring about the outcome of 'protection' at a trigger point. The CofGG needs to acknowledge that we are well past trigger points at Whitehill Rd, Drummond Cove. It is my opinion that the scope of options and actions need to be fully explored, any action/response also include a thorough search for alternative/innovative approaches beyond the list of recommendations. I strongly advise the CofGG look to other adopted approaches in other states where the amenity of the coastal asset is the highest priority. Options such as off-shore artificial reefs to mitigate wave action as the driver of coastal erosion, being just one example. I implore the CofGG seek to preserve the natural amenity and improve tourism potential wherever possible. I ask the CofGG to put on a tourism lens as they view options and consider the CBA (Cost Benefit Analysis).	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				In response to the statement below: 1. "The initial stages of the Geraldton CHRMAP project involved community and stakeholder engagement and a risk-based assessment, which examined coastal assets under threat from erosion and inundation in future planning timeframes. The outcomes of this initial CHRMAP phase were reported in the Coastal Hazard and Risk Assessment report (Baird 2018)" It is important that the CofGG continues to engage with community going forward with the view to avoid at all costs, a fracturing of community. It is an unacceptable outcome that the city takes an approach that 'we know better' and pushes ahead with projects without community buy in and seek to avoid repeating it's past mistakes. The DCPA community is well versed in understanding the CHRMAP process and seeking action. This is evidenced by holding the Geraldton Coastal Adaptation Planning Forum in 2014, a partnership between the Drummonds Cove Progress Association and Sunset Beach Coastcare groups. Followed by Application A15220 in 2015 by the Drummond Cove Progress Association (DCPA) for works north of the John Batten Hall. A community action grant in partnership with the CofGG and NACC for the coastal zone north of the John Batten Hall. It needs to be acknowledged that the CofGG has been well aware of the issues north of John Batten Hall/Whitehill Rd. and now need to act to comply with State Planning requirements.	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				Following on from the above data, it is my position to explore specifically the following recommendations from the Baird report: Section 1 & Section 2. Drummond Cove Road to Community Centre & Community Centre to Seacrest Way – We agree with the following: "A coastal protection approach for Drummond Cove north of the Community Hall in front of the closed section of Whitehill Rd warrants further assessment. MCA and CBA analysis of options considered show a net return on investment on the value of assets protected on the landside is possible. The high value of property at risk of erosion in future planning periods and the values of the coast noted in the Community Engagement process underline the importance of this issue." Following on from the above, I would like to see the CofGG re-visit the foredune re-build strategy (Application A15220) for section 1 & 2 to implement a foredune re-build for both sections 1 & 2. This course of action is reinforced by the Baird report which states: "Nature based approaches to increase resilience of shorelines and foreshore areas (eg sand trapping fences, revegetation). Recommended for section north of the Community Hall. CGG led programs supported through grant funding (estimated \$10,000 annually)."	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				I would like the City of Greater Geraldton to adopt the resolution presented to council in July to re-establish a north south link reinstated in it's original position. and include in that work a future seawall structure as part of the road base works. Future proofing this area by building a below-ground seawall will provide the necessary peace of mind to the entire community. Second, adjust the detailed plans to include creation of a natural buffer as planned in A15220 by the DCPA Coast Care group, NACC and the City of Greater Geraldton from 2015. Implement the above as a short/medium/long term approach. It is time to improve the amenity, provide confidence and the recommendations are there to do so. This scope of works can be acted on immediately	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				In response to the economic analysis below: 3.4 Economic Analysis - Adaptation options for Erosion Protection for Whitehill Rd and Community Centre I seek further clarification as to how the fundamentals were calculated to rank these options. Of note, I am of the opinion that Boat Launch Stage 1&2 has a much higher possibility of economic return by introducing a scope of works that has on-going revenue potential and tourism benefits for the whole region more than the other options. For example, an elevated rock sea wall significantly reduces the amenity and could have a negative impact for the community, tourism potential and real-estate investment. However, it will deliver coastal protection. This is an example where the CBA is presented through the lens of economic rationalism and does not consider the data to support the building of a boat ramp and associated protection works. This data appears not to have been taken into consideration in this analysis by Baird and therefore should be re-evaluated to more accurately reflect BCR values.	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				In summary, Coastal erosion and the City of Greater Geraldton responses over the years indicate a knowledge of CHRMAP and from the Drummond Cove perspective, we are now well past the beginning of the journey that this Baird CHRMAP report represents. In closing. The significant underspend at Beresford for coastal protection works should be re-directed into coastal protection works at Drummond Cove, Bluff Point and Sunset Beach. It is State Govt. money (our taxes) that paid for Beresford, there were no rate rises recommended for them in the Baird report. Furthermore, there are no recommendations for 70A's clauses to be put on titles and no user pays scheme recommended for those land- owners. Any policy that adopts the Baird recommendations will need to consider this carefully.	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
118	27/08/2018	5/09/2018	Private submission	3.1.2 Community Coastal Planning Survey and Workshops Page 7. The attached report (Appendix A.2) does not reflect what was reported in "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017". The beach and residential properties in Sunset Beach are highly valued by the community. In the "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017", it was identified that the loss of residential property and community areas would have a catastrophic impact. The results of the workshop were to "Protect" Sunset Beach properties and many of the other properties and beaches that the CHRMAP has changed to "managed retreat." Solution: The requirements of the CHRMAP process, state that community valuing and feedback is required in order to be successful. The CHRMAP needs to be updated to reflect what is important to the community by adhering to the Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report. Changing valuable assets to the community, such as properties and beaches, to "PROTECT".	The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops were undertaken to provide the opportunity for the community to identify and prioritise assets and values of importance to them in the coastal zone. The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops also explained the Coastal Adaptation Types and provided the opportunity for the community participants to suggest adaptation measures for each adaptation type. This provided information for the consultant to identify the long term adaptation pathway for the assets and values in the coastal zone.	Note the submission
				See attached Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report October 2017 Summary Page 2- Section 2.1 Purpose. "The severity of erosion and inundation impact along Geraldton's coastal areas is determined by a range of factors, and over the next 100-years the coastal region is projected to experience adverse effects from coastal hazard impact at some time." The factors used in this calculation need to be defined. Does it take into account sand replenishing, man made modifications ect. Responsibility for increased erosion has been admitted by the ports. The Geraldton Guardian has also claimed the city is also responsible for the increased erosion due to the works at the foreshore. Is this part of the calculation?	The factors used in the calculation are for coastal erosion and coastal inundation are identified in State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. In additional the Geraldton CHRMAP Report takes into account existing treatments such as the Northern Beaches Stabilisation Programme (NBSP) sand by-passing works undertaken each year by the Port Authority. The Beresford Foreshore project coastal protection structures have been designed not to interrupt the sediment flow northwards from Beresford.	Note the submission
				There is sufficient justification to have the properties and community areas classified as "PROTECT" rather than the proposed "Accomodate/Managed Retreat" in Sunset Beach. The costs of managed retreat would amount to \$35,760,000 = (149 homes x \$240,000 (median reported house price per this report) This is the lowest cost as homes located next to the ocean are valued higher. The Adaptation recommendation "Section 70a notification on Title" would devalue 149 residential properties within Sunset Beach, effecting the resale value. "PROTECT" Adaptation options have been provided at a significantly lower cost to other Coastal Management Units. Not exceeding 4 million dollars. This would also remove the need to add "Section 70a notification on Title" saving millions to home owners. Refer to Technical Appendices- Table 3-2 "Cost estimates for adaptation options"	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note the submission
				The Adaptation plans per the report ("Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017") were as follows: Sunset Beach houses - Protect- Seawall, artificial reef, sand nourishment, dune rehabilitation, Geotextile containers.	Noted. These, and other adaptation options were assessed by the consultant to identify sustainable long term adaptation pathways for the assets and values in the coastal zone.	Note the submission
				Page 105 -15.1.3 Managed Retreat Pathway. Out of the three pathways for managed retreat, in all cases, protect is the least costly and damaging to the city. The First Option "Do Nothing" will incur reputation damage and legal costs to the city. This will detour tourism and investors from coming to Geraldton. Without a legal precedent, legal counsel will need to be sought out, incurring more costs without any benefit to the community. The Second Option "Planned Retreat" the City would be required to reserve funds to acquire the properties before or at the time of the erosion trigger. Costing over \$35,760,000 for Sunset Beach alone. The Third Option "Protect" has been identified to have the least cost, risk and the biggest reward to the community and stakeholders. The community has recommended a proactive approach to protect the properties and beaches. This would ensure the best benefit to the City of Greater Geraldton, encouraging tourism, investments and showing everyone in WA that Geraldton cares about it's residents.	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note the submission
119	3/09/2018	3/09/2018	Private submission	In response to the overall recommendations: 1. I, _____, reject some of the recommendations of Managed Retreat. The CofGG has adopted the strategy of Managed Retreat for many years now in the absence of a hazard mapping and CHRMAP reports. It has passed trigger points resulting in lost assets in Drummond Cove and must now act. It is not acceptable that the CHRMAP report is a justification for adopting Managed Retreat from this point forward as the CofGG has been aware and has obligations under the Planning Act to land owners. We recommend that the CofGG explore with the DCPA via community consultation the CBA (Cost Benefit Analysis) of strategies now, short term and long term. Considering Under the Western Australian legislative framework voluntary or compulsory acquisition is based on the value of the land and its improvements. Case law pertaining to compulsory acquisition judgments indicates that values paid usually far exceed current market value due to Courts also awarding on-costs like removal expenses and legal costs. 2. I recommend a 'Protect' approach (Pr1-7): The values of the properties within the report are significantly understated given current market value. Second, sufficient justification exists for permanent solutions development on coastal land areas that are available to buffer areas 'at risk from coastal erosion and inundation. I, _____ propose coastal protection works as there is an enormous need to preserve the Drummond Cove foreshore areas for all people in the CofGG. The CofGG should explore, with the direct involvement of community, protection works that consider public access, public safety, property and infrastructure as our coastal lifestyle is not expendable.	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				In response to the following recommendations: Require Section 70A notification to be placed on titles to alert prospective purchasers to the risk of coastal erosion and / or inundation. I recommend that the CofGG undertake immediately Geophysical studies of all the shoreline areas to examine presence of rock strata that could reduce the erodibility of critical sections over the longer term (estimate \$25,000) and apply that data to the setback lines to create an accurate representation of setback lines. The current setbacks do not fit with specific height differences in adjacent areas not affected by setback lines indicating a broad-brush approach with significant financial implications at stake. I understand that the purpose of this study is to provide scope of works recommendations. However, more detailed information is necessary that includes analysis of rock strata within the setbacks and accurate elevations to be included. This is essential before any 70A notifications be placed on titles. I advise caution to the CofGG to avoid possible class action under the state planning act. Which will be triggered by a broad-based policy approach that de-values land by placing 70A notifications on titles. Such action as applying 70A's will require the CofGG to consider the legal costs associated with lengthy process of legal action. This will need to be taken into consideration as part of the CBA (Cost Benefit Analysis).	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission

Submission Information				Submission and Comment		
ID	Received	Responded	Submitter	Comment Submission	CGG Comment	Recommendation
				I agree with the recommendations of continued immediate Monitoring and Management outlined below: Recommend a geophysical study of the shoreline areas is undertaken to examine presence of rock strata that could reduce the erodibility of critical sections over the longer term; The foreshore reserve area offers a crucial natural buffer against coastal erosion and inundation for coastal assets located landward (houses, roads etc), as well as providing highly valued public amenity. Active monitoring and nature-based approaches (e.g. coastal revegetation, sand trapping fences) to increase resilience of this foreshore reserve from erosion are strongly recommended. Community groups and local organisations should be included / supported in the delivery of these programs, to provide opportunity to raise awareness and build ownership of the coastal adaptation requirements. Again, I urge the CofGG to consider the tourism impacts to the region and future economic consequences of any policy, particularly the consequences of a Managed Retreat paradigm. Some of the recommended actions will bring about the outcome of 'protection' at a trigger point. The CofGG needs to acknowledge that we are well past trigger points at Whitehill Rd, Drummond Cove. It is my opinion that the scope of options and actions need to be fully explored, any action/response also include a thorough search for alternative/innovative approaches beyond the list of recommendations. I strongly advise the CofGG look to other adopted approaches in other states where the amenity of the coastal asset is the highest priority. Options such as off-shore artificial reefs to mitigate wave action as the driver of coastal erosion, being just one example. I implore the CofGG seek to preserve the natural amenity and improve tourism potential wherever possible. I ask the CofGG to put on a tourism lens as they view options and consider the CBA (Cost Benefit Analysis).	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				In response to the statement below: 1. "The initial stages of the Geraldton CHRMAP project involved community and stakeholder engagement and a risk-based assessment, which examined coastal assets under threat from erosion and inundation in future planning timeframes. The outcomes of this initial CHRMAP phase were reported in the Coastal Hazard and Risk Assessment report (Baird 2018)" It is important that the CofGG continues to engage with community going forward with the view to avoid at all costs, a fracturing of community. It is an unacceptable outcome that the city takes an approach that 'we know better' and pushes ahead with projects without community buy in and seek to avoid repeating it's past mistakes. The DCPA community is well versed in understanding the CHRMAP process and seeking action. This is evidenced by holding the Geraldton Coastal Adaptation Planning Forum in 2014, a partnership between the Drummonds Cove Progress Association and Sunset Beach Coastcare groups. Followed by Application A15220 in 2015 by the Drummond Cove Progress Association (DCPA) for works north of the John Batten Hall. A community action grant in partnership with the CofGG and NACC for the coastal zone north of the John Batten Hall. It needs to be acknowledged that the CofGG has been well aware of the issues north of John Batten Hall/Whitehill Rd. and now need to act to comply with State Planning requirements.	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				Following on from the above data, it is my position to explore specifically the following recommendations from the Baird report: Section 1 & Section 2. Drummond Cove Road to Community Centre & Community Centre to Seacrest Way – We agree with the following: "A coastal protection approach for Drummond Cove north of the Community Hall in front of the closed section of Whitehill Rd warrants further assessment. MCA and CBA analysis of options considered show a net return on investment on the value of assets protected on the landside is possible. The high value of property at risk of erosion in future planning periods and the values of the coast noted in the Community Engagement process underline the importance of this issue." Following on from the above, I would like to see the CofGG re-visit the foredune re-build strategy (Application A15220) for section 1 & 2 to implement a foredune re-build for both sections 1 & 2. This course of action is reinforced by the Baird report which states: "Nature based approaches to increase resilience of shorelines and foreshore areas (eg sand trapping fences, revegetation). Recommended for section north of the Community Hall. CGG led programs supported through grant funding (estimated \$10,000 annually)."	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				I would like the City of Greater Geraldton to adopt the resolution presented to council in July to re-establish a north south link reinstated in it's original position. and include in that work a future seawall structure as part of the road base works. Future proofing this area by building a below-ground seawall will provide the necessary peace of mind to the entire community. Second, adjust the detailed plans to include creation of a natural buffer as planned in A15220 by the DCPA Coast Care group, NACC and the City of Greater Geraldton from 2015. Implement the above as a short/medium/long term approach. It is time to improve the amenity, provide confidence and the recommendations are there to do so. This scope of works can be acted on immediately	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				In response to the economic analysis below: 3.4 Economic Analysis - Adaptation options for Erosion Protection for Whitehill Rd and Community Centre I seek further clarification as to how the fundamentals were calculated to rank these options. Of note, I am of the opinion that Boat Launch Stage 1&2 has a much higher possibility of economic return by introducing a scope of works that has on-going revenue potential and tourism benefits for the whole region more than the other options. For example, an elevated rock sea wall significantly reduces the amenity and could have a negative impact for the community, tourism potential and real-estate investment. However, it will deliver coastal protection. This is an example where the CBA is presented through the lens of economic rationalism and does not consider the data to support the building of a boat ramp and associated protection works. This data appears not to have been taken into consideration in this analysis by Baird and therefore should be re-evaluated to more accurately reflect BCR values.	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				In summary, Coastal erosion and the City of Greater Geraldton responses over the years indicate a knowledge of CHRMAP and from the Drummond Cove perspective, we are now well past the beginning of the journey that this Baird CHRMAP report represents. In closing. The significant underspend at Beresford for coastal protection works should be re-directed into coastal protection works at Drummond Cove, Bluff Point and Sunset Beach. It is State Govt. money (our taxes) that paid for Beresford, there were no rate rises recommended for them in the Baird report. Furthermore, there are no recommendations for 70A's clauses to be put on titles and no user pays scheme recommended for those land- owners. Any policy that adopts the Baird recommendations will need to consider this carefully.	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
120	27/08/2018	3/09/2018	Private submission	3.1.2 Community Coastal Planning Survey and Workshops Page 7. The attached report (Appendix A.2) does not reflect what was reported in "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017. The beach and residential properties in Kempton Street are highly valued by the community. In the "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017", it was identified that the loss of residential property and community areas would have a catastrophic impact. The results of the workshop were to 'Protect' Kempton Street properties and many of the other properties and beaches that the CHRMAP has changed to 'managed retreat.' Solution: The requirements of the CHRMAP process, state that community valuing and feedback is required in order to be successful. The CHRMAP needs to be updated to reflect what is important to the community by adhering to the Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report. Changing valuable assets to the community, such as properties and beaches, to "PROTECT".	The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops were undertaken to provide the opportunity for the community to identify and prioritise assets and values of importance to them in the coastal zone. The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops also explained the Coastal Adaptation Types and provided the opportunity for the community participants to suggest adaptation measures for each adaptation type. This provided information for the consultant to identify the long term adaptation pathway for the assets and values in the coastal zone.	Note the submission
				See attached Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report October 2017 Summary Page 2-Section 2.1 Purpose "The severity of erosion and inundation impact along Geraldton's coastal areas is determined by a range of factors, and over the next 100-years the coastal region is projected to experience adverse effects from coastal hazard impact at some time." The factors used in this calculation need to be defined. Does it take into account sand replenishing, man made modifications ect. Responsibility for increased erosion has been admitted by the ports. The Geraldton Guardian has also claimed the city is also responsible for the increased erosion due to the works at the foreshore. Is this part of the calculation?	The factors used in the calculation are for coastal erosion and coastal inundation are identified in State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. In additional the Geraldton CHRMAP Report takes into account existing treatments such as the Northern Beaches Stabilisation Programme (NBS) sand by-passing works undertaken each year by the Port Authority. The Beresford Foreshore project coastal protection structures have been designed not to interrupt the sediment flow northwards from Beresford.	Note the submission
				There is sufficient justification to have the properties and community areas classified as "PROTECT" rather than the proposed "Accomodate/Managed Retreat" in Sunset Beach. The costs of managed retreat would amount to \$35,760,000 = (149 homes x \$240,000 (median reported house price per this report) This is the lowest cost as homes located next to the ocean are valued higher. The Adaptation recommendation "Section 70a notification on Title" would devalue 149 residential properties within Sunset Beach, effecting the resale value. "PROTECT" Adaptation options have been provided at a significantly lower cost to other Coastal Management Units. Not exceeding 4 million dollars. This would also remove the need to add "Section 70a notification on Title" saving millions to home owners. Refer to Technical Appendices- Table 3-2 "Cost estimates for adaptation options"	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note the submission
				The Adaptation plans per the report ("Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017") were as follows: Sunset Beach houses - Protect- Seawall, artificial reef, sand nourishment, dune rehabilitation, Geotextile containers.	Noted. These, and other adaptation options were assessed by the consultant to identify sustainable long term adaptation pathways for the assets and values in the coastal zone.	Note the submission
				Page 105 -15.1.3 Managed Retreat Pathway Out of the three pathways for managed retreat, in all cases, protect is the least costly and damaging to the city. The First Option "Do Nothing" will incur reputation damage and legal costs to the city. This will detour tourism and investors from coming to Geraldton. Without a legal precedent, legal counsel will need to be sought out, incurring more costs without any benefit to the community. The Second Option "Planned Retreat" the City would be required to reserve funds to acquire the properties before or at the time of the erosion trigger. Costing over \$35,760,000 for Sunset Beach alone. The Third Option "Protect" has been identified to have the least cost. risk and the biggest reward to the community and stakeholders. The community has recommended a proactive approach to protect the properties and beaches. This would ensure the best benefit to the City of Greater Geraldton, encouraging tourism, investments and showing everyone in WA that Geraldton cares about it's residents	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note the submission
121	29/08/2018	5/09/2018	Private submission	Referencing the Coastal Planning Community Survey Report January 2018, particularly pages 4 and 5, the whole of our community and tourists alike considers the beaches and associated coastal strip of paramount importance to their lifestyle and enjoyment. Living in close proximity of the beach, I see on a daily basis the number of cars both local and towing campers and caravans stopping at Drummonds to enjoy the beach areas and those tourism potentials into the economics that benefit community benefit everyone. During the community consultation phase of CHRMAP, the data clearly demonstrates that the Geraldton community at large values the beaches and foreshore of the municipality of Geraldton above all other assets. This view must expand to include all people in the entire region of the CofGG jurisdiction. Including, residents from the Shire of Chapman Valley who also enjoy the foreshore areas, particularly the connection to Drummond Cove. It is too narrow a perspective to view this CHRMAP report through a lens of only those residents living within coastal processes setback lines as affected.	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				In response to the overall recommendations: 1. I reject some of the recommendations of Managed Retreat. The CofGG has adopted the strategy of Managed Retreat for many years now in the absence of a hazard mapping and CHRMAP reports. It has passed trigger points resulting in lost assets in Drummond Cove and must now act. It is not acceptable that the CHRMAP report is a justification for adopting Managed Retreat from this point forward as the CofGG has been aware and has obligations under the Planning Act to land owners. We recommend that the CofGG explore with the DCPA via community consultation the CBA (Cost Benefit Analysis) of strategies now, short term and long term. Considering Under the Western Australian legislative framework voluntary or compulsory acquisition is based on the value of the land and its improvements. Case law pertaining to compulsory acquisition judgments indicates that values paid usually far exceed current market value due to Courts also awarding on-costs like removal expenses and legal costs. 2. I recommend a 'Protect' approach (Pr1-7): The values of the properties within the report are significantly understated given current market value. Second, sufficient justification exists for permanent solutions development on coastal land areas that are available to buffer areas 'at risk from coastal erosion and inundation. I, propose coastal protection works as there is an enormous need to preserve the Drummond Cove foreshore areas for all people in the CofGG. The CofGG should explore, with the direct involvement of community, protection works that consider public access, public safety, property and infrastructure as our coastal lifestyle is not expendable.	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				In response to the following recommendations: Require Section 70A notification to be placed on titles to alert prospective purchasers to the risk of coastal erosion and / or inundation. I recommend that the CofGG undertake immediately Geophysical studies of all the shoreline areas to examine presence of rock strata that could reduce the erodibility of critical sections over the longer term (estimate \$25,000) and apply that data to the setback lines to create an accurate representation of setback lines. The current setbacks do not fit with specific height differences in adjacent areas not affected by setback lines indicating a broad-brush approach with significant financial implications at stake. I understand that the purpose of this study is to provide scope of works recommendations. However, more detailed information is necessary that includes analysis of rock strata within the setbacks and accurate elevations to be included. This is essential before any 70A notifications be placed on titles. I advise caution to the CofGG to avoid possible class action under the state planning act. Which will be triggered by a broad-based policy approach that de-values land by placing 70A notifications on titles. Such action as applying 70A's will require the CofGG to consider the legal costs associated with lengthy process of legal action. This will need to be taken into consideration as part of the CBA (Cost Benefit Analysis).	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission

Submission Information				Submission and Comment		
ID	Received	Responded	Submitter	Comment Submission	CGG Comment	Recommendation
				I agree with the recommendations of continued immediate Monitoring and Management outlined below: Recommend a geophysical study of the shoreline areas is undertaken to examine presence of rock strata that could reduce the erodibility of critical sections over the longer term; The foreshore reserve area offers a crucial natural buffer against coastal erosion and inundation for coastal assets located landward (houses, roads etc), as well as providing highly valued public amenity. Active monitoring and nature-based approaches (e.g. coastal revegetation, sand trapping fences) to increase resilience of this foreshore reserve from erosion are strongly recommended. Community groups and local organisations should be included / supported in the delivery of these programs, to provide opportunity to raise awareness and build ownership of the coastal adaptation requirements. Again, I urge the CofGG to consider the tourism impacts to the region and future economic consequences of any policy, particularly the consequences of a Managed Retreat paradigm. Some of the recommended actions will bring about the outcome of 'protection' at a trigger point. The CofGG needs to acknowledge that we are well past trigger points at Whitehill Rd, Drummond Cove. It is my opinion that the scope of options and actions need to be fully explored, any action/response also include a thorough search for alternative/innovative approaches beyond the list of recommendations. I strongly advise the CofGG look to other adopted approaches in other states where the amenity of the coastal asset is the highest priority. Options such as off-shore artificial reefs to mitigate wave action as the driver of coastal erosion, being just one example. I implore the CofGG seek to preserve the natural amenity and improve tourism potential wherever possible. I ask the CofGG to put on a tourism lens as they view options and consider the CBA (Cost Benefit Analysis).	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				In response to the statement below: 1. "The initial stages of the Geraldton CHRMAP project involved community and stakeholder engagement and a risk-based assessment, which examined coastal assets under threat from erosion and inundation in future planning timeframes. The outcomes of this initial CHRMAP phase were reported in the Coastal Hazard and Risk Assessment report (Baird 2018)" It is important that the CofGG continues to engage with community going forward with the view to avoid at all costs, a fracturing of community. It is an unacceptable outcome that the city takes an approach that 'we know better' and pushes ahead with projects without community buy in and seek to avoid repeating it's past mistakes. The DCPA community is well versed in understanding the CHRMAP process and seeking action. This is evidenced by holding the Geraldton Coastal Adaptation Planning Forum in 2014, a partnership between the Drummonds Cove Progress Association and Sunset Beach Coastcare groups. Followed by Application A15220 in 2015 by the Drummond Cove Progress Association (DCPA) for works north of the John Batten Hall. A community action grant in partnership with the CofGG and NACC for the coastal zone north of the John Batten Hall. It needs to be acknowledged that the CofGG has been well aware of the issues north of John Batten Hall/Whitehill Rd. and now need to act to comply with State Planning requirements.	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				Following on from the above data, it is my position to explore specifically the following recommendations from the Baird report: Section 1 & Section 2. Drummond Cove Road to Community Centre & Community Centre to Seacrest Way – We agree with the following: "A coastal protection approach for Drummond Cove north of the Community Hall in front of the closed section of Whitehill Rd warrants further assessment. MCA and CBA analysis of options considered show a net return on investment on the value of assets protected on the landside is possible. The high value of property at risk of erosion in future planning periods and the values of the coast noted in the Community Engagement process underline the importance of this issue." Following on from the above, I would like to see the CofGG re-visit the foredune re-build strategy (Application A15220) for section 1 & 2 to implement a foredune re-build for both sections 1 & 2. This course of action is reinforced by the Baird report which states: "Nature based approaches to increase resilience of shorelines and foreshore areas (eg sand trapping fences, revegetation). Recommended for section north of the Community Hall. CGG led programs supported through grant funding (estimated \$10,000 annually)."	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				I would like the City of Greater Geraldton to adopt the resolution presented to council in July to re-establish a north south link reinstated in it's original position. and include in that work a future seawall structure as part of the road base works. Future proofing this area by building a below-ground seawall will provide the necessary peace of mind to the entire community. Second, adjust the detailed plans to include creation of a natural buffer as planned in A15220 by the DCPA Coast Care group, NACC and the City of Greater Geraldton from 2015. Implement the above as a short/medium/long term approach. It is time to improve the amenity, provide confidence and the recommendations are there to do so. This scope of works can be acted on immediately.	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				In response to the economic analysis below: 3.4 Economic Analysis – Adaptation options for Erosion Protection for Whitehill Rd and Community Centre. I seek further clarification as to how the fundamentals were calculated to rank these options. Of note, I am of the opinion that Boat Launch Stage 1&2 has a much higher possibility of economic return by introducing a scope of works that has on-going revenue potential and tourism benefits for the whole region more than the other options. For example, an elevated rock sea wall significantly reduces the amenity and could have a negative impact for the community, tourism potential and real-estate investment. However, it will deliver coastal protection. This is an example where the CBA is presented through the lens of economic rationalism and does not consider the data to support the building of a boat ramp and associated protection works. This data appears not to have been taken into consideration in this analysis by Baird and therefore should be re-evaluated to more accurately reflect BCR values.	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				In summary, Coastal erosion and the CofGG's responses over the years indicate a knowledge of CHRMAP and from the Drummond Cove perspective, we are now well past the beginning of the journey that this Baird CHRMAP report represents. In closing, the significant underspend at Beresford for coastal protection works should be redirected into coastal protection works at Drummond Cove, Bluff Point and Sunset Beach. It is Stave Govt. money (out taxes) that paid for Beresford, there were no rate rises recommended for them in the Baird report. Furthermore, there area no recommendations for 70A's clauses to be put on titles and no user pays scheme recommended for those landowners. Any policy that adopts the Baird recommendations will need to consider this carefully	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
122	1/09/2018	3/09/2018	Private submission	Part 1: Coastal Hazard & Risk Assessment Report is a lengthy report containing technical data which stakeholders, residents, staff and councillors of CGG, found complicated and difficult to interpret. There is extensive cross referencing within the report which confused the readers. It was stated that for the CHRMAP process to be successful, community engagement was essential at every step of the process. (Refer page 36, Coastal Hazard Risk Management and Adaptation Planning Guidelines). The project team recommended that CGG conduct a 1.5hr information session with two people from their team in attendance to present the draft report and answer questions. The CGG chose not to include this important step in the process when presenting the draft CHRMAP report. Community information session is vitally needed to explain the comprehensive CHRMAP draft report to the public before asking for community feedback. The session needs to display key components of the document, including hazard mapping, the long term adaptation pathways and other relevant information for discussion purposes. Community members need to be provided with this information, as well as information on how they can provide formal feedback on the report. (Refer to: HRMAP/Part_1-Technical_Appendices A.1 CGG Community and stakeholders engagement strategy, September 2017, 7.Communication and engagement actions task 15.5).	The development of the Geraldton CHRMAP report has had extensive community consultation. Community consultation will continue throughout the CHRMAP process.	Note the submission
				The draft CHRMAP report (Appendix A.2) doesn't reflect what was reported in "Coastal Workshops Summary Report" dated October 2017. The beach and residential properties in Sunset Beach are highly valued by the community. At the workshops, it was identified that the loss of residential property, coastal reserves and public assets would have a "catastrophic impact". The results of the workshop were to "PROTECT" Sunset Beach properties and many of the other properties and beach that the draft CHRMAP report has changed to "Managed Retreat". (Refer 3.1.2 Community Coastal Planning Survey & Workshops Page 7.)	The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops were undertaken to provide the opportunity for the community to identify and prioritise assets and values of importance to them in the coastal zone. The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops also explained the Coastal Adaptation Types and provided the opportunity for the community participants to suggest adaptation measures for each adaptation type. This provided information for the consultant to identify the long term adaptation pathway for the assets and values in the coastal zone.	Note the submission
				The draft CHRMAP report states CGG undertook extensive promotion of the Coastal Planning Community Survey and Workshops. From the feedback received by CGG and via local doorknocking, it is evident that residents of Geraldton are not aware of the CHRMAP process. CGG have followed standard Local Government guidelines however it could be suggested that this was insufficient for the complex nature of the CHRMAP process. Effective communication is essential for the success of this process and the 14 properties which fall within the 2030 setback line should have been notified of the CHRMAP process by letter. (Refer 3.1.2 Community Coastal Planning Survey & Workshops Page 7.)	The Geraldton CHRMAP process has had extensive community consultation. All ratepayers were informed of the CHRMAP process through the rates notice.	Note the submission
				There is sufficient justification to have the properties and community areas classified as "PROTECT" rather than the proposed "Accommodate/Managed Retreat" in Sunset Beach. The cost of managed retreat would amount to \$35,760,000 for properties in Sunset Beach ie. 149 homes x \$240,000 (median reported house price per this report – Refer Part 1 – page 12, 4.3 Value of Coastal Assets). This figure is considerably conservative for properties adjacent to the ocean. The adaptation recommendation "Section 70A Notification on Title" would devalue 149 residential properties within Sunset Beach, affecting the resale value. It is unclear what ramifications the placement of "Section 70A Notification on Title" will have on insurance policy premiums and whether residents can insure their properties in vulnerable areas at risk of erosion or inundation. "PROTECT" Adaptation options have been provided at a significantly lower cost to other Coastal Management Units, not exceeding \$4m. Adopting a "Protect" option would also avoid the need to add "Section 70A Notification on Title" saving millions to home owners. Refer to Technical Appendices – Table 3-2 "Cost Estimates for Adaptation Options".	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note the submission
				The adaptation plans per the report "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017, page 4" were as follows: SUNSET BEACH houses – Protect – Seawall, artificial reef, sand nourishment, dune rehabilitation, Geotextile containers, managed access. Page 105 -15.1.3 Managed Retreat Pathway. Of the three pathways for "Managed Retreat", in all cases, "Protect" is the least costly option and damaging to the city. Option 1: "Doing nothing" will incur reputation damage and legal costs to the City. This will deter tourism and investors from coming to Geraldton. Without a legal precedent, legal counsel will be to be sought out, incurring more costs without any benefit to the community. Option 2: "Planned Retreat" - the City would be required to reserve funds to acquire the properties before or at the time of the erosion trigger. This will cost on \$35,760,000 for Sunset Beach alone not including cost of rate write-offs, demolition costs and re-vegetation of properties. Option 3: "Protect" has been identified to have the least cost, risk and the biggest reward to the community and stakeholders. The community has recommended a proactive approach to protect the properties and beaches. This would ensure the best benefit to the City of Greater Geraldton, encouraging tourism, investments and showing everyone in WA that Geraldton cares about its residents.	Noted. These, and other adaptation options were assessed by the consultant to identify sustainable long term adaptation pathways for the assets and values in the coastal zone.	Note the submission
				Refer to Coastal Council Conference held 8/5/17 <a href="https://coastalcouncils.org.au/">https://coastalcouncils.org.au/</a> Many of the areas that will be most affected by climate change are already at risk. Stakeholder engagement is an important part of by the development of any adaptation strategy. There is a shift from idealised "retreat" options to adaptation and protect options as stakeholders become increasingly engaged in decision making. There can be benefits to beginning the adaptation process sooner rather than later in areas that are already at risk to coastal hazards.	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
123	29/08/2018	5/09/2018	Private submission	Referencing the Coastal Planning Community Survey Report January 2018, particularly pages 4 and 5, the whole of our community and tourists alike considers the beaches and associated coastal strip of paramount importance to their lifestyle and enjoyment. Living in close proximity of the beach, I see on a daily basis the number of cars both local and towing campers and caravans stopping at Drummonds to enjoy the beach areas and those tourism potentials into the economics that benefit community benefit everyone. During the community consultation phase of CHRMAP, the data clearly demonstrates that the Geraldton community at large values the beaches and foreshore of the municipality of Geraldton above all other assets. This view must expand to include all people in the entire region of the CofGG jurisdiction. Including, residents from the Shire of Chapman Valley who also enjoy the foreshore areas, particularly the connection to Drummond Cove. It is too narrow a perspective to view this CHRMAP report through a lens of only those residents living within coastal processes setback lines as affected.	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission



Submission Information				Submission and Comment		
ID	Received	Responded	Submitter	Comment Submission	CGG Comment	Recommendation
				In response to the overall recommendations: 1. I reject some of the recommendations of Managed Retreat. The CofGG has adopted the strategy of Managed Retreat for many years now in the absence of a hazard mapping and CHRMAP reports. It has passed trigger points resulting in lost assets in Drummond Cove and must now act. It is not acceptable that the CHRMAP report is a justification for adopting Managed Retreat from this point forward as the CofGG has been aware and has obligations under the Planning Act to land owners. We recommend that the CofGG explore with the DCPA via community consultation the CBA (Cost Benefit Analysis) of strategies now, short term and long term. Considering Under the Western Australian legislative framework voluntary or compulsory acquisition is based on the value of the land and its improvements. Case law pertaining to compulsory acquisition judgments indicates that values paid usually far exceed current market value due to Courts also awarding on-costs like removal expenses and legal costs. 2. I recommend a 'Protect' approach (Pr1-7): The values of the properties within the report are significantly understated given current market value. Second, sufficient justification exists for permanent solutions development on coastal land areas that are available to buffer areas 'at risk from coastal erosion and inundation. I propose coastal protection works as there is an enormous need to preserve the Drummond Cove foreshore areas for all people in the CofGG. The CofGG should explore, with the direct involvement of community, protection works that consider public access, public safety, property and infrastructure as our coastal lifestyle is not expendable.	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				In response to the following recommendations: Require Section 70A notification to be placed on titles to alert prospective purchasers to the risk of coastal erosion and / or inundation. I recommend that the CofGG undertake immediately Geophysical studies of all the shoreline areas to examine presence of rock strata that could reduce the erodibility of critical sections over the longer term (estimate \$25,000) and apply that data to the setback lines to create an accurate representation of setback lines. The current setbacks do not fit with specific height differences in adjacent areas not affected by setback lines indicating a broad-brush approach with significant financial implications at stake. I understand that the purpose of this study is to provide scope of works recommendations. However, more detailed information is necessary that includes analysis of rock strata within the setbacks and accurate elevations to be included. This is essential before any 70A notifications be placed on titles. I advise caution to the CofGG to avoid possible class action under the state planning act. Which will be triggered by a broad-based policy approach that de-values land by placing 70A notifications on titles. Such action as applying 70A's will require the CofGG to consider the legal costs associated with lengthy process of legal action. This will need to be taken into consideration as part of the CBA (Cost Benefit Analysis).	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				I agree with the recommendations of continued immediate Monitoring and Management outlined below: Recommend a geophysical study of the shoreline areas is undertaken to examine presence of rock strata that could reduce the erodibility of critical sections over the longer term; The foreshore reserve area offers a crucial natural buffer against coastal erosion and inundation for coastal assets located landward (houses, roads etc), as well as providing highly valued public amenity. Active monitoring and nature-based approaches (e.g. coastal revegetation, sand trapping fences) to increase resilience of this foreshore reserve from erosion are strongly recommended. Community groups and local organisations should be included / supported in the delivery of these programs, to provide opportunity to raise awareness and build ownership of the coastal adaptation requirements. Again, I urge the CofGG to consider the tourism impacts to the region and future economic consequences of any policy, particularly the consequences of a Managed Retreat paradigm. Some of the recommended actions will bring about the outcome of 'protection' at a trigger point. The CofGG needs to acknowledge that we are well past trigger points at Whitehill Rd, Drummond Cove. It is my opinion that the scope of options and actions need to be fully explored, any action/response also include a thorough search for alternative/innovative approaches beyond the list of recommendations. I strongly advise the CofGG look to other adopted approaches in other states where the amenity of the coastal asset is the highest priority. Options such as off-shore artificial reefs to mitigate wave action as the driver of coastal erosion, being just one example. I implore the CofGG seek to preserve the natural amenity and improve tourism potential wherever possible. I ask the CofGG to put on a tourism lens as they view options and consider the CBA (Cost Benefit Analysis).	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				In response to the statement below: 1. "The initial stages of the Geraldton CHRMAP project involved community and stakeholder engagement and a risk-based assessment, which examined coastal assets under threat from erosion and inundation in future planning timeframes. The outcomes of this initial CHRMAP phase were reported in the Coastal Hazard and Risk Assessment report (Baird 2018)" It is important that the CofGG continues to engage with community going forward with the view to avoid at all costs, a fracturing of community. It is an unacceptable outcome that the city takes an approach that 'we know better' and pushes ahead with projects without community buy in and seek to avoid repeating it's past mistakes. The DCPA community is well versed in understanding the CHRMAP process and seeking action. This is evidenced by holding the Geraldton Coastal Adaptation Planning Forum in 2014, a partnership between the Drummonds Cove Progress Association and Sunset Beach Coastcare groups. Followed by Application A15220 in 2015 by the Drummond Cove Progress Association (DCPA) for works north of the John Batten Hall. A community action grant in partnership with the CofGG and NACC for the coastal zone north of the John Batten Hall. It needs to be acknowledged that the CofGG has been well aware of the issues north of John Batten Hall/Whitehill Rd. and now need to act to comply with State Planning requirements.	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				Following on from the above data, it is my position to explore specifically the following recommendations from the Baird report: Section 1 & Section 2. Drummond Cove Road to Community Centre & Community Centre to Seacrest Way – We agree with the following: "A coastal protection approach for Drummond Cove north of the Community Hall in front of the closed section of Whitehill Rd warrants further assessment. MCA and CBA analysis of options considered show a net return on investment on the value of assets protected on the landside is possible. The high value of property at risk of erosion in future planning periods and the values of the coast noted in the Community Engagement process underline the importance of this issue." Following on from the above, I would like to see the CofGG re-visit the foredune re-build strategy (Application A15220) for section 1 & 2 to implement a foredune re-build for both sections 1 & 2. This course of action is reinforced by the Baird report which states: "Nature based approaches to increase resilience of shorelines and foreshore areas (eg sand trapping fences, revegetation). Recommended for section north of the Community Hall. CGG led programs supported through grant funding (estimated \$10,000 annually)."	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				I would like the City of Greater Geraldton to adopt the resolution presented to council in July to re-establish a north south link reinstated in it's original position. and include in that work a future seawall structure as part of the road base works. Future proofing this area by building a below-ground seawall will provide the necessary peace of mind to the entire community. Second, adjust the detailed plans to include creation of a natural buffer as planned in A15220 by the DCPA Coast Care group, NACC and the City of Greater Geraldton from 2015. Implement the above as a short/medium/long term approach. It is time to improve the amenity, provide confidence and the recommendations are there to do so. This scope of works can be acted on immediately.	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				In response to the economic analysis below: 3.4 Economic Analysis – Adaptation options for Erosion Protection for Whitehill Rd and Community Centre. I seek further clarification as to how the fundamentals were calculated to rank these options. Of note, I am of the opinion that Boat Launch Stage 1&2 has a much higher possibility of economic return by introducing a scope of works that has on-going revenue potential and tourism benefits for the whole region more than the other options. For example, an elevated rock sea wall significantly reduces the amenity and could have a negative impact for the community, tourism potential and real-estate investment. However, it will deliver coastal protection. This is an example where the CBA is presented through the lens of economic rationalism and does not consider the data to support the building of a boat ramp and associated protection works. This data appears not to have been taken into consideration in this analysis by Baird and therefore should be re-evaluated to more accurately reflect BCR values.	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				In summary, Coastal erosion and the CofGG's responses over the years indicate a knowledge of CHRMAP and from the Drummond Cove perspective, we are now well past the beginning of the journey that this Baird CHRMAP report represents. In closing, the significant underspend at Beresford for coastal protection works should be redirected into coastal protection works at Drummond Cove, Bluff Point and Sunset Beach. It is Stave Govt. money (out taxes) that paid for Beresford, there were no rate rises recommended for them in the Baird report. Furthermore, there are no recommendations for 70A's clauses to be put on titles and no user pays scheme recommended for those landowners. Any policy that adopts the Baird recommendations will need to consider this carefully	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
124	27/08/2018	5/09/2018	Private submission	3.1.2 Community Coastal Planning Survey and Workshops Page 7. The attached report (Appendix A.2) does not reflect what was reported in "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017. The beach and residential properties in Kempton Street are highly valued by the community. In the "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017", it was identified that the loss of residential property and community areas would have a catastrophic impact. The results of the workshop were to 'Protect' Kempton Street properties and many of the other properties and beaches that the CHRMAP has changed to 'managed retreat.' Solution: The requirements of the CHRMAP process, state that community valuing and feedback is required in order to be successful. The CHRMAP needs to be updated to reflect what is important to the community by adhering to the Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report. Changing valuable assets to the community, such as properties and beaches, to "PROTECT".	The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops were undertaken to provide the opportunity for the community to identify and prioritise assets and values of importance to them in the coastal zone. The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops also explained the Coastal Adaptation Types and provided the opportunity for the community participants to suggest adaptation measures for each adaptation type. This provided information for the consultant to identify the long term adaptation pathway for the assets and values in the coastal zone.	Note the submission
				See attached Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report October 2017 Summary Page 2-Section 2.1 Purpose "The severity of erosion and inundation impact along Geraldton's coastal areas is determined by a range of factors, and over the next 100-years the coastal region is projected to experience adverse effects from coastal hazard impact at some time." The factors used in this calculation need to be defined. Does it take into account sand replenishing, man made modifications ect. Responsibility for increased erosion has been admitted by the ports. The Geraldton Guardian has also claimed the city is also responsible for the increased erosion due to the works at the foreshore. Is this part of the calculation?	The factors used in the calculation are for coastal erosion and coastal inundation are identified in State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. In addition the Geraldton CHRMAP Report takes into account existing treatments such as the Northern Beaches Stabilisation Programme (NBSPP) sand by-passing works undertaken each year by the Port Authority. The Beresford Foreshore project coastal protection structures have been designed not to interrupt the sediment flow northwards from Beresford.	Note the submission
				There is sufficient justification to have the properties and community areas classified as "PROTECT" rather than the proposed "Accomodate/Managed Retreat" in Sunset Beach. The costs of managed retreat would amount to \$35,760,000 = (149 homes x \$240,000 (median reported house price per this report) This is the lowest cost as homes located next to the ocean are valued higher. The Adaptation recommendation "Section 70a notification on Title" would devalue 149 residential properties within Sunset Beach, effecting the resale value. "PROTECT" Adaptation options have been provided at a significantly lower cost to other Coastal Management Units. Not exceeding 4 million dollars. This would also remove the need to add "Section 70a notification on Title" saving millions to home owners. Refer to Technical Appendices- Table 3-2 "Cost estimates for adaptation options"	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note the submission
				The Adaptation plans per the report ("Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017") were as follows: Sunset Beach houses - Protect- Seawall, artificial reef, sand nourishment, dune rehabilitation, Geotextile containers.	Noted. These, and other adaptation options were assessed by the consultant to identify sustainable long term adaptation pathways for the assets and values in the coastal zone.	Note the submission
				Page 105 -15.1.3 Managed Retreat Pathway Out of the three pathways for managed retreat, in all cases, protect is the least costly and damaging to the city. The First Option "Do Nothing" will incur reputation damage and legal costs to the city. This will detour tourism and investors from coming to Geraldton. Without a legal precedent, legal counsel will need to be sought out, incurring more costs without any benefit to the community. The Second Option 'Planned Retreat' the City would be required to reserve funds to acquire the properties before or at the time of the erosion trigger. Costing over \$35,760,000 for Sunset Beach alone. The Third Option "Protect" has been identified to have the least cost. risk and the biggest reward to the community and stakeholders. The community has recommended a proactive approach to protect the properties and beaches. This would ensure the best benefit to the City of Greater Geraldton, encouraging tourism, investments and showing everyone in WA that Geraldton cares about it's residents	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note the submission
				We, at _____, strongly urge council to explore options towards protection of mine (and my family's) assets! I purchased this house as a forever home and an asset for my daughter to have in the future. Where is my daughter's future if NOTHING IS DONE!!!! or there is a "managed retreat." This is not on! At least let the people have their say on a document that is easier to understand than the one provided! I strongly urge you utilise the HIGH cost of rate I pay for contingency plans!!	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
125	3/09/2018	3/09/2018	Private submission	Referencing the Coastal Planning Community Survey Report January 2018, particularly pages 4 and 5, the whole of our community and tourists alike considers the beaches and associated coastal strip of paramount importance to their lifestyle and enjoyment. Living in close proximity of the beach, I see on a daily basis the number of cars both local and towing campers and caravans stopping at Drummonds to enjoy the beach areas and those tourism potentials into the economics that benefit community benefit everyone. During the community consultation phase of CHRMAP, the data clearly demonstrates that the Geraldton community at large values the beaches and foreshore of the municipality of Geraldton above all other assets. This view must expand to include all people in the entire region of the CofGG jurisdiction. Including, residents from the Shire of Chapman Valley who also enjoy the foreshore areas, particularly the connection to Drummond Cove. It is too narrow a perspective to view this CHRMAP report through a lens of only those residents living within coastal processes setback lines as affected.	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission

Submission Information				Submission and Comment		
ID	Received	Responded	Submitter	Comment Submission	CGG Comment	Recommendation
				<p>In response to the overall recommendations: 1. I, _____ reject some of the recommendations of Managed Retreat. The CofGG has adopted the strategy of Managed Retreat for many years now in the absence of a hazard mapping and CHRMAP reports. It has passed trigger points resulting in lost assets in Drummond Cove and must now act. It is not acceptable that the CHRMAP report is a justification for adopting Managed Retreat from this point forward as the CofGG has been aware and has obligations under the Planning Act to land owners. We recommend that the CofGG explore with the DCPA via community consultation the CBA (Cost Benefit Analysis) of strategies now, short term and long term. Considering Under the Western Australian legislative framework voluntary or compulsory acquisition is based on the value of the land and its improvements. Case law pertaining to compulsory acquisition judgments indicates that values paid usually far exceed current market value due to Courts also awarding on-costs like removal expenses and legal costs. 2. I recommend a 'Protect' approach (Pr1-7): The values of the properties within the report are significantly understated given current market value. Second, sufficient justification exists for permanent solutions development on coastal land areas that are available to buffer areas 'at risk from coastal erosion and inundation. I, _____ propose coastal protection works as there is an enormous need to preserve the Drummond Cove foreshore areas for all people in the CofGG. The CofGG should explore, with the direct involvement of community, protection works that consider public access, public safety, property and infrastructure as our coastal lifestyle is not expendable.</p>	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				<p>In response to the following recommendations: Require Section 70A notification to be placed on titles to alert prospective purchasers to the risk of coastal erosion and / or inundation. I recommend that the CofGG undertake immediately Geophysical studies of all the shoreline areas to examine presence of rock strata that could reduce the erodibility of critical sections over the longer term (estimate \$25,000) and apply that data to the setback lines to create an accurate representation of setback lines. The current setbacks do not fit with specific height differences in adjacent areas not affected by setback lines indicating a broad-brush approach with significant financial implications at stake. I understand that the purpose of this study is to provide scope of works recommendations. However, more detailed information is necessary that includes analysis of rock strata within the setbacks and accurate elevations to be included. This is essential before any 70A notifications be placed on titles. I advise caution to the CofGG to avoid possible class action under the state planning act. Which will be triggered by a broad-based policy approach that de-values land by placing 70A notifications on titles. Such action as applying 70A's will require the CofGG to consider the legal costs associated with lengthy process of legal action. This will need to be taken into consideration as part of the CBA (Cost Benefit Analysis).</p>	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				<p>I agree with the recommendations of continued immediate Monitoring and Management outlined below: Recommend a geophysical study of the shoreline areas is undertaken to examine presence of rock strata that could reduce the erodibility of critical sections over the longer term; The foreshore reserve area offers a crucial natural buffer against coastal erosion and inundation for coastal assets located landward (houses, roads etc), as well as providing highly valued public amenity. Active monitoring and nature-based approaches (e.g. coastal revegetation, sand trapping fences) to increase resilience of this foreshore reserve from erosion are strongly recommended. Community groups and local organisations should be included / supported in the delivery of these programs, to provide opportunity to raise awareness and build ownership of the coastal adaptation requirements. Again, I urge the CofGG to consider the tourism impacts to the region and future economic consequences of any policy, particularly the consequences of a Managed Retreat paradigm. Some of the recommended actions will bring about the outcome of 'protection' at a trigger point. The CofGG needs to acknowledge that we are well past trigger points at Whitehill Rd, Drummond Cove. It is my opinion that the scope of options and actions need to be fully explored, any action/response also include a thorough search for alternative/innovative approaches beyond the list of recommendations. I strongly advise the CofGG look to other adopted approaches in other states where the amenity of the coastal asset is the highest priority. Options such as off-shore artificial reefs to mitigate wave action as the driver of coastal erosion, being just one example. I implore the CofGG seek to preserve the natural amenity and improve tourism potential wherever possible. I ask the CofGG to put on a tourism lens as they view options and consider the CBA (Cost Benefit Analysis).</p>	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				<p>In response to the statement below: 1. "The initial stages of the Geraldton CHRMAP project involved community and stakeholder engagement and a risk-based assessment, which examined coastal assets under threat from erosion and inundation in future planning timeframes. The outcomes of this initial CHRMAP phase were reported in the Coastal Hazard and Risk Assessment report (Baird 2018)" It is important that the CofGG continues to engage with community going forward with the view to avoid at all costs, a fracturing of community. It is an unacceptable outcome that the city takes an approach that 'we know better' and pushes ahead with projects without community buy in and seek to avoid repeating it's past mistakes. The DCPA community is well versed in understanding the CHRMAP process and seeking action. This is evidenced by holding the Geraldton Coastal Adaptation Planning Forum in 2014, a partnership between the Drummonds Cove Progress Association and Sunset Beach Coastcare groups. Followed by Application A15220 in 2015 by the Drummond Cove Progress Association (DCPA) for works north of the John Batten Hall. A community action grant in partnership with the CofGG and NACC for the coastal zone north of the John Batten Hall. It needs to be acknowledged that the CofGG has been well aware of the issues north of John Batten Hall/Whitehill Rd. and now need to act to comply with State Planning requirements.</p>	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				<p>Following on from the above data, it is my position to explore specifically the following recommendations from the Baird report: Section 1 &amp; Section 2. Drummond Cove Road to Community Centre &amp; Community Centre to Seacrest Way – We agree with the following: "A coastal protection approach for Drummond Cove north of the Community Hall in front of the closed section of Whitehill Rd warrants further assessment. MCA and CBA analysis of options considered show a net return on investment on the value of assets protected on the landside is possible. The high value of property at risk of erosion in future planning periods and the values of the coast noted in the Community Engagement process underline the importance of this issue." Following on from the above, I would like to see the CofGG re-visit the foredune re-build strategy (Application A15220) for section 1 &amp; 2 to implement a foredune re-build for both sections 1 &amp; 2. This course of action is reinforced by the Baird report which states: "Nature based approaches to increase resilience of shorelines and foreshore areas (eg sand trapping fences, revegetation). Recommended for section north of the Community Hall. CGG led programs supported through grant funding (estimated \$10,000 annually)."</p>	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				<p>I would like the City of Greater Geraldton to adopt the resolution presented to council in July to re-establish a north south link reinstated in it's original position. and include in that work a future seawall structure as part of the road base works. Future proofing this area by building a below-ground seawall will provide the necessary peace of mind to the entire community. Second, adjust the detailed plans to include creation of a natural buffer as planned in A15220 by the DCPA Coast Care group, NACC and the City of Greater Geraldton from 2015. Implement the above as a short/medium/long term approach. It is time to improve the amenity, provide confidence and the recommendations are there to do so. This scope of works can be acted on immediately.</p>	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				<p>In response to the economic analysis below: 3.4 Economic Analysis – Adaptation options for Erosion Protection for Whitehill Rd and Community Centre. I seek further clarification as to how the fundamentals were calculated to rank these options. Of note, I am of the opinion that Boat Launch Stage 1&amp;2 has a much higher possibility of economic return by introducing a scope of works that has on-going revenue potential and tourism benefits for the whole region more than the other options. For example, an elevated rock sea wall significantly reduces the amenity and could have a negative impact for the community, tourism potential and real-estate investment. However, it will deliver coastal protection. This is an example where the CBA is presented through the lens of economic rationalism and does not consider the data to support the building of a boat ramp and associated protection works. This data appears not to have been taken into consideration in this analysis by Baird and therefore should be re-evaluated to more accurately reflect BCR values.</p>	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				<p>In summary, Coastal erosion and the CofGG's responses over the years indicate a knowledge of CHRMAP and from the Drummond Cove perspective, we are now well past the beginning of the journey that this Baird CHRMAP report represents. In closing, the significant underspend at Beresford for coastal protection works should be redirected into coastal protection works at Drummond Cove, Bluff Point and Sunset Beach. It is Stave Govt. money (out taxes) that paid for Beresford, there were no rate rises recommended for them in the Baird report. Furthermore, there are no recommendations for 70A's clauses to be put on titles and no user pays scheme recommended for those landowners. Any policy that adopts the Baird recommendations will need to consider this carefully</p>	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
126	3/09/2018	3/09/2018	Private submission	<p>Referencing the Coastal Planning Community Survey Report January 2018, particularly pages 4 and 5, the whole of our community and tourists alike considers the beaches and associated coastal strip of paramount importance to their lifestyle and enjoyment. Living in close proximity of the beach, I see on a daily basis the number of cars both local and towing campers and caravans stopping at Drummonds to enjoy the beach areas and those tourism potentials into the economics that benefit community benefit everyone. During the community consultation phase of CHRMAP, the data clearly demonstrates that the Geraldton community at large values the beaches and foreshore of the municipality of Geraldton above all other assets. This view must expand to include all people in the entire region of the CofGG jurisdiction. Including, residents from the Shire of Chapman Valley who also enjoy the foreshore areas, particularly the connection to Drummond Cove. It is too narrow a perspective to view this CHRMAP report through a lens of only those residents living within coastal processes setback lines as affected.</p>	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				<p>In response to the overall recommendations: 1. I, _____ reject some of the recommendations of Managed Retreat. The CofGG has adopted the strategy of Managed Retreat for many years now in the absence of a hazard mapping and CHRMAP reports. It has passed trigger points resulting in lost assets in Drummond Cove and must now act. It is not acceptable that the CHRMAP report is a justification for adopting Managed Retreat from this point forward as the CofGG has been aware and has obligations under the Planning Act to land owners. We recommend that the CofGG explore with the DCPA via community consultation the CBA (Cost Benefit Analysis) of strategies now, short term and long term. Considering Under the Western Australian legislative framework voluntary or compulsory acquisition is based on the value of the land and its improvements. Case law pertaining to compulsory acquisition judgments indicates that values paid usually far exceed current market value due to Courts also awarding on-costs like removal expenses and legal costs. 2. I recommend a 'Protect' approach (Pr1-7): The values of the properties within the report are significantly understated given current market value. Second, sufficient justification exists for permanent solutions development on coastal land areas that are available to buffer areas 'at risk from coastal erosion and inundation. I, _____ propose coastal protection works as there is an enormous need to preserve the Drummond Cove foreshore areas for all people in the CofGG. The CofGG should explore, with the direct involvement of community, protection works that consider public access, public safety, property and infrastructure as our coastal lifestyle is not expendable.</p>	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				<p>In response to the following recommendations: Require Section 70A notification to be placed on titles to alert prospective purchasers to the risk of coastal erosion and / or inundation. I recommend that the CofGG undertake immediately Geophysical studies of all the shoreline areas to examine presence of rock strata that could reduce the erodibility of critical sections over the longer term (estimate \$25,000) and apply that data to the setback lines to create an accurate representation of setback lines. The current setbacks do not fit with specific height differences in adjacent areas not affected by setback lines indicating a broad-brush approach with significant financial implications at stake. I understand that the purpose of this study is to provide scope of works recommendations. However, more detailed information is necessary that includes analysis of rock strata within the setbacks and accurate elevations to be included. This is essential before any 70A notifications be placed on titles. I advise caution to the CofGG to avoid possible class action under the state planning act. Which will be triggered by a broad-based policy approach that de-values land by placing 70A notifications on titles. Such action as applying 70A's will require the CofGG to consider the legal costs associated with lengthy process of legal action. This will need to be taken into consideration as part of the CBA (Cost Benefit Analysis).</p>	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission

Submission Information				Submission and Comment		
ID	Received	Responded	Submitter	Comment Submission	CGG Comment	Recommendation
				I agree with the recommendations of continued immediate Monitoring and Management outlined below: Recommend a geophysical study of the shoreline areas is undertaken to examine presence of rock strata that could reduce the erodibility of critical sections over the longer term; The foreshore reserve area offers a crucial natural buffer against coastal erosion and inundation for coastal assets located landward (houses, roads etc), as well as providing highly valued public amenity. Active monitoring and nature-based approaches (e.g. coastal revegetation, sand trapping fences) to increase resilience of this foreshore reserve from erosion are strongly recommended. Community groups and local organisations should be included / supported in the delivery of these programs, to provide opportunity to raise awareness and build ownership of the coastal adaptation requirements. Again, I urge the CofGG to consider the tourism impacts to the region and future economic consequences of any policy, particularly the consequences of a Managed Retreat paradigm. Some of the recommended actions will bring about the outcome of 'protection' at a trigger point. The CofGG needs to acknowledge that we are well past trigger points at Whitehill Rd, Drummond Cove. It is my opinion that the scope of options and actions need to be fully explored, any action/response also include a thorough search for alternative/innovative approaches beyond the list of recommendations. I strongly advise the CofGG look to other adopted approaches in other states where the amenity of the coastal asset is the highest priority. Options such as off-shore artificial reefs to mitigate wave action as the driver of coastal erosion, being just one example. I implore the CofGG seek to preserve the natural amenity and improve tourism potential wherever possible. I ask the CofGG to put on a tourism lens as they view options and consider the CBA (Cost Benefit Analysis).	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				In response to the statement below: 1. "The initial stages of the Geraldton CHRMAP project involved community and stakeholder engagement and a risk-based assessment, which examined coastal assets under threat from erosion and inundation in future planning timeframes. The outcomes of this initial CHRMAP phase were reported in the Coastal Hazard and Risk Assessment report (Baird 2018)" It is important that the CofGG continues to engage with community going forward with the view to avoid at all costs, a fracturing of community. It is an unacceptable outcome that the city takes an approach that 'we know better' and pushes ahead with projects without community buy in and seek to avoid repeating it's past mistakes. The DCPA community is well versed in understanding the CHRMAP process and seeking action. This is evidenced by holding the Geraldton Coastal Adaptation Planning Forum in 2014, a partnership between the Drummonds Cove Progress Association and Sunset Beach Coastcare groups. Followed by Application A15220 in 2015 by the Drummond Cove Progress Association (DCPA) for works north of the John Batten Hall. A community action grant in partnership with the CofGG and NACC for the coastal zone north of the John Batten Hall. It needs to be acknowledged that the CofGG has been well aware of the issues north of John Batten Hall/Whitehill Rd. and now need to act to comply with State Planning requirements.	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				Following on from the above data, it is my position to explore specifically the following recommendations from the Baird report: Section 1 & Section 2. Drummond Cove Road to Community Centre & Community Centre to Seacrest Way – We agree with the following: "A coastal protection approach for Drummond Cove north of the Community Hall in front of the closed section of Whitehill Rd warrants further assessment. MCA and CBA analysis of options considered show a net return on investment on the value of assets protected on the landside is possible. The high value of property at risk of erosion in future planning periods and the values of the coast noted in the Community Engagement process underline the importance of this issue." Following on from the above, I would like to see the CofGG re-visit the foredune re-build strategy (Application A15220) for section 1 & 2 to implement a foredune re-build for both sections 1 & 2. This course of action is reinforced by the Baird report which states: "Nature based approaches to increase resilience of shorelines and foreshore areas (eg sand trapping fences, revegetation). Recommended for section north of the Community Hall. CGG led programs supported through grant funding (estimated \$10,000 annually)."	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				I would like the City of Greater Geraldton to adopt the resolution presented to council in July to re-establish a north south link reinstated in it's original position. and include in that work a future seawall structure as part of the road base works. Future proofing this area by building a below-ground seawall will provide the necessary peace of mind to the entire community. Second, adjust the detailed plans to include creation of a natural buffer as planned in A15220 by the DCPA Coast Care group, NACC and the City of Greater Geraldton from 2015. Implement the above as a short/medium/long term approach. It is time to improve the amenity, provide confidence and the recommendations are there to do so. This scope of works can be acted on immediately.	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				In response to the economic analysis below: 3.4 Economic Analysis – Adaptation options for Erosion Protection for Whitehill Rd and Community Centre. I seek further clarification as to how the fundamentals were calculated to rank these options. Of note, I am of the opinion that Boat Launch Stage 1&2 has a much higher possibility of economic return by introducing a scope of works that has on-going revenue potential and tourism benefits for the whole region more than the other options. For example, an elevated rock sea wall significantly reduces the amenity and could have a negative impact for the community, tourism potential and real-estate investment. However, it will deliver coastal protection. This is an example where the CBA is presented through the lens of economic rationalism and does not consider the data to support the building of a boat ramp and associated protection works. This data appears not to have been taken into consideration in this analysis by Baird and therefore should be re-evaluated to more accurately reflect BCR values.	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				In summary, Coastal erosion and the CofGG's responses over the years indicate a knowledge of CHRMAP and from the Drummond Cove perspective, we are now well past the beginning of the journey that this Baird CHRMAP report represents. In closing, the significant underspend at Beresford for coastal protection works should be redirected into coastal protection works at Drummond Cove, Bluff Point and Sunset Beach. It is State Govt. money (out taxes) that paid for Beresford, there were no rate rises recommended for them in the Baird report. Furthermore, there are no recommendations for 70A's clauses to be put on titles and no user pays scheme recommended for those landowners. Any policy that adopts the Baird recommendations will need to consider this carefully	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
127	27/08/2018	5/09/2018	Private submission	3.1.2 Community Coastal Planning Survey and Workshops Page 7. The attached report (Appendix A.2) does not reflect what was reported in "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017. The beach and residential properties in Kempton Street are highly valued by the community. In the "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017", it was identified that the loss of residential property and community areas would have a catastrophic impact. The results of the workshop were to 'Protect' Kempton Street properties and many of the other properties and beaches that the CHRMAP has changed to 'managed retreat.' Solution: The requirements of the CHRMAP process, state that community valuing and feedback is required in order to be successful. The CHRMAP needs to be updated to reflect what is important to the community by adhering to the Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report. Changing valuable assets to the community, such as properties and beaches, to "PROTECT".	The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops were undertaken to provide the opportunity for the community to identify and prioritise assets and values of importance to them in the coastal zone. The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops also explained the Coastal Adaptation Types and provided the opportunity for the community participants to suggest adaptation measures for each adaptation type. This provided information for the consultant to identify the long term adaptation pathway for the assets and values in the coastal zone.	Note the submission
				See attached Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report October 2017 Summary Page 2-Section 2.1 Purpose "The severity of erosion and inundation impact along Geraldton's coastal areas is determined by a range of factors, and over the next 100-years the coastal region is projected to experience adverse effects from coastal hazard impact at some time." The factors used in this calculation need to be defined. Does it take into account sand replenishing, man made modifications ect. Responsibility for increased erosion has been admitted by the ports. The Geraldton Guardian has also claimed the city is also responsible for the increased erosion due to the works at the foreshore. Is this part of the calculation?	The factors used in the calculation are for coastal erosion and coastal inundation are identified in State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. In additional the Geraldton CHRMAP Report takes into account existing treatments such as the Northern Beaches Stabilisation Programme (NBSPP) sand by-passing works undertaken each year by the Port Authority. The Beresford Foreshore project coastal protection structures have been designed not to interrupt the sediment flow northwards from Beresford.	Note the submission
				There is sufficient justification to have the properties and community areas classified as "PROTECT" rather than the proposed "Accomodate/Managed Retreat" in Sunset Beach. The costs of managed retreat would amount to \$35,760,000 = (149 homes x \$240,000 (median reported house price per this report) This is the lowest cost as homes located next to the ocean are valued higher. The Adaptation recommendation "Section 70a notification on Title" would devalue 149 residential properties within Sunset Beach, effecting the resale value. "PROTECT" Adaptation options have been provided at a significantly lower cost to other Coastal Management Units. Not exceeding 4 million dollars. This would also remove the need to add "Section 70a notification on Title" saving millions to home owners. Refer to Technical Appendices- Table 3-2 "Cost estimates for adaptation options"	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note the submission
				The Adaptation plans per the report ("Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017") were as follows: Sunset Beach houses - Protect- Seawall, artificial reef, sand nourishment, dune rehabilitation, Geotextile containers.	Noted. These, and other adaptation options were assessed by the consultant to identify sustainable long term adaptation pathways for the assets and values in the coastal zone.	Note the submission
				Page 105 -15.1.3 Managed Retreat Pathway Out of the three pathways for managed retreat, in all cases, protect is the least costly and damaging to the city. The First Option "Do Nothing" will incur reputation damage and legal costs to the city. This will detour tourism and investors from coming to Geraldton. Without a legal precedent, legal counsel will need to be sought out, incurring more costs without any benefit to the community. The Second Option "Planned Retreat" the City would be required to reserve funds to acquire the properties before or at the time of the erosion trigger. Costing over \$35,760,000 for Sunset Beach alone. The Third Option "Protect" has been identified to have the least cost. risk and the biggest reward to the community and stakeholders. The community has recommended a proactive approach to protect the properties and beaches. This would ensure the best benefit to the City of Greater Geraldton, encouraging tourism, investments and showing everyone in WA that Geraldton cares about it's residents	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note the submission
128	27/08/2018	5/09/2018	Private submission	3.1.2 Community Coastal Planning Survey and Workshops Page 7. The attached report (Appendix A.2) does not reflect what was reported in "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017. The beach and residential properties in Kempton Street are highly valued by the community. In the "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017", it was identified that the loss of residential property and community areas would have a catastrophic impact. The results of the workshop were to 'Protect' Kempton Street properties and many of the other properties and beaches that the CHRMAP has changed to 'managed retreat.' Solution: The requirements of the CHRMAP process, state that community valuing and feedback is required in order to be successful. The CHRMAP needs to be updated to reflect what is important to the community by adhering to the Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report. Changing valuable assets to the community, such as properties and beaches, to "PROTECT".	The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops were undertaken to provide the opportunity for the community to identify and prioritise assets and values of importance to them in the coastal zone. The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops also explained the Coastal Adaptation Types and provided the opportunity for the community participants to suggest adaptation measures for each adaptation type. This provided information for the consultant to identify the long term adaptation pathway for the assets and values in the coastal zone.	Note the submission
				See attached Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report October 2017 Summary Page 2-Section 2.1 Purpose "The severity of erosion and inundation impact along Geraldton's coastal areas is determined by a range of factors, and over the next 100-years the coastal region is projected to experience adverse effects from coastal hazard impact at some time." The factors used in this calculation need to be defined. Does it take into account sand replenishing, man made modifications ect. Responsibility for increased erosion has been admitted by the ports. The Geraldton Guardian has also claimed the city is also responsible for the increased erosion due to the works at the foreshore. Is this part of the calculation?	The factors used in the calculation are for coastal erosion and coastal inundation are identified in State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. In additional the Geraldton CHRMAP Report takes into account existing treatments such as the Northern Beaches Stabilisation Programme (NBSPP) sand by-passing works undertaken each year by the Port Authority. The Beresford Foreshore project coastal protection structures have been designed not to interrupt the sediment flow northwards from Beresford.	Note the submission
				There is sufficient justification to have the properties and community areas classified as "PROTECT" rather than the proposed "Accomodate/Managed Retreat" in Sunset Beach. The costs of managed retreat would amount to \$35,760,000 = (149 homes x \$240,000 (median reported house price per this report) This is the lowest cost as homes located next to the ocean are valued higher. The Adaptation recommendation "Section 70a notification on Title" would devalue 149 residential properties within Sunset Beach, effecting the resale value. "PROTECT" Adaptation options have been provided at a significantly lower cost to other Coastal Management Units. Not exceeding 4 million dollars. This would also remove the need to add "Section 70a notification on Title" saving millions to home owners. Refer to Technical Appendices- Table 3-2 "Cost estimates for adaptation options"	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note the submission
				The Adaptation plans per the report ("Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017") were as follows: Sunset Beach houses - Protect- Seawall, artificial reef, sand nourishment, dune rehabilitation, Geotextile containers.	Noted. These, and other adaptation options were assessed by the consultant to identify sustainable long term adaptation pathways for the assets and values in the coastal zone.	Note the submission
				Page 105 -15.1.3 Managed Retreat Pathway Out of the three pathways for managed retreat, in all cases, protect is the least costly and damaging to the city. The First Option "Do Nothing" will incur reputation damage and legal costs to the city. This will detour tourism and investors from coming to Geraldton. Without a legal precedent, legal counsel will need to be sought out, incurring more costs without any benefit to the community. The Second Option "Planned Retreat" the City would be required to reserve funds to acquire the properties before or at the time of the erosion trigger. Costing over \$35,760,000 for Sunset Beach alone. The Third Option "Protect" has been identified to have the least cost. risk and the biggest reward to the community and stakeholders. The community has recommended a proactive approach to protect the properties and beaches. This would ensure the best benefit to the City of Greater Geraldton, encouraging tourism, investments and showing everyone in WA that Geraldton cares about it's residents	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note the submission



Submission Information				Submission and Comment		
ID	Received	Responded	Submitter	Comment Submission	CGG Comment	Recommendation
129	27/08/2018	5/09/2018	Private submission (x2)	<p>3.1.2 Community Coastal Planning Survey and Workshops Page 7. The attached report (Appendix A.2) does not reflect what was reported in "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017. The beach and residential properties in Kempton Street are highly valued by the community. In the "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017", it was identified that the loss of residential property and community areas would have a catastrophic impact. The results of the workshop were to 'Protect' Kempton Street properties and many of the other properties and beaches that the CHRMAP has changed to 'managed retreat.' Solution: The requirements of the CHRMAP process, state that community valuing and feedback is required in order to be successful. The CHRMAP needs to be updated to reflect what is important to the community by adhering to the Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report. Changing valuable assets to the community, such as properties and beaches, to "PROTECT".</p> <p>See attached Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report October 2017 Summary Page 2-Section 2.1 Purpose "The severity of erosion and inundation impact along Geraldton's coastal areas is determined by a range of factors, and over the next 100-years the coastal region is projected to experience adverse effects from coastal hazard impact at some time." The factors used in this calculation need to be defined. Does it take into account sand replenishing, man made modifications ect. Responsibility for increased erosion has been admitted by the ports. The Geraldton Guardian has also claimed the city is also responsible for the increased erosion due to the works at the foreshore. Is this part of the calculation?</p> <p>There is sufficient justification to have the properties and community areas classified as "PROTECT" rather than the proposed "Accomodate/Managed Retreat" in Sunset Beach. The costs of managed retreat would amount to \$35,760,000 = (149 homes x \$240,000 (median reported house price per this report) This is the lowest cost as homes located next to the ocean are valued higher. The Adaptation recommendation "Section 70a notification on Title" would devalue 149 residential properties within Sunset Beach, effecting the resale value. "PROTECT" Adaptation options have been provided at a significantly lower cost to other Coastal Management Units. Not exceeding 4 million dollars. This would also remove the need to add "Section 70a notification on Title" saving millions to home owners. Refer to Technical Appendices- Table 3-2 "Cost estimates for adaptation options"</p> <p>The Adaptation plans per the report ("Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017") were as follows: Sunset Beach houses - Protect- Seawall, artificial reef, sand nourishment, dune rehabilitation, Geotextile containers.</p> <p>Page 105 -15.1.3 Managed Retreat Pathway Out of the three pathways for managed retreat, in all cases, protect is the least costly and damaging to the city. The First Option "Do Nothing" will incur reputation damage and legal costs to the city. This will detour tourism and investors from coming to Geraldton. Without a legal precedent, legal counsel will need to be sought out, incurring more costs without any benefit to the community. The Second Option 'Planned Retreat' the City would be required to reserve funds to acquire the properties before or at the time of the erosion trigger. Costing over \$35,760,000 for Sunset Beach alone. The Third Option "Protect" has been identified to have the least cost. risk and the biggest reward to the community and stakeholders. The community has recommended a proactive approach to protect the properties and beaches. This would ensure the best benefit to the City of Greater Geraldton, encouraging tourism, investments and showing everyone in WA that Geraldton cares about it's residents</p> <p>We don't believe that community consultation was as rigorous as it should have been particularly in regards to engaging with those who will be affected most. Hopefully this improves before recommendations are finalised and the final report released.</p> <p>We think an artificial reef is worth investigating as the waves breaking further out to sea should help reduce the erosion. It will be more cost effective than sacrificing our homes and will boost tourism</p> <p>We believe that City of Greater Geraldton and the Geraldton Port should take accountability for creating a solution as the dredging of the port channel and recent works to the foreshore have pushed the erosion problem further north. How can you fix the problem in one location, creating one in another and throw your hands in the air and say you won't do anything about it.</p>	<p>The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops were undertaken to provide the opportunity for the community to identify and prioritise assets and values of importance to them in the coastal zone. The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops also explained the Coastal Adaptation Types and provided the opportunity for the community participants to suggest adaptation measures for each adaptation type. This provided information for the consultant to identify the long term adaptation pathway for the assets and values in the coastal zone.</p> <p>The factors used in the calculation are for coastal erosion and coastal inundation are identified in State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. In addition the Geraldton CHRMAP Report takes into account existing treatments such as the Northern Beaches Stabilisation Programme (NBSPP) sand bypassing works undertaken each year by the Port Authority. The Beresford Foreshore project coastal protection structures have been designed not to interrupt the sediment flow northwards from Beresford.</p> <p>The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.</p> <p>Noted. These, and other adaptation options were assessed by the consultant to identify sustainable long term adaptation pathways for the assets and values in the coastal zone.</p> <p>The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.</p> <p>The development of the Geraldton CHRMAP report has had extensive community consultation. Community consultation will continue throughout the CHRMAP process.</p> <p>Acknowledgement of submission</p> <p>The Port Enhancement Project went through a Public Environment Review as part of the approvals process. The Port has an ongoing commitment to bypass 12,500m3 of sand from Pages Beach to the Northern Beaches between the Beresford Foreshore and the Chapman River annually.</p>	<p>Note the submission</p> <p>Note the submission</p> <p>Note the submission</p> <p>Note the submission</p> <p>Note the submission</p> <p>Note the submission</p>
130	28/08/2018	5/09/2018	Private submission (x2)	<p>In the "Coastal Planning Community Workshop Summary Report October 2017" it says that the beach and properties in sunset beach are "Highly Valued" by the community and the loss of properties and communal areas would have a catastrophic impact on the community in Geraldton. The results were shown that the option was to "Protect" Sunset Beach and other affected areas. Why has it now been changed to "Managed Retreat" in the CHRMAP The CHRMAP needs to be changed to "Protect" in accordance with its requirements of the CHRMAP process which is value and feedback from the community in order to be successful</p> <p>There are many reasons that "Protect" is a far better option than a managed retreat. One of these reasons is cost. It will cost far less in the long run to protect the communities, properties and assets as well as public beaches. There are cost effective measures that can be explored. Let's look at the figures, Managed Retreat: 149 homes @ an average value you determined as \$240,000 = \$35,760,000 This isn't taking into account the higher value homes. That's a lot of money. (Sunset Beach Alone) How much would a few rock groins and sand bags cost??? Not as much as the above figure, that's for sure. There are definitely more cost effective and beneficial options to explore here rather than a "managed retreat"</p> <p>The cheapest and best option for the city is clearly the "Protect Option" If you do nothing, there will be damage to the city, we will lose public space (beaches etc), homes and devalue assets. Also, investors won't want to invest here if they know that the city isn't willing to help its local community and that it is happy to let the property value of its residents decrease. If you have a "managed retreat" it will cost the city more in the long run as the figures clearly show. As trigger points are hit, the city will have to compensate. Do they even have that kind of money to implement the managed retreat? Where will the money come from? The option to "protect" is clearly the most cost effective and beneficial to residents, the community and the CGG council.</p> <p>The community at Sunset Beach is a unique and thriving community. I believe that it would be in the best interest of the CGG to choose to protect the coast and surrounding areas. I am a young couple who work hard and bought our property in sunset beach as an investment for our family's future and as an asset which to borrow money against to further our family business. Having read the report it seems to me that the report is trying suggesting implementing what they believe to be the cheapest option possible which is to do nothing and implement a "managed retreat" as well as put a warning on our properties title deed warning potential buyers of the risks of buying a house in our area. Well I'm sorry but this just is not good enough and I can assure you that in the long run this will in fact be the most expensive option when you take into consideration the math on how much it will cost for land swaps and compensation etc. As rate payers we expect our assets to be protected. Why is it that the house the area of St Georges are being protected with new foreshore infrastructure but our areas will just be left to fall into the sea? Are particular areas of Geraldton valued more than others? CGG website is promoting Geraldton as a hot spot for property investment. What confidence does CGG provide to investors when they hear that the land value around some Geraldton suburbs is decreasing? The best and most cost effective option is protection of our assets, beaches and coastline. A managed retreat or land swap is not an option as far as we are concerned. I would hate to see a notice on our title devalue both mine and others properties because the council refuses to choose the option of protecting our assets which we work hard to accumulate. Isn't this why we pay rates? Every year when we are sent our rates notice (which also increases every year) it shows us that 13.6% of rates we pay goes towards parks, coastal and natural management. As a rate payer I would expect nothing less than total protection of our homes and assets. There are many cost effective options to explore and paths to take in the way of protecting our coast and assets such as groins, sand bags, infrastructure, artificial reefs and sand re-placement. Let's explore some of those options together and come up with an outcome that benefits both the community and the CGG council. Furthermore, there has not been enough consultation with the community regarding this issue. The report far too complicated for some folks to understand. There needs to be a simplified version put into lay man's terms so that everyone can make sense of the report and its proposal. Much of this erosion problem lies with the modification and land reclamation of the foreshore (as the Geraldton Guardian admits) and the ports who also admit responsibility. Shouldn't they have to work with us in taking steps to protect sunset beach and the affected coastline?</p>	<p>The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops were undertaken to provide the opportunity for the community to identify and prioritise assets and values of importance to them in the coastal zone. The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops also explained the Coastal Adaptation Types and provided the opportunity for the community participants to suggest adaptation measures for each adaptation type. This provided information for the consultant to identify the long term adaptation pathway for the assets and values in the coastal zone.</p> <p>The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.</p> <p>The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.</p> <p>Acknowledgement of submission</p>	<p>Note the submission</p> <p>Note the submission</p> <p>Note the submission</p> <p>Note the submission</p>
131	2/09/2018	4/09/2018	Sunset Beach Community Group	<p>SBCG believes a Community Information session is vitally needed to explain the comprehensive CHRMAP draft report to the public before asking for any community feedback. The session needs to display key components of the document, including hazard mapping, the long term adaptation pathways and other relevant information for discussion purposes. Community members need to be provided with this information to understand the whole CHRMAP for being able to comment in a constructive way. This report is very complex to read.</p> <p>SBCG is requesting for the CMU 3 the CGG to undertake the following key studies to improve understanding in the CMU and support the CHRMAP as recommended in the BAIRD report.</p> <p>- A geophysical study of the critical shoreline areas in the northern coastal management units at Drummond Cove, Sunset Beach and Bluff Point should be undertaken to examine presence of rock strata, specific analysis and potentially modelling of shoreline response to sea level rise and storm erosion to improve the confidence in the coastal erosion setback extents in future planning periods referring to Part 1-Coastal Hazard and Risk Assessment Report 5.3 Assumptions, Table 5.5: Hazard Mapping Assumptions and Limitations. Detailed geotechnical data is not available for most of the coastal areas. In the absence of site specific data, coastal areas have been assessed as Sandy Coast under the SPP2.6 guidelines. and apply that data to the setback lines to create an accurate representation of setback lines. The current setbacks are not accurate, specific height differences in adjacent areas not affected by setback lines</p> <p>- A targeted monitoring program to support the CHRMAP recommendations and build understanding of coastal erosion and inundation impacts in key coastal areas. Annual shoreline monitoring to track rate of erosion. Regular monitoring and reviewing the coastal hazard risk management and adaptation planning will ensure that the management and adaptation planning identified and established remains relevant. This effectively converts it from a one-off linear process to a cyclical process. - Additional guidance on the managed retreat trigger process should be provided by the state government agencies including Department of Planning with input from the Department of Transport outlining whether this post storm response can be considered.</p> <p>- Applying a sliding scale of adaptation response in the SCA, recognises there is uncertainty in the estimate of the long-term shoreline position (eg at 2070, 2110), and that making decisions based on this uncertainty today,</p> <p>SBCG is supporting following Coastal Protection options:</p> <p>- Implantation of structures such as a groynes, detached breakwater or artificial reef is not recommended near the Chapman River due to the high seasonal and annual variability of the longshore transport direction in this area and the complexity of sediment dynamics at the Chapman River Mouth. The river can indeed discharge a large quantity of sediment, which may bury or expose the structure, potentially causing unpredictable behaviour at river mouth and upstream. Moreover, such structures are also likely to interact negatively with the river discharge (for example by blocking the discharge flow).- Therefore, a structure having no impact on the sediment transport such as the implementation of buried seawall is preferred - At Sunset Beach, in the absence of an erosion control solution, the Caravan Park and adjacent public car parks are threatened. The following options could mitigate coastal erosion issue and provide sufficient buffer against storm erosion to protect the Caravan Park and other developments: - Initial beach nourishment of 100,000 m3 combined with regular re nourishment of 10,000m3/year; - Buried seawall of 300m combined with regular re nourishment of 10,000 m3/year - Cost benefit analysis of a range of alternatives indicated a series of geotextile groynes similar to the one currently installed at the northern end of St Georges Beach could deliver a net return on investment when taking into account the value of the property and public land that is protected. Needs to be classified in Managed Retreat. Referring to Worley Parson Study 2010 : Net Present Value ; The following notes can be drawn: Long the Northern Beaches, the value of the calculated NPV of the "Do Nothing" option is more than 12 times the cost of the most expensive proposed coastal protection option. Therefore, a coastal management strategy has to be maintained. Along Sunset Beach, NPVs are similar for the "Managed Recession" option and the most expensive proposed coastal protection option based on a 300m buried seawall.</p>	<p>The CHRMAP report has been divided up into 12 coastal management units each with a summary explanation. Visual tables show and explain the adaptation pathway. Readers can delve into the technical appendices for a more in-depth understanding. A newspaper advert has been included, identifying clearly where the City is in the Coastal Adaptation process.</p> <p>Acknowledgement of submission</p> <p>Acknowledgement of submission</p>	<p>Note the submission</p> <p>Note the submission</p> <p>Note the submission</p>

Submission Information				Submission and Comment		
ID	Received	Responded	Submitter	Comment Submission	CGG Comment	Recommendation
				<p>The SBCG is recommending a transparent and effective community involvement process for the upcoming phases of this CHRMAP project to evaluate the adaptation options within each of the CMU that will mitigate the coastal risk. It is essential to engage the community and stakeholders effectively throughout the entire CHRMAP process and to define their involvement at the outset, especially when developing risk evaluation criteria, to ensure a successful outcome for the risk management process. Community engagement can assist in: - determining the consequences and their acceptability or otherwise of a given set of coastal hazards, as these are best determined by those who will be most directly affected by those consequences; - identifying more innovative risk management and adaptation measures - potential solutions or responses to identified unacceptable/intolerable risks should be sought from as many sources as possible to encourage innovative and locally tailored solutions; - acceptance and success of the outcomes of the CHRMAP process given the community's involvement in the development and 'ownership' of the risk assessment/management process</p> <p>The Western Australian coastal zone is a significant asset of the state in terms of its environmental, economic, social and cultural resources. The coastline from Grey's Beach to Sunset beach is intensively used for a range of activities. The diversity of the coastal setting and nearshore and inshore reefs are part of this valuable community asset. The entire coastline is well utilised for recreation including swimming (where possible), walking, jogging, riding (on the dual path or on the sandy beaches), snorkelling on the inshore reefs, windsurfing (especially along the Northern part of the Northern Beaches), rock lobster fishing on and around the reefs, sailing (using of the boat ramp at St George's Beach for launching), picnicking and barbecues. It is therefore a necessity to maintain the beach amenities and aesthetics in order to maintain the attractiveness of the area. Experience has shown that the use of coastal structures is typically less desirable from a social perspective in these circumstances and it should be limited to a few critical locations because of their visually intrusive nature and potential interference to beach users and coastal residents. (Worley Parson 2010) The "Do Nothing" or "Managed Recession" solution for the Northern Beaches and Sunset Beach is showing gradual recession and an increased area of beach and development is placed under threat of erosion. Sunset Beach has a history of erosion over the past 60 years. With an average rate of erosion of about 0.7 m/year, SBCG supports the CHRMAP project as an important process to ensure that the coastal areas, values and benefits that are so important to the community can be managed sustainably. Ongoing review is essential to ensure that the management plan remains relevant. Factors that may affect the likelihood and consequences of an outcome may change, as may the factors that affect the suitability or cost of the treatment options. It is therefore necessary to repeat the risk management cycle regularly. It is not a one-off linear process, but a continual cyclical process.</p> <p>Referring to: Part 1-Coastal Hazard and Risk Assessment Report 2.2.2 Coastal Hazard Risk Management and Adaptation Planning Guidelines Figure 2.3: Risk Management and Adaptation Flow Chart (WAPC 2014) SBCG</p>	<p>The development of the Geraldton CHRMAP report has had extensive community consultation. Community consultation will continue throughout the CHRMAP process.</p> <p>Acknowledgement of submission</p>	<p>Note the submission</p> <p>Note the submission</p>
132	2/09/2018	2/09/2018	Private submission (x2)	<p>I am writing to respond to the recently released Draft Coastal Hazard and Risk Assessment Report. My issues in particular lie within Part 2 - Summary of the Coastal Adaptation Report. As a resident living on Glendinning Road, Tarcoola Beach, I strongly object to the proposed 70a Notification on our title, mentioned in the report. As stated in the report, Tarcoola Beach has been accreting by approximately 1m per year since the 1940's due to the protection of off-shore reefs and sand migration from the Southgate dunes. As the report notes, this accretion is expected to continue for at least another 50 years according to the current forecasts. I find it preposterous that given we are living on a beach that is actually growing, you propose to classify my property as at 'moderate risk' and place a 70a notification on my title, which will significantly impact on re-sale values and future investments where borrowing against the property is required. In addition, when I studied the proposed coastal setbacks for 2110, I found that some 95% of my property was indeed behind the rather thick setback line which includes a margin for error. I am greatly concerned that the difference between my property being classified 'Low Risk' with no 70a title requirements and my current proposed classification is simply down to a margin of error and or the thickness of a line on an overhead photograph. These nuances will likely have significant financial implications which I will fight to prevent. I do note that the report mentions that there is no need in our location to do specific monitoring outside a planned re-evaluation in some 5 years and that a seaward migration of the coastal setback is a possibility if re-assessment is favourable. Surely it makes far greater sense to classify a property as 'low risk' and leave titles free of caveats until there is some evidence that supports such action. Lastly, I was disheartened to read that the studies associated with the production of the aforementioned report were completed between 2015 and 2017 yet approval was granted to build my current residence in 2015 with no mention of potential setback issues or future caveats. Had notification been received at that time, I am certain that my financial outlay may well have been modified.</p> <p>Whilst I agree that erosion is a significant issue for greater Geraldton, I hope that for the sake of well over 100 residents from the southern beachside suburbs of Geraldton who have made significant investments in their properties and in Geraldton itself, that appropriate decisions are made, common sense prevails and the abovementioned issues are rectified.</p>	<p>Acknowledgement of submission</p> <p>Acknowledgement of submission</p>	<p>Note the submission</p> <p>Note the submission</p>
133	3/09/2018	3/09/2018	Private submission (x2)	<p>Living across the road from St Georges Park/Beach since 2004 we have experienced the devastation of the coastline and had some anxious moments with many strong tidal storms. We have noticed that since the sand bagging groyne was established near the old boat ramp the erosion has been considerably less. Because St Georges and Knepton Street is such a popular tourist attraction due to the lovely park - windsurfing/swimming beach, triathlons, caravans, etc etc. It is a "No Brainer" to prevent any further erosion to this area. Surely by continuing up the coast to Sunset and Drummonds with similar sandbag walls the same effect can be possible - without any huge expense). Anywhere else in the world properties as beautiful as ours would be a valuable asset so close to the ocean. Why should this not apply in Geraldton. Please do not have any more talk about caveats and devaluing this beautiful part of Geraldton. It's time for confidence in our futures.</p> <p>This section of the Report particularly AS coastal mapping erosion projections for the coastline is hugely concerning. The Accommodate and Protection Adoptions should be our way forward as each of the 12 Coastal Management Units are deserved of equal consideration. The Adoption Tool Box as a whole is the only way forward. As assessing which PR, in advance of need, would advantage each CM unit to resolve and remedy problem areas to bring about positive resolves. To even consider 70A, Managing Retreat, Buyback or Avoidance are not valid outcomes and should not be part of this otherwise informing report. Our coastline is our greatest asset and is enjoyed by ratepayers and tourists alike and should not be walked away from by using any of the above considerations. This along with consideration of the people who have invested to dwell on this coastline it is required to only adopt Accommodate and Protections Adoptions to preserve this asset for the City's future.</p> <p>Prevention as per the Adoption Tool Box is the only acceptable answer to resolve the plight of our coastline. As admitted in the Report, modifications and protection projects along with deepening our harbour has obstructed the natural flow and contributed to this pending coastline destruction. The unsuspecting home owners are now under threat through no fault of their own along with the coastline used by locals and visitors. The Port Authority and City need to take responsibility for previous decisions and commit to Prevention. 70A cannot be instigated as this impact on real estate is far reaching on asset values. Researching dividing the costs by a combined financial input of our City, the Port Authority and rate payers in some way in order to share the financial impact as has been done for the Beresford community. The work on the Beresford coastline will soon be enjoyed by all rate payers and the end result is a credit to the City and is an excellent example of caring for our coastline. A 50 year long term similar commitment would ensure the beauty and on going useful enjoyment of our shoreline. I would thank the City for once again presenting to its people the problems and possible solutions and trust that with due consideration positive decisions will be implemented.</p>	<p>Acknowledgement of submission</p> <p>Acknowledgement of submission</p> <p>Acknowledgement of submission</p>	<p>Note the submission</p> <p>Note the submission</p> <p>Note the submission</p>
135	3/09/2018	4/09/2018	Private submission	<p>Referencing the Coastal Planning Community Survey Report January 2018, particularly pages 4 and 5, the whole of our community and tourists alike considers the beaches and associated coastal strip of paramount importance to their lifestyle and enjoyment. Living in close proximity of the beach, I see on a daily basis the number of cars both local and towing campers and caravans stopping at Drummonds to enjoy the beach areas and those tourism potentials into the economics that benefit community benefit everyone. During the community consultation phase of CHRMAP, the data clearly demonstrates that the Geraldton community at large values the beaches and foreshore of the municipality of Geraldton above all other assets. This view must expand to include all people in the entire region of the CofGG jurisdiction. Including, residents from the Shire of Chapman Valley who also enjoy the foreshore areas, particularly the connection to Drummond Cove. It is too narrow a perspective to view this CHRMAP report through a lens of only those residents living within coastal processes setback lines as affected.</p> <p>In response to the overall recommendations: 1. I, _____ being a Drummond Cove Resident and Ratepayer on 3 x properties affected by the CHRMAP reject some of the recommendations of Managed Retreat. The most vulnerable of my properties was purchased/settled in the early stages of 2018 just prior to the CHRMAP being released. No notification of the 70A caveat, or intention/possibility of this course of action was mentioned even though this report was close to public release and response. 2. The CofGG has adopted the strategy of Managed Retreat for many years now in the absence of a hazard mapping and CHRMAP reports. It has passed trigger points resulting in lost assets in Drummond Cove and must now act. It is not acceptable that the CHRMAP report is a justification for adopting Managed Retreat from this point forward as the CofGG has been aware and has obligations under the Planning Act to land owners. We recommend that the CofGG explore with the DCPA via community consultation the CBA (Cost Benefit Analysis) of strategies now, short term and long term. Considering Under the Western Australian legislative framework voluntary or compulsory acquisition is based on the value of the land and its improvements. Case law pertaining to compulsory acquisition judgments indicates that values paid usually far exceed current market value due to Courts also awarding on-costs like removal expenses and legal costs. 3. I recommend a 'Protect' approach (Pr1-7): The values of the properties within the report are significantly understated given current market value. Second, sufficient justification exists for permanent solutions development on coastal land areas that are available to buffer areas 'at risk from coastal erosion and inundation. I, Barbara Varney propose coastal protection works as there is an enormous need to preserve the Drummond Cove foreshore areas for all people in the CofGG. The CofGG should explore, with the direct involvement of community, protection works that consider public access, public safety, property and infrastructure as our coastal lifestyle is not expendable.</p> <p>In response to the following recommendations: Require Section 70A notification to be placed on titles to alert prospective purchasers to the risk of coastal erosion and / or inundation. I recommend that the CofGG undertake immediately Geophysical studies of all the shoreline areas to examine presence of rock strata that could reduce the erodibility of critical sections over the longer term (estimate \$25,000) and apply that data to the setback lines to create an accurate representation of setback lines. The current setbacks do not fit with specific height differences in adjacent areas not affected by setback lines indicating a broad-brush approach with significant financial implications at stake. I understand that the purpose of this study is to provide scope of works recommendations. However, more detailed information is necessary that includes analysis of rock strata within the setbacks and accurate elevations to be included. This is essential before any 70A notifications be placed on titles. I advise caution to the CofGG to avoid possible class action under the state planning act. Which will be triggered by a broad-based policy approach that de-values land by placing 70A notifications on titles. Such action as applying 70A's will require the CofGG to consider the legal costs associated with lengthy process of legal action. This will need to be taken into consideration as part of the CBA (Cost Benefit Analysis).</p> <p>I agree with the recommendations of continued immediate Monitoring and Management outlined below: Recommend a geophysical study of the shoreline areas is undertaken to examine presence of rock strata that could reduce the erodibility of critical sections over the longer term; The foreshore reserve area offers a crucial natural buffer against coastal erosion and inundation for coastal assets located landward (houses, roads etc), as well as providing highly valued public amenity. Active monitoring and nature-based approaches (e.g. coastal revegetation, sand trapping fences) to increase resilience of this foreshore reserve from erosion are strongly recommended. Community groups and local organisations should be included / supported in the delivery of these programs, to provide opportunity to raise awareness and build ownership of the coastal adaptation requirements. Again, I urge the CofGG to consider the tourism impacts to the region and future economic consequences of any policy, particularly the consequences of a Managed Retreat paradigm. Some of the recommended actions will bring about the outcome of 'protection' at a trigger point. The CofGG needs to acknowledge that we are well past trigger points at Whitehill Rd, Drummond Cove. It is my opinion that the scope of options and actions need to be fully explored, any action/response also include a thorough search for alternative/innovative approaches beyond the list of recommendations PR1-6. I strongly advise the CofGG look to other adopted approaches in other states where the amenity of the coastal asset is the highest priority. Options such as off-shore artificial reefs to mitigate wave action as the driver of coastal erosion, being just one example. As per State Planning Policy 2.6, Community consultation at every step of the way is recommended. The CofGG should seek to preserve the natural amenity and improve tourism potential wherever possible. I ask the CofGG to put on a tourism lens as they view options and consider the CBA (Cost Benefit Analysis).</p>	<p>Acknowledgement of submission</p> <p>Acknowledgement of submission</p> <p>Acknowledgement of submission</p>	<p>Note the submission</p> <p>Note the submission</p> <p>Note the submission</p>

Submission Information				Submission and Comment		
ID	Received	Responded	Submitter	Comment Submission	CGG Comment	Recommendation
				In response to the statement below: 1. "The initial stages of the Geraldton CHRMAP project involved community and stakeholder engagement and a risk-based assessment, which examined coastal assets under threat from erosion and inundation in future planning timeframes. The outcomes of this initial CHRMAP phase were reported in the Coastal Hazard and Risk Assessment report (Baird 2018)" It is important that the COFGG continues to engage with community going forward with the view to avoid at all costs, a fracturing of community. It is an unacceptable outcome that the city takes an approach that 'we know better' and pushes ahead with projects without community buy in and seek to avoid repeating it's past mistakes. The DCPA community is well versed in understanding the CHRMAP process and seeking action. This is evidenced by holding the Geraldton Coastal Adaptation Planning Forum in 2014, a partnership between the Drummonds Cove Progress Association and Sunset Beach Coastcare groups. Followed by Application A15220 in 2015 by the Drummond Cove Progress Association (DCPA) for works north of the John Batten Hall. A community action grant in partnership with the CofGG and NACC for the coastal zone north of the John Batten Hall. It needs to be acknowledged that the CofGG has been well aware of the issues north of John Batten Hall/Whitehill Rd. and now need to act.	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				Following on from the above data, it is my position to explore specifically the following recommendations from the Baird report: Section 1 & Section 2. Drummond Cove Road to Community Centre & Community Centre to Seacrest Way – We agree with the following: "A coastal protection approach for Drummond Cove north of the Community Hall in front of the closed section of Whitehill Rd warrants further assessment. MCA and CBA analysis of options considered show a net return on investment on the value of assets protected on the landside is possible. The high value of property at risk of erosion in future planning periods and the values of the coast noted in the Community Engagement process underline the importance of this issue." Following on from the above, I would like to see the CofGG re-visit the foredune re-build strategy (Application A15220) for section 1 & 2 to implement a foredune re-build for both sections 1 & 2. This course of action is reinforced by the Baird report which states: "Nature based approaches to increase resilience of shorelines and foreshore areas (eg sand trapping fences, revegetation). Recommended for section north of the Community Hall. CGG led programs supported through grant funding (estimated \$10,000 annually)."	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				I would like the CofGG to adopt the resolution presented to council in July to re-establish a north south link reinstated in its original position and include in that work a future seawall structure as part of the road base works. Future proofing this area by building a below ground seawall will provide the necessary peace of mind to the entire community. Second, adjust the detailed plans to include creation of a natural buffer as planned in A15220 by the DCPA Coastcare group, NACC and the CofGG from 2015. Implement the abocce as short/medium/long term approach. It is time to improve the amenity, provide confidence and the recommendations are there to do so. This scope of works can be acted on immediately.	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				In response to the economic analysis below 3.4 Economic Analysis – Adaptation options for Erosion Protection for Whitehill Rd and Community Centre. I seek further clarification as to how the fundamentals were calculated to rank these options. Of note, I am of the opinion that Boat Launch Stage 1&2 has a much higher possibility of economic return by introducing a scope of works that has on-going revenue potential and tourism benefits for the whole region that have not been considered in this report. Also, creating a permanent entry/access at the seacrest wat beach access point would allow easier access to the bay for families and amateur crayfisherman with smaller boat. For example, an elevated rock sea wall significantly reduces the amenity and could have a negative impact for the community, tourism potential and real-estate investment. However, it will deliver coastal protection. This is an example where the CBA is presented through the lens of economic rationalism and does not consider the data to support the building of a boat ramp and associated protection works. This data appears not to have been taken into consideration in this analysis by Baird and therefore should be re-evaluated to more accurately reflect BCR values.	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				In summary, Coastal erosion and the CofGG's responses over the years indicate a knowledge of CHRMAP and that we are now well past the beginning of the journey that this Baird CHRMAP report represents. In closing, the significant underspend at Beresford for coastal protection works should be re-directed into coastal protection works at Drummond Cove, Bluff Point and Sunset Beach. It is State Govt. money (our taxes) that paid for Beresford, there were no rate rises recommended for them in the Baird report. Furthermore, there are no recommendations for 70A's clauses to be put on titles and no user pays scheme recommended for those land-owners. Any policy that adopts the Baird recommendations will need to consider this carefully.	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
136	3/09/2018	4/09/2018	Private submission	The report was long and not user friendly and therefore difficult to navigate. Numerous references made to other sections of the report were difficult to access and reference while reading. Obviously the report is very comprehensive and I can understand why such a report was necessary, but the reality is that it tells us in precise detail what those of us living on the coast already know. Those of us living at Bluff Point have already experienced the loss of the boat ramp and part of Rundle Park. I appreciate the risk assessment and now want to know what action the Shire is going to take.	The CHRMAP report has been divided up into 12 coastal management units each with a summary explanation. Visual tables show and explain the adaptation pathway. Readers can delve into the technical appendices for a more in-depth understanding. A newspaper advert has been included, identifying clearly where the City is in the Coastal Adaptation process.	Note the submission
				Climate change is a reality and even though no one knows what the future holds we need to be proactive in protecting our community and everything within it. The PROTECT work on Beresford foreshore has set a precedent and rightly so, and with strategic planning that precedent needs to be extended to the northern suburbs. To do anything less than PROTECT is a waste of ratepayers money, this issue is not going to go away.	In line with State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy, the Beresford Foreshore Project, as new coastal protection works has progressed only after all other options for avoiding and adapting to coastal hazards had been fully explored, as part of a comprehensive coastal hazard risk management process.	Note the submission
				I want the same commitment from CGG as I have given to Geraldton, moving here from Perth 15 years ago and working at GRH. My three sons their wives and young families all live in Geraldton, they are home and local business owners in the town and love living here, they have to know the shores are going to be protected, which are the essence of living in Geraldton. On retirement I made the decision to buy a block of land and build in Bluff Point, I cannot believe that the Shire would reward this investment with a Section 70a notification on my Title and think of abandoning such progress and the potential that still exists in Bluff Point and Geraldton as a whole. It just wouldn't make sense.	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				The advertising of the workshops and the report should have included social media; I received a note in my mail box and would have known nothing of this otherwise	The development of the Geraldton CHRMAP report has had extensive community consultation. Community consultation will continue throughout the CHRMAP process. This included social media	Note the submission
137	3/09/2018	4/09/2018	Private submission	BLANK SUBMISSION	Not applicable	Not applicable
138	3/09/2018	4/09/2018	Private submission	3.1.2 Community Coastal Planning Survey and Workshops Page 7. The attached report (Appendix A.2) does not reflect what was reported in "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017. The beach and residential properties in Kempton Street are highly valued by the community. In the "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017", it was identified that the loss of residential property and community areas would have a catastrophic impact. The results of the workshop were to 'Protect' Kempton Street properties and many of the other properties and beaches that the CHRMAP has changed to 'managed retreat.' Solution: The requirements of the CHRMAP process, state that community valuing and feedback is required in order to be successful. The CHRMAP needs to be updated to reflect what is important to the community by adhering to the Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report. Changing valuable assets to the community, such as properties and beaches, to "PROTECT".	The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops were undertaken to provide the opportunity for the community to identify and prioritise assets and values of importance to them in the coastal zone. The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops also explained the Coastal Adaptation Types and provided the opportunity for the community participants to suggest adaptation measures for each adaptation type. This provided information for the consultant to identify the long term adaptation pathway for the assets and values in the coastal zone.	Note the submission
				See attached Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report October 2017 Summary Page 2-Section 2.1 Purpose "The severity of erosion and inundation impact along Geraldton's coastal areas is determined by a range of factors, and over the next 100-years the coastal region is projected to experience adverse effects from coastal hazard impact at some time." The factors used in this calculation need to be defined. Does it take into account sand replenishing, man made modifications ect. Responsibility for increased erosion has been admitted by the ports. The Geraldton Guardian has also claimed the city is also responsible for the increased erosion due to the works at the foreshore. Is this part of the calculation?	The factors used in the calculation are for coastal erosion and coastal inundation are identified in State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. In additional the Geraldton CHRMAP Report takes into account existing treatments such as the Northern Beaches Stabilisation Programme (NBSPP) sand by-passing works undertaken each year by the Port Authority. The Beresford Foreshore project coastal protection structures have been designed not to interrupt the sediment flow northwards from Beresford.	Note the submission
				There is sufficient justification to have the properties and community areas classified as "PROTECT" rather than the proposed "Accomodate/Managed Retreat" in Sunset Beach. The costs of managed retreat would amount to \$35,760,000 = (149 homes x \$240,000 (median reported house price per this report) This is the lowest cost as homes located next to the ocean are valued higher. The Adaptation recommendation "Section 70a notification on Title" would devalue 149 residential properties within Sunset Beach, effecting the resale value. "PROTECT" Adaptation options have been provided at a significantly lower cost to other Coastal Management Units. Not exceeding 4 million dollars. This would also remove the need to add "Section 70a notification on Title" saving millions to home owners. Refer to Technical Appendices- Table 3-2 "Cost estimates for adaptation options"	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note the submission
				The Adaptation plans per the report ("Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017") were as follows: Sunset Beach houses - Protect- Seawall, artificial reef, sand nourishment, dune rehabilitation, Geotextile containers.	Noted. These, and other adaptation options were assessed by the consultant to identify sustainable long term adaptation pathways for the assets and values in the coastal zone.	Note the submission
				Page 105 -15.1.3 Managed Retreat Pathway Out of the three pathways for managed retreat, in all cases, protect is the least costly and damaging to the city. The First Option "Do Nothing" will incur reputation damage and legal costs to the city. This will detour tourism and investors from coming to Geraldton. Without a legal precedent, legal counsel will need to be sought out, incurring more costs without any benefit to the community. The Second Option 'Planned Retreat' the City would be required to reserve funds to acquire the properties before or at the time of the erosion trigger. Costing over \$35,760,000 for Sunset Beach alone. The Third Option "Protect" has been identified to have the least cost. risk and the biggest reward to the community and stakeholders. The community has recommended a proactive approach to protect the properties and beaches. This would ensure the best benefit to the City of Greater Geraldton, encouraging tourism, investments and showing everyone in WA that Geraldton cares about it's residents	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note the submission
139	3/09/2018	4/09/2018	Private submission	I believe a consultant who specialises in building and who can address this erosion problem seriously and effectively. A consultant from the Netherlands would be advisable	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				3.1.2 Community Coastal Planning Survey and Workshops Page 7. The attached report (Appendix A.2) does not reflect what was reported in "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017. The beach and residential properties in Kempton Street are highly valued by the community. In the "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017", it was identified that the loss of residential property and community areas would have a catastrophic impact. The results of the workshop were to 'Protect' Kempton Street properties and many of the other properties and beaches that the CHRMAP has changed to 'managed retreat.' Solution: The requirements of the CHRMAP process, state that community valuing and feedback is required in order to be successful. The CHRMAP needs to be updated to reflect what is important to the community by adhering to the Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report. Changing valuable assets to the community, such as properties and beaches, to "PROTECT".	The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops were undertaken to provide the opportunity for the community to identify and prioritise assets and values of importance to them in the coastal zone. The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops also explained the Coastal Adaptation Types and provided the opportunity for the community participants to suggest adaptation measures for each adaptation type. This provided information for the consultant to identify the long term adaptation pathway for the assets and values in the coastal zone.	Note the submission
				See attached Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report October 2017 Summary Page 2-Section 2.1 Purpose "The severity of erosion and inundation impact along Geraldton's coastal areas is determined by a range of factors, and over the next 100-years the coastal region is projected to experience adverse effects from coastal hazard impact at some time." The factors used in this calculation need to be defined. Does it take into account sand replenishing, man made modifications ect. Responsibility for increased erosion has been admitted by the ports. The Geraldton Guardian has also claimed the city is also responsible for the increased erosion due to the works at the foreshore. Is this part of the calculation?	The factors used in the calculation are for coastal erosion and coastal inundation are identified in State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. In additional the Geraldton CHRMAP Report takes into account existing treatments such as the Northern Beaches Stabilisation Programme (NBSPP) sand by-passing works undertaken each year by the Port Authority. The Beresford Foreshore project coastal protection structures have been designed not to interrupt the sediment flow northwards from Beresford.	Note the submission
				There is sufficient justification to have the properties and community areas classified as "PROTECT" rather than the proposed "Accomodate/Managed Retreat" in Sunset Beach. The costs of managed retreat would amount to \$35,760,000 = (149 homes x \$240,000 (median reported house price per this report) This is the lowest cost as homes located next to the ocean are valued higher. The Adaptation recommendation "Section 70a notification on Title" would devalue 149 residential properties within Sunset Beach, effecting the resale value. "PROTECT" Adaptation options have been provided at a significantly lower cost to other Coastal Management Units. Not exceeding 4 million dollars. This would also remove the need to add "Section 70a notification on Title" saving millions to home owners. Refer to Technical Appendices- Table 3-2 "Cost estimates for adaptation options"	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note the submission
				The Adaptation plans per the report ("Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017") were as follows: Sunset Beach houses - Protect- Seawall, artificial reef, sand nourishment, dune rehabilitation, Geotextile containers.	Noted. These, and other adaptation options were assessed by the consultant to identify sustainable long term adaptation pathways for the assets and values in the coastal zone.	Note the submission



Submission Information				Submission and Comment		
ID	Received	Responded	Submitter	Comment Submission	CGG Comment	Recommendation
				Page 105 -15.1.3 Managed Retreat Pathway Out of the three pathways for managed retreat, in all cases, protect is the least costly and damaging to the city. The First Option "Do Nothing" will incur reputation damage and legal costs to the city. This will detour tourism and investors from coming to Geraldton. Without a legal precedent, legal counsel will need to be sought out, incurring more costs without any benefit to the community. The Second Option "Planned Retreat" the City would be required to reserve funds to acquire the properties before or at the time of the erosion trigger. Costing over \$35,760,000 for Sunset Beach alone. The Third Option "Protect" has been identified to have the least cost. risk and the biggest reward to the community and stakeholders. The community has recommended a proactive approach to protect the properties and beaches. This would ensure the best benefit to the City of Greater Geraldton, encouraging tourism, investments and showing everyone in WA that Geraldton cares about it's residents	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note the submission
140	3/09/2018	4/09/2018	Private submission (x2)	In these submissions I have taken into account the following: i. State Planning Policy No 2.6 State Coastal Planning Policy ("SPP2.6"); ii. State Coastal Planning Policy Guidelines ("SPPG"); iii. Coastal Hazard risk management and adaptation planning Guidelines ("SPPPG"); iv. Draft Planned or Managed Retreat Guidelines ("PMRG"); v. Land Administration Act 1997- section 17; vi. Department of Transport, Coastal Infrastructure, Coastal Engineering Group Report "Sea Level Change in Western Australia- Application to Coastal Planning "dated 2 February 2010 ("SLR"); vii. Town Beach to Drummond Cove Inundation & Coastal Processes Study March 2017 ("MRA2016") made public on 6 April 2017 via community information sessions, and available on the CGG website.; viii. Part 1 Coastal Hazard and Risk Assessment Report and Appendix ("Part 1"); and ix. Part 2 Coastal Adaptation Report ("Part 2"). I am limiting my submissions, largely, to the direct effect the proposals will have on CMU 4, and in particular, our property located at _____, Bluff Point,	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				Section2- Establishing the Context. The Baird Report P1 refers to the studies of the City (MRA2015,2016,2017) . It is noted in the R675 Rev 0 March 2016 Town Beach to Drummond Cover Inundation and Coastal Processes Study, at page ii, that "whilst SPP2.6 provides a methodology for assessing the foreshore reserve requirements for new development, it is not retrospective. As a result, the outcomes and requirements of an assessment completed in accordance with SPP2.6 are not directly applicable to existing development. Rather, for existing development, the allowances provided through the implementation of SPP2.6 assessment methodology should be considered an analysis of potential coastal vulnerability. In such cases there is generally a requirement to implement management actions where coastal hazard risk is considered to be too high, in order to reduce the risk to acceptable levels." If an existing dwelling is removed to make way for a new dwelling on the site, is that sufficient, or do you propose to stop any new development on existing lands, and dramatically affect the value of the existing property, making it either a 'renovate and repair' option, but without the ability to demolish and rebuild?	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note the submission
				SPP2.6 at 5.8i requires the CCC to "ensure that adequate opportunity is provided to enable the community to participate in coastal planning and management. 5.8ii goes on further to say that community consultation and engagement strategies should be developed to encourage informed community input. I submit that adequate opportunity and engagement did not occur either as a result of the release of MRA 2016, or as a result of the Baird Reports collectively. I am told that it has been advertised or referred to: on the CGG Facebook page; The CGG website; Flyers in key locations; A leaflet included in 2017 Rates envelopes inviting parties to be notified in regard to any results or reports. The owners of the properties that are directly and adversely impacted, almost immediately, no matter what decision is ultimately made, ought to have been contacted both by letter and telephone, where practical, and advised to read the relevant documentation and recommendations. Given the report identifies a small number of dwellings at immediate risk, it would not have been an onerous task.	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report to date has had extensive community consultation. Community consultation will continue throughout the CHRMAP process.	Note the submission
				The consequences of the CCC's decision will adversely impact many people, either directly or indirectly, financially, socially or larger volumes as a community. 3.1.7 refers to the success criteria, and community consultation, and shows that the most mentioned asset was 'beaches'. Part 1 at 2.2.1 refers to SPP2.6 and within Schedule 1 it is accepted by Baird that CMU 4 is "sandy coast" as defined in SPP2.6 at 3.1. Sandy coast is defined as "Sandy coasts comprise un lithified/ unconsolidated sediments, rock is wither not present or not dominant. They typically feature gently to moderately sloping shores and are often backed by dunes or beach ridges, which may contain dune blowouts. The shoreline can quickly alternate between accretion and erosion but is likely to retreat as a result of sea level rise" 4.4 Allowance for erosion on a sandy coast should be measured from the HSD and calculated as the sum of the factors S1, S2 and S3 plus 0.2 metres per year allowance for uncertainty. I note the adoption of a total coastal processes allowance for CMU4 as follows: Present day 26 metres; I note the sea level rise as enunciated in MRA 2016 refers to storm inundation levels as at 0 currently; 2030 - 41 metres; I note the sea level rise as enunciated in MRA 2016 refers to storm inundation levels as at 0.07m in 2030; 2070 - 93 metres; and I note the sea level rise as enunciated in MRA 2016 refers to storm inundation levels as at 0.39m as at 2070; and 2110 - 166 metres. I note the sea level rise as enunciated in MRA 2016 refers to storm inundation levels as at .90m as at 2110;	Noted. The S2 calculation is based on a calculation that translates the predicted vertical sea level rise into a horizontal linear set-back. Both are measured in metres	Note the submission
				The MRA16 Report refers to the data collection dates and refers to the difference in erosion both prior to, and post the Batavia Coast Marina development in 1992. At page 57 they state "consideration needs to be given to the key changes that have affected the sediment dynamics. These include the construction of the Batavia Coast Marina (completed by 1992) and sand nourishment that is being carried out by MWPA since 2000. "However, from 2010 to 2014, the shoreline generally experienced erosion. This short term trend could have been the result of storm events, as the magnitude of these fluctuations are typically less than those determined for the Si allowance" The report goes on to say that "coastline movement data south of Chapman River between 1952 and 1992 (completion of the Batavia Coast Marina) was not available for the study, however states that despite this, the shoreline movement since 1992 is the most critical for the assessment." What studies or research has been done into the short and long term effect on the shoreline of the CMU's closest to the Marina, and the effect the Marina has had on the erosion and inundation of the shoreline north of the Marina. The MWPA is required to do sand bypassing. Is there a requirement for the Batavia Coast Marina to do the same? Was this entertained at the time of approval? At what point does the requirement for MWPA to do sand bypassing cease to be a requirement?	The Port Enhancement Project went through a Public Environment Review as part of the approvals process. The Environmental Protection Authorities report on this project can be found here <a href="http://www.epa.wa.gov.au/sites/default/files/EPA_Report/1135_B1050.pdf">http://www.epa.wa.gov.au/sites/default/files/EPA_Report/1135_B1050.pdf</a> The Port has an ongoing commitment to bypass 12500m3 of sand from Pages Beach to the Northern Beaches between the Beresford Foreshore and the Chapman R+F772iver annually. The sand placed at Beresford feeds the northern beaches between the Beresford Foreshore and the Chapman River through then "littoral drift" coastal process. The Marina sits in the lee of the Port	Note the submission
				There needs to be geotechnical surveying of the affected areas and sedimentary blocks to see the overall effect of the groynes, seawalls, etc, especially now that Beresford works have nearly been completed to see the physical effect those works, and the continuing effect of the Batavia Coast Marina has had, or will have, on sedimentary deposits and the movement of the seas. There is no question that the works at Beresford, and <del>changing the coast, will effect the areas immediately to the north, and possibly to the south of that area</del>	The Beresford Foreshore project coastal protection structures have been designed not to interrupt the sediment flow northwards from Beresford	Note the submission
				The recommendations, more particularly in regard to our property do not take into account the current elevation of our property, such that a .9m increase in sea level would have no effect on our block of land.	Inundation needs to take into account the waves and swells that would be created and impinge the shoreline from a 1:500 ARI inundation event - not just the vertical static water level resulting from sea level rise.	Note the submission
				At 4.3 the value of houses/ commercial property has been estimated at the rateable value as a 'proxy value'. This is not how the value is to be assessed under the Land Administration Act, making any projected costs grossly undervalued.	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				Table 5.5 states that the LiDAR capture date was March 2013, some 5 years ago. This makes even the aerial data from 2016 outdated. It also states that modifications to ground levels in developed areas are not described.	The LiDAR data has a vertical accuracy to 10mm. It captures the natural ground level as at 2013	Note the submission
				The Bathing Flooding approach has been adopted, however fails to take into account the contours of the land. It is therefore contingent on the LiDAR data, which is as at 2013. Ultimately, this results in a flawed estimation of the level of inundation across the various areas.	The flooding model was reviewed by BAIRD and any disconnected inundation areas removed from the inundation hazard maps. The Geraldton CHRMAP report recommends undertaking further modelling to better understand the extent of inundation in the Geraldton CBD for both incoming and outgoing flood waters.	Note the submission
				No geotechnical information has been used. The CMU4 area has offshore reefs and sand structures that effectively break the oceans force at the beachside. None of that information has been investigated, nor reported on	The Wave set-ups are described in the MRA reports referred to in the submission	Note the submission
				The geotextile groyne at St Georges Beach has been in place since 2017 (see 6.2) however also notes erosion potential on the north side. Why wasn't the structure extended north and south of the existing location.	A low-crest groyne was installed at St Georges Beach to address erosion of the beach at Rundle Park	Note the submission
				7.6 outlines possibility of using a flood level limit over floor levels of properties. If this was used for all new buildings, the impact would therefore be low, with little to no risk of inundation.	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				Table 7.14 shows houses west of Kempton Road at extreme risk of erosion, as at 2018, and at moderate risk for inundation until 2070. The tolerance scale (Table 7.10) shows that the action required is 'immediate action required to eliminate or reduce the risk to acceptable levels, with an acceptance/ tolerance level of unacceptable and intolerable. As previously stated, I believe that procedural fairness was not afforded to the homeowners in Bluff Point. Table 7.24 rates Rundle Park and Coastal pathways and cycleways as most valued assets by the community. This was as a direct result of meetings held, with many homeowners in Bluff Point unaware of such meetings.	The development of the Geraldton CHRMAP report has had extensive community consultation. Community consultation will continue throughout the CHRMAP process.	Note the submission
				The adaptation hierarchy immediately renders some properties valueless, as an 'avoid' decision means properties would ultimately be worthless, with little to no resale value. 'Accommodate' can enable building requirement to take into account the inherent risks in building and design with Protect being the most viable option.	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note the submission
				Appendix A.1 - 4.3-Stakeholder analysis Property owners in the project area) were identified as residential and business property owners who are living/working within the project area. Communication methods recommended were "direct mail outs and emails,web updates, Facebook updates, advertisements". The power rating was "medium power/High Interest ("D") and recommendation was to involve them in the consultation process. The recommended actions were then as follows: • Communications of Technical Project Information; • Community and Stakeholder Survey; • Community and Stakeholder workshop; • Information Session; Key External Stakeholder Meetings (as required); and • Project Communications/ Advertising. No emails were ever received by my family. No letters were ever received. I have not received any surveys, nor been invited to any workshops. I have also not been aware of any stakeholder meetings, to which I could have attended. Section 5, seems to not have been adhered to, it also mentions that letters of invitation will be sent out, or emails. None of that has been done by the CCC at all	The development of the Geraldton CHRMAP report has had extensive community consultation. Community consultation will continue throughout the CHRMAP process.	Note the submission
				To date, the CGG seems unwilling to even identify, by parcel of land, the most effected properties as described in the reports.	Coastal Hazard Maps present the extents of the hazards on aerial photographs	Note the submission
				The Attachment 3 to the appendix's shows an example of MCA study of costs of the various options, the CBA example is for Drummonds Cove. Why weren't CBA examples done for all zones?	CBA is presented for Bluff Point	Note the submission
				To deem our property within a SCA, or to amend the current planning requirements for our property will ultimately deem it worthless.	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				In dealing with CMU4 only, we note that at page vi-viii our property (_____) is classed immediately as 'infill'. It states that 'managed retreat conditions will be imposed on these properties as a condition of development or redevelopment, with details specified consistent with the Managed Retreat guidelines (DPLH 2017); and The specific managed retreat riggers will be determined as part of the CGG review of its planning framework, but are likely to be based on Point Moore lease conditions that would trigger vacating the property if: . The most landward limit of the horizontal shoreline datum (HSD) is within the 51 distance of any structures on the lot: • Etc. Using the above, this report has rendered our home valueless	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				There is sufficient justification to have the properties in Bluff Point PROTECTED. The costs of the PROTECT option would be significantly cheaper than the costs of managed retreat and acquiring properties. The properties on Kempton Street are higher in value given their proximity to the ocean, as is the case with most properties wanting ocean frontage or views. Placing a S70A notification on the title immediately opens the Crown to claims of economic loss due to the loss of value on the properties. Where the recommendation of managed retreat and conditions disallowing any development to be built closer than the HSD to less than 26m (S1) is stated (page 38) this does not take into account the current position of the landowners, being they are, able to, at law resume ownership of the portion of their land currently under water. Does the CGG intend to change that to disallow any infill of property to existing land ownership boundaries?	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note the submission
				Has there been any research as to when (I submit based on the information provided, it is actually now) the CGG will commence negotiations for acquisition of properties?	No, that is a matter for Council to decide	Note the submission
				Surely it is up to the CGG to put to effected parties their draft planning approval changes, prior to them being adopted. When would the CGG intend to have those discussions?	Further consultation will occur if a local coastal planning policy is developed.	Note the submission
				Table 6.4 notes the properties west of Kempton Street have a land level of approx. 2.8-3m AHD. The guesstimate of sea level rise of im in 2110 means these two properties will not be inundated until well after 2110, if we protect the shoreline with seawalls, or a protective structure.	Inundation needs to take into account the waves and swells that would be created and impinge the shoreline from a 1:500 ARI inundation event - not just the water level resulting from sea level rise.	Note the submission

Submission Information				Submission and Comment		
ID	Received	Responded	Submitter	Comment Submission	CGG Comment	Recommendation
				<p>Page 105- Out of the 3 pathways, Protect is the least costly, and the most confirmatory. Do nothing will trigger a claim for lack of duty of care. Given these properties have been located where they are for many, many years, it is remiss of the CGG to have done nothing about protections thus far, instead dealing only with near town assets such as the Batavia Coast Marina and Beresford. 15.2 Planning actions- to propose that any new buildings are built so that they are 'transportable' is ridiculous. What happens with the current homes along Kempton Street, including those recently built? The community wants a pro active approach by the CGG, which would maintain tourism, investment and population. To allow the properties at risk to succumb to the natural forces would be at a huge economical cost to CGG (Crown)</p> <p>The example of the seawall for Bluff Point stops south of our properties, thus would offer no protection at all. The area immediately north of our home is a carpark (Crown) and to the south of our southerly neighbours, is an access way for surfers. The coastline directly in front of our properties has reef and rock deposits, thereby reducing the impact of storms and surges, given these act as a break for the velocity of the ocean when it reaches the shoreline. The seawall option has a lifespan of 50 years, with an initial cost estimate of 3.2M. The guesstimate for present value of property at extreme risk in Bluff Point is \$572,000. This figure is severely undervalued, when even a vacant block sold across the road within the last 2 years for approx. \$550,000. The CHRMAP states that detailed geotechnical data was not available for most coastal areas. Did Baird visit the areas concerned <u>and undertake any geotechnical data?</u></p> <p>The CGG has failed in according procedural fairness to the most affected property owners of CMU4. At no time were we notified by post! email. The CGG needs to propose a transparent path moving forward. The costs to the CGG of doing nothing would mean lower GRV values, with a S70A notification on titles. This would also mean a loss of income to the CGG, where the increase in value of all homes PROTECTED would result in higher GRV <u>and more funds being raised by CGG by way of rates.</u></p>	<p>The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.</p> <p>The coastal hazards maps are based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The Geraldton CHRMAP Report recommends undertaking geotechnical studies to inform whether coastal erosion set-back lines can be refined in line with the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy.</p> <p>The development of the Geraldton CHRMAP report has had extensive community consultation. Community consultation will continue throughout the CHRMAP process.</p>	<p>Note the submission</p> <p>Note the submission</p> <p>Note the submission</p>
141	3/09/2018	3/09/2018	Private submission (x2)	<p>We are a concerned residents of Kempton Street and would like to reply with the submission to 'Protect our Coastline'. There are many submissions that have been sent back to council, so we will not continue to say the same information. However we need to voice our opinion. As a Council for the City of Greater Geraldton your vision and duty to the Ratepayers of Geraldton involved should have been before this Coastal Hazard Report happened should have been to... A) Support an extensive community and stakeholder engagement process with the Coastal Hazard B) Sought input from the Geraldton community. C) To have "Key stakeholders" to shape the CHRMAP outcome. D) A Steering Committee (led by the Shire) but involving key stakeholders to establish and to oversee the project and it's delivery. We feel very strongly that you have NOT followed the correct <u>procedures as above and now as Residents we are fighting against the Shire instead of being UNITED</u></p> <p>Refer to the City of Sorrento in Victoria with their Sandbagging Program which is very effective and at all cost PROTECT existing assets through a coastal protection structure... "MANAGED RETREAT "for current structures <u>and properties within the erosion hazard area.</u></p> <p>We are also very concerned that Geraldton are following the same pathway as the Baird Report on the "Broome Coastal Hazard Report" and that they have very little erosion but more tidal flooding issues v Geraldton huge erosion issues.</p>	<p>The development of the Geraldton CHRMAP report has had extensive community consultation. Community consultation will continue throughout the CHRMAP process.</p> <p>Acknowledgement of submission</p> <p>The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.</p>	<p>Note the submission</p> <p>Note the submission</p> <p>Note the submission</p>
142	3/09/2018	4/09/2018	Private submission (x2)	<p>In reference to both the Coastal Planning Community Survey Report (January 2018), as well as the CHRMAP community consultation, the data collected is absolutely clear that the community values the beach. As a coastal town, and a coastal Drummond Cove community, this value goes beyond lifestyle and enjoyment. It's a culture, which Drummond Cove has proudly nurtured and supported since the 1940's. So highly valued is this sense of community and beach culture, that it attracts people, not only locally, but regionally, nationally and internationally. The impact of desimated coastline and infrastructure has been severe on the wider community in all forms <u>from culturally, socially, environmentally and economically.</u></p> <p>Whilst the CHRMAP assessment report focuses on the areas affected, we must widen our view to include those that are impacted outside of these coastal management units. The environmental, social, cultural and economic impacts all equally as severe and interrelated. The wider effects are that tourism and economic investment will halt due to property investment, holiday home/B&amp;B investment and other related tourism <u>opportunities.</u></p> <p>Our family were pioneers in the development of Drummond Cove, installing utilities and infrastructure, creating a strong connected community, only to be forced to relinquish a life time lease on our house and demolish it in 2016. To then be offered a block to purchase (Surf Place) which now falls within the line on a map of coastal risk. We then purchased a block in Estuary Way, met with CoGG Planning Department in September 2017, Surveyors and builders to investigate planning and building requirements. Approval was granted to build our 2 houses. Our decisions were based on findings of the Drummond Cove Community Engagement Report and Design Guidelines 2014, a positive and proactive planning strategy. We are almost ready to be handed the keys to our new home and find out our asset could be almost frozen.</p> <p>We reject some of the recommendations of Managed Retreat. The CoGG has adopted the strategy of Managed Retreat for many years in the absence of hazard mapping and reliable data, reports and policy. This has resulted in trigger points being passed and coastal assets lost in Drummond Cove, so we urge CoGG to now act. It is unacceptable to see that CHRMAP report is a justification for adopting the Managed Retreat approach as CoGG have been well aware and has obligations to landowners under the Planning Act. We urge the CoGG to work with the incredibly proactive Drummond Cove community via direct consultation, using the DCPA (Drummond Cove Progress Association) to work toward both immediate and long term strategies. This is essential to prevent further fracturing of community and relationships. You have a proactive community, therefore it is vital to use them and work together. We are in favour of the Protect Approach as the values and properties within the report are significantly understated. In addition to this sufficient justification exists for permanent solutions of development on coastal land areas that are available for buffer areas that are 'at risk of coastal erosion and inundation'. We propose coastal protection works in zone 1 &amp; 2 as there is a need to preserve the Drummond Cove Foreshore areas for ALL people in the CoGG. We would encourage the CoGG to involve the community and explore protection works that consider public access, public safety, property and infrastructure. There is significant cultural and economic value for this approach</p> <p>In regards to Section 70A notification to be placed on titles to alert prospective purchasers, we recommend CoGG undertake immediate geophysical studies of all shoreline areas to examine the presence of rock strata that could reduce the erodibility of critical sections over the long term and apply that data to the setback lines to create an accurate representation of setback lines. The current setbacks are not accurate, specific height differences in adjacent areas not affected by setback lines indicate a broad-brush approach with significant perceived financial implications at stake. We understand the need to gain a 'scope of works' through the study, but more data gathering is necessary to include these elevations and setbacks. It is vital that no 70A notifications be placed as current and historical data does not provide certainty. We agree with recommendations of continued immediate monitoring and management as outlined with geophysical study of the shoreline area.</p> <p>We urge the CoGG to consider the consequences for these areas in relation to tourism and economic impacts if using purely managed retreat options. We are already well past trigger points in Drummond Cove. Working with the community of Drummond Cove every step of the way is recommended and view this as an opportunity. We need to work together to future proof the area and reinstall confidence in a collaborative approach.</p>	<p>Acknowledgement of submission</p> <p>The CHRMAP process is and has been promoted for whole-of-community involvement</p> <p>The coastal hazard maps covering Drummond Cove have been publicly available since April 2016</p> <p>Acknowledgement of submission</p>	<p>Note the submission</p> <p>Note the submission</p> <p>Note the submission</p> <p>Note the submission</p>
143	3/09/2018	4/09/2018	Private submission	<p>I agree with the Avoid New Development and Protect approach and preserve the foreshore (Section 1 &amp; 2) Drummond Cove</p> <p><u>I recommend a geophysical study of the shoreline</u></p> <p><u>I disagree with the 70A clauses. Disagree with managed retreat</u></p> <p><u>I totally disagree with the recommendation of managed retreat. To lose our homes has to be the last option and we can't have the 70A clauses devaluing our properties and affecting insurances etc. I would prefer to see the use of geotextile bags backed by rock walls or an artificial reef being the best option to protect our foreshores and properties (Sections 1 &amp; 2) in Drummond Cove</u></p>	<p>The Geraldton CHRMAP Report identifies the recommended long-term adaptation pathways for the 12 Coastal Management Units</p> <p>Acknowledgement of submission</p> <p>Acknowledgement of submission</p> <p>Acknowledgement of submission</p>	<p>Note the submission</p> <p>Note the submission</p> <p>Note the submission</p> <p>Note the submission</p>
144	3/09/2018	4/09/2018	Private submission	<p>I agree with the Avoid New Development and Protect approach and preserve the foreshore (Section 1 &amp; 2) Drummond Cove</p> <p><u>Recommend a geophysical study of the shoreline</u></p> <p><u>Disagree with the 70A clauses. Disagree with managed retreat</u></p> <p><u>I think the use of geotextile bags (with rockwalls or brekwater) of artificial reefs to protect foreshore of Drummond Cove Sections 1 &amp; 2. I disagree with managed retreat and the 70a clauses</u></p>	<p>The Geraldton CHRMAP Report identifies the recommended long-term adaptation pathways for the 12 Coastal Management Units</p> <p>Acknowledgement of submission</p> <p>Acknowledgement of submission</p> <p>Acknowledgement of submission</p>	<p>Note the submission</p> <p>Note the submission</p> <p>Note the submission</p> <p>Note the submission</p>
145	3/09/2018	4/09/2018	Private submission	<p>3.1.2 Community Coastal Planning Survey and Workshops Page 7. The attached report (Appendix A.2) does not reflect what was reported in "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017. The beach and residential properties in Kempton Street are highly valued by the community. In the "Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017", it was identified that the loss of residential property and community areas would have a catastrophic impact. The results of the workshop were to 'Protect' Kempton Street properties and many of the other properties and beaches that the CHRMAP has changed to 'managed retreat.' Solution: The requirements of the CHRMAP process, state that community valuing and feedback is required in order to be successful. The CHRMAP needs to be updated to reflect what is important to the community by adhering to the Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report. Changing valuable assets to the community, such as properties and beaches, to "PROTECT".</p> <p>See attached Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report October 2017 Summary Page 2-Section 2.1 Purpose "The severity of erosion and inundation impact along Geraldton's coastal areas is determined by a range of factors, and over the next 100-years the coastal region is projected to experience adverse effects from coastal hazard impact at some time." The factors used in this calculation need to be defined. Does it take into account sand replenishing, man made modifications ect. Responsibility for increased erosion has been admitted by the ports. The Geraldton Guardian has also claimed the city is also responsible for the increased erosion due to the works at the foreshore. Is this part of the calculation?</p> <p>There is sufficient justification to have the properties and community areas classified as "PROTECT" rather than the proposed "Accomodate/Managed Retreat" in Sunset Beach. The costs of managed retreat would amount to \$35,760,000 = (149 homes x \$240,000 (median reported house price per this report) This is the lowest cost as homes located next to the ocean are valued higher. The Adaptation recommendation "Section 70a notification on Title" would devalue 149 residential properties within Sunset Beach, effecting the resale value. "PROTECT" Adaptation options have been provided at a significantly lower cost to other Coastal Management Units. Not exceeding 4 million dollars. This would also remove the need to add "Section 70a notification on Title" saving millions to home owners. Refer to Technical Appendices- Table 3-2 "Cost estimates for adaptation options"</p> <p>The Adaptation plans per the report ("Coastal Planning Community Workshops Summary Report, October 2017") were as follows: Sunset Beach houses - Protect- Seawall, artificial reef, sand nourishment, dune rehabilitation, Geotextile containers.</p> <p>Out of the three pathways for managed retreat, in all cases, protect is the least costly and damaging to the city. The First Option "Do Nothing" will incur reputation damage and legal costs to the city. This will detour tourism and investors from coming to Geraldton. Without a legal precedent, legal counsel will need to be sought out, incurring more costs without any benefit to the community. The Second Option "Planned Retreat" the City would be required to reserve funds to acquire the properties before or at the time of the erosion trigger. Costing over \$35,760,000 for Sunset Beach alone. The Third Option "Protect" has been identified to have the least cost, risk and the biggest reward to the community and stakeholders. The community has recommended a proactive approach to protect the properties and beaches. This would ensure the best benefit to the City of Greater Geraldton, encouraging tourism, investments and showing everyone in WA that Geraldton cares about it's residents.</p> <p>My 2 brothers and I are all directors in our building company. WE thought 4 years ago that investing in the Sunset would be a great idea being close to the coast and because Geraldton was expanding rapidly. Between us we have 2 established houses on Volute St and 1 house currently under construction on Outrigger Esp. All 3 fall in the 2030-2070 area. We were hoping to buy-build-sell and keep the process going with equity in our assets we worked hard for and spent our hard earned money towards. For the Geraldton Council not to look at rectifying the depleting coastline would be damaging for our situation and jeopardise all that we worked for.</p>	<p>The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops were undertaken to provide the opportunity for the community to identify and prioritise assets and values of importance to them in the coastal zone. The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops also explained the Coastal Adaptation Types and provided the opportunity for the community participants to suggest adaptation measures for each adaptation type. This provided information for the consultant to identify the long term adaptation pathway for the assets <u>and values in the coastal zone.</u></p> <p>The factors used in the calculation are for coastal erosion and coastal inundation are identified in State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. In additional the Geraldton CHRMAP Report takes into account existing treatments such as the Northern Beaches Stabilisation Programme (NBSP) sand bypassing works undertaken each year by the Port Authority. The Beresford Foreshore project coastal protection structures have been designed not to interrupt the sediment flow northwards from <u>Beresford</u></p> <p>The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.</p> <p>Noted. These, and other adaptation options were assessed by the consultant to identify sustainable long-term adaptation pathways for the assets and values in the coastal zone.</p> <p>The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.</p> <p>Acknowledgement of submission</p>	<p>Note the submission</p> <p>Note the submission</p> <p>Note the submission</p> <p>Note the submission</p> <p>Note the submission</p>

Submission Information				Submission and Comment		
ID	Received	Responded	Submitter	Comment Submission	CGG Comment	Recommendation
146	3/09/2018	4/09/2018	Private submission	<p>Please find following my response to the recently released draft CHRMAP report. I have addressed areas within the report that I feel are important. I am disappointed that the CoGG has not held any PUBLIC OPEN FORUMS to work through the report with the General Public. I do acknowledge that the CoGG is short staffed however I believe it is warranted for forums to have been held to assist the community in making educated decisions. I am comforted that recent media reports state that the Mayor has indicated the Public will be consulted through the CoGG policy development process on CHRMAP. As a pre-emptive to my submission, I would like to provide some background to give the reader (s) a better understanding of the human element being impacted by this situation: My husband and I moved to Geraldton in 2013 after many years living and working in remote areas in the north of WA and offshore in the South Pacific islands. We were attracted to the coastal lifestyle of Geraldton (as is the catch cry of many Geraldton employers), and with a view of making a long-term retirement commitment to the City, we rented before purchasing our home at 8 Waterfront Circle, Drummond Cove. Our attraction to Drummond Cove was the quiet community focused lifestyle and coastal amenities. At the time we made our financial commitment to our home we had a dual traffic road along the foreshore (Whitehill Road), through traffic in front of our house (Waterfront Circle), several parking bays along the foreshore (heavily utilised by visitors to the area), a gazebo, multiple trees, and a distinct sand hill in front of all of these fore-mentioned assets. In an attempt to dispel the myth of the "haves" and "have nots" which I can see is already dividing the community over coastal erosion, we purchased with the knowledge we could not see the ocean and had public access and traffic in front and around our home. This has changed, but these changes are not to ours or the wider CoGG community benefit. Over the past 5 1/2 years we have seen the CoGG allow these to be taken by the ocean without any means of PROTECTION measures put in place. This has now seen our house price along with others in the area de-value and will continue to de-value unless the CoGG adopt a policy that is based on PROTECTION of assets. What once was a vibrant community is now disenchanting and I have seen the demeanour of friends / neighbours who have made significant financial investment in the area change dramatically. Stress levels and emotions are running high on this issue. I implore the CoGG and Councillors to act empathically and put themselves in the shoes of affected residents and work towards a PROTECTION policy for the North side of Batten Hall (White Hill Road), in consultation with affected home owners. The CoGG and State Government have acknowledged in the past that the rocking of Batten Hall has exacerbated the erosion effect on the North side of the hall. I feel that it is totally unjust for house / land owners to now bear the brunt, both financially and emotionally, of past mistakes made CoGG. Whilst we cannot change the past the CoGG needs to work towards remediating the problem. The CoGG has been happy to collect rates and taxes all through the process. Should the City not enact a PROTECTION policy for the North side of Batten Hall which provides the comfort for me that our house will not devalue (due to CoGG works) I will be left with no alternative but to seek Legal advice</p>	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				Referencing the Coastal Planning Community Survey Report January 2018, particularly pages 4 and 5, the whole of our community and tourists alike considers the beaches and associated coastal strip of paramount importance to their lifestyle and enjoyment. Our attraction to tourists both internationally and locally in WA is our outdoor coastal orientated climate, wind and surf and those tourism potentials into the economics that benefit community benefit everyone. During the community consultation phase of CHRMAP, the data clearly demonstrates that the Geraldton community at large values the beaches and foreshore of the municipality of Geraldton above all other assets. This view must expand to include all people in the entire region of the CoGG jurisdiction. Including, residents from the Shire of Chapman Valley who also enjoy the foreshore areas, particularly the connection to Drummond Cove. It is too narrow a perspective to view this CHRMAP report through a lens of only those residents living within coastal processes setback lines as affected.	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				In response to the overall recommendations: I _____ reject the recommendations of Managed Retreat. The CoGG has adopted the strategy of Managed Retreat for many years now in the absence of a hazard mapping and CHRMAP reports. It has passed trigger points that have lost assets in Drummond Cove and must now act. It is not acceptable that the CHRMAP report is a justification for adopting Managed Retreat from this point forward as the CoGG has been aware and has obligations under the Planning Act to land owners. I recommend that the CoGG explore, IN CONJUNCTION WITH LANDOWNERS and the DCPA via community consultation the CBA (Cost Benefit Analysis) of strategies now, short term and long term. Considering under the Western Australian legislative framework voluntary or compulsory acquisition is based on the value of the land and its improvements. Case law pertaining to compulsory acquisition judgments indicates that values paid usually far exceed current market value due to Courts also awarding on-costs like removal expenses and legal costs. There is enough evidence from other areas around Australia where City / Local Councils have made ill informed decisions regarding the property of LANDOWNERS and this has resulted in individual / class action against Council / Councillors. This is an area everyone both the COGG and Landowners wish to avoid. I recommend a 'Protect' approach (Pr1-7): The values of the properties within the report are significantly understated given current market value. Second, sufficient justification exists for permanent solutions development on coastal land areas that are currently available to buffer areas 'at risk from coastal erosion and inundation' (ie: sectioni public open space). I Gillian Old propose coastal protection works as there is a need to preserve the Drummond Cove foreshore areas for all people and visitors to the CoGG. The CoGG should explore, with the direct involvement of community, protection works that consider public access, public safety, property and infrastructure as our coastal lifestyle is not expendable.	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				In response to the following recommendations: recommend that the CoGG undertake immediately Geophysical studies of all the shoreline areas to examine presence of rock strata that could reduce the erodibility of critical sections over the longer term (estimate \$25,000) and apply that data to the setback lines to create an accurate representation of setback lines. The current setbacks do not fit with specific height differences in adjacent areas not affected by setback lines indicating a broad-brush approach with significant financial implications at stake. I understand that the purpose of this study is to provide scope of works recommendations. However, more detailed information is necessary that includes analysis of rock strata within the setbacks and accurate elevations to be included. This is essential before any 70A notifications be placed on titles. I advise caution to the CoGG to avoid possible class action under the state planning act, which will be triggered by a broad-based policy approach that de-values land by placing 70A notifications on titles. Such action as applying 70A's will require the CoGG to consider the legal costs associated with lengthy process of legal action. This will need to be taken into consideration as part of the CBA (Cost Benefit Analysis).	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				I agree with the recommendations of continued immediate Monitoring and Management outlined below: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recommend a geophysical study of the shoreline areas is undertaken to examine presence of rock strata that could reduce the erodibility of critical sections over the longer term;</li> <li>• The foreshore reserve area offers a crucial natural buffer against coastal erosion and inundation for coastal assets located landward (houses, roads etc.), as well as providing highly valued public amenity. Active monitoring and nature-based approaches (e.g. coastal revegetation, sand trapping fences) to increase resilience of this foreshore reserve from erosion are strongly recommended. Community groups and local organisations should be included / supported in the delivery of these programs, to provide opportunity to raise awareness and build ownership of the coastal adaptation requirements. Again, I urge the CoGG to consider the tourism impacts to the region and future economic consequences of any policy, particularly the consequences of a Managed Retreat paradigm. Some of the recommended actions will bring about the outcome of 'protection' at a trigger point. The CoGG needs to acknowledge that we are well past trigger points at Whitehill Rd. It is my opinion that the scope of options and actions need to be fully explored, any action/response also include a thorough search for alternative/innovative approaches beyond the list of recommendations. I strongly advise the CoGG look to other adopted approaches in other states where the amenity of the coastal asset is the highest priority. Options such as off-shore artificial reefs to mitigate wave action as the driver of coastal erosion, being just one example. I implore the CoGG seek to preserve the natural amenity and improve tourism potential wherever possible. I ask the CoGG to put on a tourism lens as they view options and consider the CBA (Cost Benefit Analysis). Drummonds needs to be seen as the NORTHERN GATEWAY to Geraldton by the COGG and with protection works along Whitehill Road incorporating the park land behind it could see this transitioned into a tourist area</li> </ul>	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				In response to the statement below: "The initial stages of the Geraldton CHRMAP project involved community and stakeholder engagement and a risk-based assessment, which examined coastal assets under threat from erosion and inundation in future planning timeframes. The outcomes of this initial CHRMAP phase were reported in the Coastal Hazard and Risk Assessment report (Baird 2018)" It is important that the COGG continues to engage with community going forward with the view to avoid at all costs, a fracturing of community. It is an unacceptable outcome that the city takes an approach that 'we know better' and pushes ahead with projects without community buy in and seek to avoid repeating its past mistakes. The DCPA community is well versed in understanding the CHRMAP process and seeking action. This is evidenced by holding the Geraldton Coastal Adaptation Planning Forum in 2014, a partnership between the Drummonds Cove Progress Association and Sunset Beach Coastcare groups. Followed by Application A15220 in 2015 by the Drummond Cove Progress Association (DCPA) for works north of the John Batten Hall. A community action grant in partnership with the CoGG and NACC for the coastal zone north of the John Batten Hall. It needs to be acknowledged that the CoGG has been well aware of the issues north of John Batten Hall/Whitehill Rd, and now need to act to comply with State Planning requirements. Following on from the above data, it is my position to explore specifically the following recommendations from the Baird report: Section 1 & Section 2. Drummond Cove Road to Community Centre & Community Centre to Seacrest Way - I agree with the following: "A coastal protection approach for Drummond Cove north of the Community Hall in front of the closed section of Whitehill Rd warrants further assessment. Multi Criterial Analysis (MCA) and CBA analysis of options considered show a net return on investment on the value of assets protected on the landside is possible. The high value of property at risk of erosion in future planning periods and the values of the coast noted in the Community Engagement process underline the importance of this issue." Following on from the above, further investigate the implementation of the fore dune re-build strategy (Application A15220) for section 1 & 2 to implement a fore dune re-build for both sections 1 & 2. This course of action is reinforced by the Baird report which states: "Nature based approaches to increase resilience of shorelines and foreshore areas (e.g. sand trapping fences, revegetation). Recommended for section north of the Community Hall. CGG led programs supported through grant funding (estimated \$10,000 annually)."	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				I commend the Councillors for not adopting the resolution presented to council in July to re-establish a north south link without the issuance of the Draft CHRMP Report. Now that the report is available I would support reinstatement of White Hill Road (original location) on the provision that any reinstatement carries with it PROTECTION WORKS (not short term) to retain the buffer of the public open space for the benefit of all CoGG visitors and residents, and give comfort to the affected Land Owners and prospective buyers of land / property in years to come. I would suggest that the results of the recent survey regarding the north south link be dismissed as they were strongly influenced by commentary attached to the survey indicating that protection works were not to be considered an option to allow reinstatement in the existing road reserve, which skewed the survey result. This survey should be repeated once CoGG has completed development of CHRMAP Policy which will clearly inform survey respondents as to considered options	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				In response to the economic analysis below: 3.4 Economic Analysis - Adaptation options for Erosion Protection for Whitehill Rd and Community Centre I seek further clarification as to how the fundamentals were calculated to rank these options. Of note, I am of the opinion that Boat Launch Stage 1&2 has a much higher possibility of economic return by introducing a scope of works that has on-going revenue potential and tourism benefits for the whole region more than the other options. For example, an elevated rock sea wall significantly reduces the amenity and could have a negative impact for the community, tourism potential and real-estate investment. However, it will deliver coastal protection. This is an example where the CBA is presented through the lens of economic rationalism and does not consider the data to support the building of a boat ramp and associated protection works. This data appears not to have been taken into consideration in this analysis by Baird and therefore should be re-evaluated to more accurately reflect BCR values.	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				In summary, Coastal erosion and the CoGG's responses over the years indicate knowledge of CHRMAP and that we are now well past the beginning of the journey that this Baird CHRMAP report represents. Its primary lens is 'Managed Retreat' and recommends Managed Retreat. We have passed trigger points that require protection works for section 1 & Section 2. The significant underspend at Beresford should be directed into further coastal protection works at Drummond Cove, Bluff Point and Sunset Beach.	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
147	3/09/2018	4/09/2018	Private submission (x2)	<p>As a resident living on _____, Tarcoola Beach and having another property _____, Mahomets Flats) on the coast which I will be trying to sell as soon as I have finished renovating it I strongly object to the proposed 70a Notification on our titles, mentioned in the report. As stated in the report, Tarcoola Beach has been accreting by approximately 1m per year since the 1940's due to the protection of off-shore reefs and sand migration from the Southgate dunes. As the report notes, this accretion is expected to continue for at least another 50 years according to the current forecasts. I find it preposterous that given we are living on a beach that is actually growing, you propose to classify my properties as at 'moderate risk' and place a 70a notification on my titles, which will significantly impact on re-sale values and future investments where borrowing against the property is required.</p> <p>There is also the mining of the sand at Southgates dunes which concerns me because if this is giving protection along Tarcoola Beach if the mining continues the dunes will continue to disappear at very rapid rate and that being the case what will be the consequences for the coast line along Tarcoola Beach. I have been told the the dunes are no longer a living dune once the sand goes it will not be replaced.</p>	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				The section of Southgate Dunes that is contributing to the supply of sand feeding the beaches north of the dune system is not being mined, and will not be going into the future.		Note the submission



Submission Information				Submission and Comment		
ID	Received	Responded	Submitter	Comment Submission	CGG Comment	Recommendation
				In addition, when I studied the proposed coastal setbacks for 2110, I found that some 95% of my property was indeed behind the rather thick setback line which includes a margin for error. I am greatly concerned that the difference between my property ( ) being classified 'Low Risk' with no 70a title requirements and my current proposed classification is simply down to a margin of error and or the thickness of a line on an overhead photograph. These nuances will likely have significant financial implications which I will fight to prevent. I do note that the report mentions that there is no need in our location to do specific monitoring outside a planned re-evaluation in some 5 years and that a seaward migration of the coastal setback is a possibility if re-assessment is favourable. Surely it makes far greater sense to classify a property as 'low risk' and leave titles free of caveats until there is some evidence that supports such action.	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				Lastly, we were disheartened to read that the studies associated with the production of the aforementioned report were completed between 2015 and 2017 yet approval was granted to build my current residence in 2015 with no mention of potential setback issues or future caveats. Had notification been received at that time, we are certain that my financial outlay may well have been modified. We have built our home as our retirement home and would be looking at reverse mortgage on it to fund our later years retirement having well and truly investing most of our money into the Glendinning home.	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note the submission
				Whilst I agree that erosion is a significant issue for greater Geraldton, I hope that for the sake of well over 100 residents from the southern beachside suburbs of Geraldton who have made significant investments in their properties and in Geraldton itself, that appropriate decisions are made, common sense prevails and the abovementioned issues are rectified.	The coastal hazard maps that cover Tarcoola Beach were completed and made publicly available in February 2017	Note the submission
148	3/09/2018	4/09/2018	Private submission	I recommend changing CHRMAP's advice for coastal hazard and risk assessment from "Managed Retreat" to PROTECT. There are many evidence-based successful technologies for managing coastal hazards and risks. Horrocks, ofr example has a simple wall of geotextile bags working perfectly to protect the coastline. According to CHRMAP's own report adaptation report, each \$1 spent in protection is estimated to return \$2.40 in economic benefits. Bluff Point and Drummonds Have a low reef structure close to the foreshore providing natural portection against the force of the waves. Mirroring the above via artificial reefs made from geotextile fabric sandbags are very effective at limiting (cost-effectively) wave force - as the groynes at St Georges Beach shows - although place these slightly offshore is more effective as there is no eddy (erosion) affect on the north side CHRMAP p24 & 29 indicates that the data for calculation of erosion setbacks and detailed geotechnical dat were based on insufficient data	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				I recommend a geophysical study of the Bluff Point, Drummonds and Sunset shoreline areas, and augmentation of the crucial natural barriers such as the foreshore reserves - plus offshore structures to be put in place providing PROTECTION as opposed to CHRMAP's recommendations of managed retreat. p105 - 15.1.3 Managed Retreat Pathway. Of the 3 pathways for managed retreat the 3rd option of "protect" has been identified to have the least cost, risk and the biggest reward to the community and stakeholders. I recommended the City position itself as an innovator in climate change response, utilising the best of the proven coastal protection technologies. Geraldton is of a population size and a geographical location of position it well to receive State and National funding for showcasing innovative strategies to protect both its coastline, its community and its economy. Litigation through class action is a very real possibility faced by CGG from ratepayers whose properties are effectively abandoned by the City. Instead of litigation, CGG can position itself to be a CELEBRATION of innovative responses to climate change through the PROTECTION of its communities' assets including private property.	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
149	3/09/2018	4/09/2018	Private submission	I have been able to download a submission form. I live in Drummond Cove and I am concerned about the future inundation of potential properties. In the whithill area where there is road loss and devastating erosion why not continue the Rockwall. If 1.5 to 2 metre high seaweed can hold back the ocean as it was last few weeks then surely a rock wall continuing may do the same or even an artificial reef. Make our coastline beautiful again please, we love our suburb its just shameful that its in that state and I am thinking the CGG are forgetting us to beautify the Chapman road frontage.	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
150	3/09/2018	4/09/2018	Private submission	I have participated in the process and waited along with many other residents in the area, to see the outcome of the CHRMAP process. The CGG and other government entities have long told us nothing can be progressed until the CHRMAP Report is released. I intend to keep my comments relatively brief and to the point, as I do not expect that there will be great attention placed on vague references and sentiments. Hence the reader should interpret my submission on that basis. My specific location-southern end of . The report quotes an historic erosion rate of 0.4M annually. I would strongly dispute this figure, I have lived there for 10 years and can categorically state that the section from the Surfside Terrace carparks has not changed 4 meters in that period, nor even 1 meter. It is very easy to quantify due to the unique reef line in the area. I have had a mooring in the area for around 10 years, and it is pretty much unusable in an area which supposedly eroded 4 meters due to sand accretion yet according to the CHRMAP author's data it should be 4 meters further from the shoreline? Table 6.2-quote "Seawall has been in place since approximately 2014 to protect against erosion. The CGG has not committed to long-term protection, but the structure is estimated to continue to offer protection from erosion over the next 10 years." This is a laughable statement and goes a long way toward showing either a lazy or biased report. This wall is by far the most significant factor in either the cause or exacerbation of the worst erosion by far. Why is this written in such a manner in the CHRMAP sections that are easily noticed, but the truth buried deeper? Boat Ramp option Much work and public consultation has gone into the option of combining a boat launch facility into a solution for the current and most urgent works required. This has been ignored, effectively giving the CGG an easy out for not doing anything in this regard. It is not really a surprise now why the CGG has dragged its feet for so long on the subject? Accommodate or the "Do Nothing" option...Most residents in the SCA will understand at least the need for action of some sort. However the implications of placing 70A notifications on titles are not clear. Will insurance companies no longer take on ANY risk on such properties? Will CGG take into account the greatly decreased property values as a consequence towards rates payable?	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				Referencing the Coastal Planning Community Survey Report January 2018, particularly pages 4 and 5, the whole of our community and tourists alike considers the beaches and associated coastal strip of paramount importance to their lifestyle and enjoyment. Our attraction to tourists both internationally and locally in WA is our outdoor orientated climate, wind and surf and those tourism potentials into the economics that benefit community benefit everyone. During the community consultation phase of CHRMAP, the data clearly demonstrates that the Geraldton community at large values the beaches and foreshore of the municipality of Geraldton above all other assets. This view must expand to include all people in the entire region of the CofGG jurisdiction. Including, residents from the Shire of Chapman Valley who also enjoy the foreshore areas, particularly the connection to Drummond Cove. It is too narrow a perspective to view this CHRMAP report through the lens of only those residents living within coastal processes setback lines as affected.	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				In response to the overall recommendations: 1. I of Drummond Cove WA 6532 reject some of the recommendations of Managed Retreat. The CofGG has adopted the strategy of Managed Retreat for many years now in the absence of hazard mapping and CHRMAP reports and policy. This has resulted in trigger points being passed that have lost assets in Drummond Cove and I urge the CofGG to now act. It is not acceptable to me that the CHRMAP report is a justification for adopting Managed Retreat from this point forward as the CofGG has been well aware and has obligations under the Planning Act to land owners. I recommend that the CofGG explore with the DCPA and Drummond Cove Community via community consultation the CBA (Cost Benefit Analysis) of immediate strategies now, and longer term. Community consultation is essential to prevent further fracturing of community over the issue of coastal erosion. It is important to consider the Western Australian legislative framework that would result from voluntary or compulsory acquisition. Case law pertaining to compulsory acquisition judgments indicates that values paid usually far exceed current market value due to Courts also awarding on-costs like removal expenses and legal costs. 2. I recommend a 'Protect' approach (Pr1-7):The values of the properties within the report are significantly understated given current market value, this needs to be clarified. Second, sufficient justification exists for permanent solutions of development oncoastal land areas that are available to buffer areas 'at risk from coastal erosion and inundation. I propose coastal protection works in zone 1 & 2 as there is a need to preserve the Drummond Cove foreshore areas for all people in the CofGG. The CofGG should explore, with the direct involvement of community, protection works that consider public access, public safety, property and infrastructure as our coastal lifestyle is not expendable.	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				In response to the following recommendation: Require Section 70A notification to be placed on titles to alert prospective purchasers to the risk of coastal erosion and / or inundation. I recommend that the CofGG undertake immediately Geophysical studies of all the shoreline areas to examine presence of rock strata that could reduce the erodibility of critical sections over the longer term (estimate \$25,000) and apply that data to the setback lines to create an accurate representation of setback lines. The current setbacks are not accurate, specific height differences in adjacent areas not affected by setback lines indicate a broad-brush approach with significant perceived financial implications at stake. I understand that the purpose of this study is to provide 'scope of works' recommendations. However, more detailed data gathering is necessary that includes analysis of rock strata within the setbacks and accurate elevations to be included. This is essential before any 70A notifications be placed on titles as a policy directive. It is a risk that 70A clauses on titles as recommended by such abroad-based 110 year timeframe and policy approach, the historical data doesn't even exist to provide certainty to the lines as they are currently presented. This will need to be taken into consideration as part of the CBA (Cost Benefit Analysis).	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				I agree with the recommendations of continued immediate Monitoring and Management outlined below: Recommend a geophysical study of the shoreline areas is undertaken to examine presence of rock strata that could reduce the erodibility of critical sections over the longer term; The foreshore reserve area offers a crucial natural buffer against coastal erosion and inundation for coastal assets located landward (houses, roads etc), as well as providing highly valued public amenity. Active monitoring and nature-based approaches (e.g. coastal revegetation, sand trapping fences) to increase resilience of this foreshore reserve from erosion are strongly recommended. Community groups and local organisations should be included / supported in the delivery of these programs, to provide opportunity to raise awareness and build ownership of the coastal adaptation requirements. Again, I urge the CofGG to consider the tourism impacts to the region and future economic consequences of any policy, particularly the consequences of a purely Managed Retreat paradigm. Some of the recommended actions will inevitably bring about the outcome of 'protection' at future trigger points. The CofGG needs to acknowledge that we are well past trigger points along Whitehill Rd, Drummond Cove. It is my opinion that the scope of options and actions need to be fully explored with community, any action/response also include a thorough search for alternative/innovative approaches beyond the list of recommendations PR1-6. I strongly advise the CofGG look to other adopted approaches in other states and countries where the amenity of the coastal asset has been the highest priority. Options such as off-shore artificial reefs to mitigate wave action as the driver of coastal erosion, being just one example. As per State Planning Policy 2.6, Community consultation at every step of the way is recommended. The CofGG should seek to preserve the natural amenity.	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				In response to the statement below: 1. "The initial stages of the Geraldton CHRMAP project involved community and stakeholder engagement and a risk-based assessment, which examined coastal assets under threat from erosion and inundation in future planning timeframes. The outcomes of this initial CHRMAP phase were reported in the Coastal Hazard and Risk Assessment report (Baird 2018)" It is important that the CofGG continues to engage with community going forward with the view to avoid at all costs, a fracturing of community. It is an unacceptable outcome that the city takes an approach that 'we know better' and pushes ahead with projects without community buy in and seek to avoid repeating its past mistakes at Drummond Cove. The DCPA community is well versed in understanding the CHRMAP process and seeking action. This is evidenced by holding the Geraldton Coastal Adaptation Planning Forum in 2014, a partnership between the Drummonds Cove Progress Association and Sunset Beach Coast care groups. Followed by Application A15220 in 2015 by the Drummond Cove Progress Association (DCPA) for works north of the John Batten Hall to respond to coastal erosion. A community action grant was applied for to the Dept. of Transport in partnership with the CofGG and NACC for the coastal zone north of the John Batten Hall. It needs to be acknowledged that the CofGG has been well aware of the issues north of John Batten Hall/Whitehill Rd. and now need to act. Section 1& Section 2. Drummond Cove Road to Community Centre & Community Centre to Seacrest Way- I agree with the following: "A coastal protection approach for Drummond Cove north of the Community Hall in front of the closed section of Whitehill Rd warrants further assessment. MCA and CBA analysis of options considered show a net return on investment on the value of assets protected on the landside is possible. The high value of property at risk of erosion in future planning periods and the values of the coast noted in the Community Engagement process underline the importance of this issue." Following on from the above, I would like to see the CofGG re-visit the fore dune re-build strategy (Application A15220) for section 1& 2. This course of action is reinforced by the Baird report which states: "Nature based approaches to increase resilience of shorelines and foreshore areas (eg sand trapping fences, revegetation). Recommended for section north of the Community Hall. CGG led programs supported through grant funding (\$10,000 annually)."	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission

Submission Information				Submission and Comment		
ID	Received	Responded	Submitter	Comment Submission	CGG Comment	Recommendation
				I would like the CofGG to adopt the resolution pre north south link reinstated in it's original position. structure as part of the road base works. Future proofing this area by building a below ground seawall will provide the necessary peace of mind to the entire community. Second, adjust the detailed plans to include creation of a natural buffer DCPA Coast care group, NACC and the CofGG short/medium/long term approach and the recommendations are there to do so. This scope of works can be acted on immediately.	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				In response to the economic analysis below 3.4 Economic Analysis – Adaptation options for Erosion Protection for Whitehill Rd and Community Centre. Negative impact on the community. Tourism potential will be diminished and real-estate investment impacted. However, such an approach will deliver coastal protection. This is an example of where CBA is presented too narrowly through the lens of economic rationalism and does not consider other data to support the building of a boat ramp into associated protection works. Abrohlos Island access and northern boat launching access appears not to have been taken into consideration in this analysis by the Baird report and therefore should be re-evaluated to more accurately reflect BCR values.	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				In summary, Coastal erosion and the CofGG's responses over the years indicate a knowledge of CHRMAP and from the Drummond Cove perspective, we are now well past the beginning of the journey that this Baird CHRMAP report represents. In closing, The significant underspend at Beresford for coastal protection works should be re-directed into coastal protection works at Drummond Cove, Bluff Point and Sunset Beach. It is State Govt. money (our taxes) that paid for Beresford, there were no rate rises recommended for them in the Baird report. Furthermore, there are no recommendations for 70A's clauses to be put on titles and no user pays scheme recommended for those landowners. Any policy that adopts the Baird recommendations will need to consider this carefully.	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
152	2/09/2018	4/09/2018	Private submission	Referencing the Coastal Planning Community Survey Report January 2018, particularly pages 4 and 5, the whole of our community and tourists alike considers the beaches and associated coastal strip of paramount importance to their lifestyle and enjoyment. Our attraction to tourists both internationally and locally in WA is our outdoor orientated climate, wind and surf and those tourism potentials into the economics that benefit community benefit everyone. During the community consultation phase of CHRMAP, the data clearly demonstrates that the Greater Geraldton community at large values the beaches and foreshore of the municipality of Greater Geraldton above all other assets. This view must expand to include all people in the entire region of the City of Greater Geraldton (COGG) jurisdiction. Including, residents from the Shire of Chapman Valley who also enjoy the foreshore areas, particularly the connection to Drummond Cove. It is too narrow a perspective to view this CHRMAP report through a lens of only those residents living within coastal processes setback lines as affected.	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				In response to the overall recommendations: 1. I _____ reject the recommendations of Managed Retreat. The COGG has adopted the strategy of Managed Retreat for many years now in the absence of a hazard mapping and CHRMAP reports. It has passed trigger points that have lost assets in Drummond Cove and must now act. It is not acceptable that the CHRMAP report is a justification for adopting Managed Retreat from this point forward as the COGG has been aware and has obligations under the Planning Act to land owners. I recommend that the COGG explore with the DCPA via community consultation the CBA (Cost Benefit Analysis) of strategies now, short term and long term. Considering under the Western Australian legislative framework voluntary or compulsory acquisition is based on the value of the land and its improvements. Case law pertaining to compulsory acquisition judgments indicates that values paid usually far exceed current market value due to Courts also awarding on-costs like removal expenses and legal costs. 2. I recommend a 'Protect' approach (Pr1-7): The values of the properties within the report are significantly understated given current market value. Second, sufficient justification exists for permanent solutions development on coastal land areas that are available to buffer areas, at risk from coastal erosion and inundation. I, _____ propose coastal protection works as there is a need to preserve the Greater Geraldton foreshore areas for all people in the COGG. The COGG should explore, with the direct involvement of community, protection works that consider public access, public safety, property and infrastructure as our coastal lifestyle is not expendable.	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				In response to the following recommendations: Require Section 70A notification to be placed on titles to alert prospective purchasers to the risk of coastal erosion and / or inundation. I recommend that the COGG undertake immediately Geophysical studies of all the shoreline areas to examine presence of rock strata that could reduce the erodibility of critical sections over the longer term (estimate \$25,000) and apply that data to the setback lines to create an accurate representation of setback lines. The current setbacks do not fit with specific height differences in adjacent areas not affected by setback lines indicating a broad-brush approach with significant financial implications at stake. I understand that the purpose of this study is to provide scope of works recommendations. However, more detailed information is necessary that includes analysis of rock strata within the setbacks and accurate elevations to be included. This is essential before any 70A notifications be placed on titles. I advise caution to the COGG to avoid possible class action under the state planning act. Which will be triggered by a broad-based policy approach that de-values land by placing 70A notifications on titles. Such action as applying 70A's will require the COGG to consider the legal costs associated with lengthy process of legal action. This will need to be taken into consideration as part of the CBA (Cost Benefit Analysis).	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				I agree with the recommendations of continued immediate Monitoring and Management outlined below: Recommend a geophysical study of the shoreline areas is undertaken to examine presence of rock strata that could reduce the erodibility of critical sections over the longer term; The foreshore reserve area offers a crucial natural buffer against coastal erosion and inundation for coastal assets located landward (houses, roads etc), as well as providing highly valued public amenity. Active monitoring and nature-based approaches (e.g. coastal revegetation, sand trapping fences) to increase resilience of this foreshore reserve from erosion are strongly recommended. Community groups and local organisations should be included / supported in the delivery of these programs, to provide opportunity to raise awareness and build ownership of the coastal adaptation requirements. Again, I urge the COGG to consider the tourism impacts to the region and future economic consequences of any policy, particularly the consequences of a Managed Retreat paradigm Some of the recommended actions will bring about the outcome of 'protection' at a trigger point. The COGG needs to acknowledge that we are well past trigger points at Whitehill Rd in Drummonds Cove. It is my opinion that the scope of options and actions need to be fully explored, any action/response also include a thorough search for alternative/innovative approaches beyond the list of recommendations. I strongly advise the COGG look to other adopted approaches in other states where the amenity of the coastal asset is the highest priority. Options such as off-shore artificial reefs to mitigate wave action as the driver of coastal erosion, being just one example. I implore the COGG seek to preserve the natural amenity and improve tourism potential wherever possible. I ask the COGG to put on a tourism lens as they view options and consider the CBA (Cost Benefit Analysis).	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				In response to the statement below: 1. "The initial stages of the Geraldton CHRMAP project involved community and stakeholder engagement and a risk-based assessment, which examined coastal assets under threat from erosion and inundation in future planning timeframes. The outcomes of this initial CHRMAP phase were reported in the Coastal Hazard and Risk Assessment report (Baird 2018)" It is important that the COGG continues to engage with community going forward with the view to avoid at all costs, a fracturing of community. It is an unacceptable outcome that the City takes an approach that 'we know better' and pushes ahead with projects without community buy in and seek to avoid repeating it's past mistakes. The DCPA community is well versed in understanding the CHRMAP process and seeking action. This is evidenced by holding the Geraldton Coastal Adaptation Planning Forum in 2014, a partnership between the Drummonds Cove Progress Association and Sunset Beach Coastcare groups. Followed by Application A15220 in 2015 by the Drummond Cove Progress Association (DCPA) for works north of the John Batten Hall. A community action grant in partnership with the COGG and NACC for the coastal zone north of the John Batten Hall. It needs to be acknowledged that the COGG has been well aware of the issues north of John Batten Hall/Whitehill Rd. and now need to act to comply with State Planning requirements. Following on from the above data, it is my position to explore specifically the following recommendations from the Baird report: Section 1 & Section 2. Drummond Cove Road to Community Centre & Community Centre to Seacrest Way - I agree with the following: "A coastal protection approach for Drummond Cove north of the Community Hall in front of the closed section of Whitehill Rd warrants further assessment. MCA and CBA analysis of options considered show a net return on investment on the value of assets protected on the landside is possible. The high value of property at risk of erosion in future planning periods and the values of the coast noted in the Community Engagement process underline the importance of this issue. Following on from the above, implement the foredune re-build strategy (Application A15220) for section 1 & 2 to implement a foredune re-build for both sections 1 & 2. This course of action is reinforced by the Baird report which states: "Nature based approaches to increase resilience of shorelines and foreshore areas (e.g. sand trapping fences, revegetation). Recommended for section north of the Community Hall. CGG led programs supported through grant funding (estimated \$10,000 annually)."	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				I would like the COGG to adopt the resolution presented to council in July to re-establish a north south link and adjust the associated, planned works to reference CHRMAP and DCPA recommendations. Second, adjust any detailed plans to include creation of a natural buffer as planned in A15220 by the DCPA Coastcare group and NACC concept stage from 2015. Implement the above as a short/medium term approach and improve the amenity as this scope of works can be acted on immediately.	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				In response to the economic analysis below: 3.4 Economic Analysis - Adaptation options for Erosion Protection for Whitehill Rd and Community Centre. I seek further clarification as to how the fundamentals were calculated to rank these options. Of note, I am of the opinion that Boat Launch Stage 1&2 has a much higher possibility of economic return by introducing a scope of works that has on-going revenue potential and tourism benefits for the whole region more than the other options. For example, an elevated rock sea wall significantly reduces the amenity and could have a negative impact for the community, tourism potential and real-estate investment. However, it will deliver coastal protection. This is an example where the CBA is presented through the lens of economic rationalism and does not consider the data to support the building of a boat ramp and associated protection works. This data appears not to have been taken into consideration in this analysis by Baird and therefore should be re-evaluated to more accurately reflect BCR values.	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				In summary, Coastal erosion and the COGG's responses over the years indicate a knowledge of CHRMAP and that we are now well past the beginning of the journey that this Baird CHRMAP report represents. It's primary lens is 'Managed Retreat' and recommends Managed Retreat. We have passed trigger points that require protection works for section 1 & Section 2. The significant underspend at Beresford should be directed into further coastal protection works at Drummond Cove, Bluff Point and Sunset Beach.	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
				Questions to COGG Council 1. Why does the City consider managed retreat the preferred option? 2. What protection options have the City investigated? 3. What is the cost difference overtime between protecting our coastline and managed retreat?	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note the submission
153	2/09/2018	4/09/2018	Private submission (x2)	A copy of the report (whether hard copy or electronic copy) was not distributed to the applicable property owners and as such we had no notification that the Council would be making decisions on matters that may severely impact the value of our properties and the lifestyles of the residents. We found out by word of mouth. As landowners and long term residents the issues outlined in the report are very concerning and we expect due diligence by the Council to take all measures required to mitigate any issues associated with the erosion and rising sea levels to ensure minimal negative impact to the residents and also the Geraldton community who utilise the coastline for recreational and commercial purposes.	The development of the Geraldton CHRMAP report has had extensive community consultation. Community consultation will continue throughout the CHRMAP process.	Note the submission
				Some maps and charts don't appear to be consistent in relation to individual properties. For example inundation levels in Kempton St do not appear to be as far reaching as erosion. Our understanding is that if the erosion occurs, then the inundation would follow in due course. We support the "Accommodate" and "Protection" adoption pathways for all CMU'S with each area being important to the individual affected.	The coastal erosion and coastal inundation hazard maps have been calculated in accordance with the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy	Note the submission
				Recommendations and suggestions of managed retreat, avoid, buyback and 70A Imposition cannot be considered. These options will have negative impacts on investment and result in large declines in asset values. The coastline and beaches of Geraldton are what attract people to the region. Without their the region has little to offer and should they be lost the entire community will suffer massive negative impacts on their lifestyles and financial situations. As previously stated the coastline and beaches of Geraldton are what attract people to the region and therefore managed retreat, avoid, buyback and 70A Imposition must not be implemented. The Council has a legal accountability and duty to take all measures required to mitigate any issues associated with the erosion and rising sea levels to ensure minimal negative impact to the residents and users of the coastline areas.	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission

Submission Information				Submission and Comment		
ID	Received	Responded	Submitter	Comment Submission	CGG Comment	Recommendation
154	3/09/2018	4/09/2018	Private submission	<p>Please find following my response to the recently released draft CHRMAP report. I have addressed areas within the report that I feel are important. I am disappointed that the CoGG has not held any PUBLIC OPEN FORUMS to work through the report with the General Public. I do acknowledge that the CoGG is short staffed however I believe it is warranted for forums to have been held to assist the community in making educated decisions. I am comforted that recent media reports state that the Mayor has indicated the Public will be consulted through the CoGG policy development process on CHRMAP. To give the reader (s) a better understanding of my thinking I have included the following to assist; I am 52 years of age and married. We moved to Geraldton in 2013 and rented in Stillwater Avenue, Drummond Cove for 6 months before purchasing our home at _____ Drummond Cove. Both my wife and I are full time employed and are working towards our retirement. Part of our plan incorporated buying our home in Drummonds due to the quiet lifestyle and coastal amenities that it held for us. At the time we made our financial commitment to our house we had a road along Whitehill Road, several parking bays along it, gazebo and a sand hill in front of all of these assets. Over the past 5 1/2 years we have seen the CoGG allow these to be taken by the ocean without any means of PROTECTION measures put in place. This has now seen our house price along with others in the area de-value and will continue to de-value unless the CoGG adopt a policy that is based on PROTECTION of assets. What once was a vibrant community is now disenchanting and I have seen the demeanour of friends / neighbours who have made significant financial investment in the area change dramatically. Stress levels and emotions are running high on this issue. I implore the CoGG and Councillors to act empathically and put themselves in the shoes of affected residents and work towards a PROTECTION policy for the North side of Batten Hall (White Hill Road), in consultation with affected home owners. The CoGG and State Government have acknowledged in the past that the rocking of Batten Hall has exacerbated the erosion effect on the North side of the hall. I feel that it is totally unjust for house / land owners to now bear the brunt, both financially and emotionally, of past mistakes made CoGG. Whilst we cannot change the past the CoGG needs to work towards remediating the problem. The CoGG has been happy to collect rates and taxes all through the process. Should the City not enact a PROTECTION policy for the North side of Batten Hall which provides the comfort for me that our house will not devalue (due to CoGG works) I will be left with no alternative but to seek Legal advice. Sections in Blue are copied from the CHRMAP report for reference:</p> <p>Referencing the Coastal Planning Community Survey Report January 2018, particularly pages 4 and 5, the whole of our community and tourists alike considers the beaches and associated coastal strip of paramount importance to their lifestyle and enjoyment. Our attraction to tourists both internationally and locally in WA is our outdoor orientated climate, wind and surf and those tourism potentials into the economics that benefit community benefit everyone. During the community consultation phase of CHRMAP, the data clearly demonstrates that the Geraldton community at large values the beaches and foreshore of the municipality of Geraldton above all other assets. This view must expand to include all people in the entire region of the CoGG jurisdiction. Including, residents from the Shire of Chapman Valley who also enjoy the foreshore areas, particularly the connection to Drummond Cove. It is too narrow a perspective to view this CHRMAP report through a lens of only those residents living within coastal processes setback lines as affected.</p> <p>In response to the overall recommendations: I _____ reject the recommendations of Managed Retreat. The CoGG has adopted the strategy of Managed Retreat for many years now in the absence of a hazard mapping and CHRMAP reports. It has passed trigger points that have lost assets in Drummond Cove and must now act. It is not acceptable that the CHRMAP report is a justification for adopting Managed Retreat from this point forward as the CoGG has been aware and has obligations under the Planning Act to land owners. I recommend that the CoGG explore, IN CONJUNCTION WITH LANDOWNERS and the DCPA via community consultation the CBA (Cost Benefit Analysis) of strategies now, short term and long term. Considering under the Western Australian legislative framework voluntary or compulsory acquisition is based on the value of the land and its improvements. Case law pertaining to compulsory acquisition judgments indicates that values paid usually far exceed current market value due to Courts also awarding on-costs like removal expenses and legal costs. There is enough evidence from other areas around Australia where City / Local Councils have made ill informed decisions regarding the property of LANDOWNERS and this has resulted in individual / class action against Council / Councillors. This is an area everyone both the COGG and Landowners wish to avoid. I recommend a 'Protect' approach (Pr1-7): The values of the properties within the report are significantly understated given current market value. Second, sufficient justification exists for permanent solutions development on coastal land areas that are available to buffer areas at risk from coastal erosion and inundation. I _____ propose coastal protection works as there is a need to preserve the Drummond Cove foreshore areas for all people in the CoGG. The CoGG should explore, with the direct involvement of community, protection works that consider public access, public safety, property and infrastructure as our coastal lifestyle is not expendable.</p> <p>In response to the following recommendations: Require Section 70A notification to be placed on titles to alert prospective purchasers of the risk of coastal erosion and / or inundation. I recommend that the CoGG undertake immediately Geophysical studies of all the shoreline areas to examine presence of rock strata that could reduce the erodibility of critical sections over the longer term (estimate \$25,000) and apply that data to the setback lines to create an accurate representation of setback lines. The current setbacks do not fit with specific height differences in adjacent areas not affected by setback lines indicating a broad-brush approach with significant financial implications at stake. I understand that the purpose of this study is to provide scope of works recommendations. However, more detailed information is necessary that includes analysis of rock strata within the setbacks and accurate elevations to be included. This is essential before any 70A notifications be placed on titles. I advise caution to the CoGG to avoid possible class action under the state planning act, which will be triggered by a broad-based policy approach that de-values land by placing 70A notifications on titles. Such action as applying 70A's will require the CoGG to consider the legal costs associated with lengthy process of legal action. This will need to be taken into consideration as part of the CBA (Cost Benefit Analysis):</p> <p>I agree with the recommendations of continued immediate Monitoring and Management outlined below: Recommend a geophysical study of the shoreline areas is undertaken to examine presence of rock strata that could reduce the erodibility of critical sections over the longer term; The foreshore reserve area offers a crucial natural buffer against coastal erosion and inundation for coastal assets located landward (houses, roads etc.), as well as providing highly valued public amenity. Active monitoring and nature- based approaches (e.g. coastal revegetation, sand trapping fences) to increase resilience of this foreshore reserve from erosion are strongly recommended. Community groups and local organisations should be included / supported in the delivery of these programs, to provide opportunity to raise awareness and build ownership of the coastal adaptation requirements. Again, I urge the CoGG to consider the tourism impacts to the region and future economic consequences of any policy, particularly the consequences of a Managed Retreat paradigm. Some of the recommended actions will bring about the outcome of 'protection' at a trigger point. The CoGG needs to acknowledge that we are well past trigger points at Whitehill Rd. It is my opinion that the scope of options and actions need to be fully explored, any action/response also include a thorough search for alternative/innovative approaches beyond the list of recommendations. I strongly advise the CoGG look to other adopted approaches in other states where the amenity of the coastal asset is the highest priority. Options such as off-shore artificial reefs to mitigate wave action as the driver of coastal erosion, being just one example. I implore the CoGG seek to preserve the natural amenity and improve tourism potential wherever possible. I ask the CoGG to put on a tourism lens as they view options and consider the CBA (Cost Benefit Analysis). Drummonds needs to be seen as the NORTHERN GATEWAY to Geraldton by the COGG and with protection works along Whitehill Road incorporating the park land behind it could see this transitioned into a tourist area.</p> <p>In response to the statement below: 1. "The initial stages of the Geraldton CHRMAP project involved community and stakeholder engagement and a risk-based assessment, which examined coastal assets under threat from erosion and inundation in future planning timeframes. The outcomes of this initial CHRMAP phase were reported in the Coastal Hazard and Risk Assessment report (Baird 2018)" It is important that the COGG continues to engage with community going forward with the view to avoid at all costs, a fracturing of community. It is an unacceptable outcome that the city takes an approach that 'we know better' and pushes ahead with projects without community buy in and seek to avoid repeating it's past mistakes. The DCPA community is well versed in understanding the CHRMAP process and seeking action. This is evidenced by holding the Geraldton Coastal Adaptation Planning Forum in 2014, a partnership between the Drummonds Cove Progress Association and Sunset Beach Coastcare groups. Followed by Application A15220 in 2015 by the Drummond Cove Progress Association (DCPA) for works north of the John Batten Hall. A community action grant in partnership with the CoGG and NACC for the coastal zone north of the John Batten Hall. It needs to be acknowledged that the CoGG has been well aware of the issues north of John Batten Hall/Whitehill Rd. and now need to act to comply with State Planning requirements. Following on from the above data, it is my position to explore specifically the following recommendations from the Baird report: Section 1 &amp; Section 2. Drummond Cove Road to Community Centre &amp; Community Centre to Seacrest Way — I agree with the following: "A coastal protection approach for Drummond Cove north of the Community Hall in front of the closed section of Whitehill Rd warrants further assessment. Multi Criterial Analysis (MCA) and CBA analysis of options considered show a net return on investment on the value of assets protected on the landside is possible. The high value of property at risk of erosion in future planning periods and the values of the coast noted in the Community Engagement process underline the importance of this issue. Following on from the above, implement the fore dune re-build strategy (Application A15220) for section 1 &amp; 2 to implement a fore dune re-build for both sections 1 &amp; 2. This course of action is reinforced by the Baird report which states: "Nature based approaches to increase resilience of shorelines and foreshore areas (e.g. sand trapping fences, revegetation. Recommended for section north of the Community Hall. CGG led programs supported through grant funding (estimated \$10,000 annually).</p> <p>I commend the Councillors for not adopting the resolution presented to council in July to re- establish a north south link without the issuance of the Draft CHRMAP Report. Now that the report is available I would support reinstatement of White Hill Road (original location) on the provision that any reinstatement carries with it PROTECTION WORKS (not short term) to give comfort to the affected Land Owners and prospective buyers of land / <u>property in years to come</u>.</p> <p>In response to the economic analysis below: 3.4 Economic Analysis - Adaptation options for Erosion Protection for Whitehill Rd and Community Centre I seek further clarification as to how the fundamentals were calculated to rank these options. Of note, I am of the opinion that Boat Launch Stage 1&amp;2 has a much higher possibility of economic return by introducing a scope of works that has on-going revenue potential and tourism benefits for the whole region more than the other options. For example, an elevated rock sea wall significantly reduces the amenity and could have a negative impact for the community, tourism potential and real-estate investment. However, it will deliver coastal protection. This is an example where the CBA is presented through the lens of economic rationalism and does not consider the data to support the building of a boat ramp and associated protection works. This data appears not to have been taken into consideration in this analysis by Baird and therefore should be re-evaluated to more accurately reflect BCR values.</p> <p>In summary, Coastal erosion and the CoGG's responses over the years indicate knowledge of CHRMAP and that we are now well past the beginning of the journey that this Baird CHRMAP report represents. Its primary lens is 'Managed Retreat' and recommends Managed Retreat. We have passed trigger points that require protection works for section 1 &amp; Section 2. The significant underspend at Beresford should be directed into further coastal <u>protection works at Drummond Cove, Bluff Point and Sunset Beach</u>.</p>	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
					Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
					Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
					Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
					Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
					Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
					Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
					Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
					Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
					Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
155	3/09/2018		Main Roads WA	<p>Table 10.2: Coastal Adaptation Strategies – Addressing Risks on page 77 for the Asset named 'John Willcock Link' states the Owner is the 'CGG'. John Willcock Link and road reserve is a State road managed and controlled by Main Roads WA, and therefore the table should be corrected.</p> <p>For Point Moore CMU7 and Beachlands CMU8, John Willcock Link is within the coastal erosion setback in the forecast 2070 to 2110 period between Grey's Beach and Separation Point. Under Table 9.3:Adaptation Options on page 71 and Table 10.3:Adaptation Options on page 79 under erosion for the Asset named 'Roads' is Managed Retreat. Under Table 10.1:Coastal Adaptation Strategies–Long Term Pathways for assets in the Beachlands CMU on page 76 for John Willcock Link is to Monitor from now to 2070-2080 and Managed Retreat from 2080-2090 onwards for erosion. Managed Retreat of John Willcock Link which forms part of the transport infrastructure corridor to the Geraldton Port needs to be considered in the preparation of the Geraldton Port Master Plan outlook to 2050. Also, further review of the asset's level of service with the appropriate State <u>government agencies would be required in the future</u></p> <p>For Tarcoola Beach CMU10, Glendinning Road and the first line of properties along the road are sited as within the coastal erosion setback line in the forecast 2070 to 2110 period. Under Table 12.1: Coastal Adaptation Strategies–Long Term Pathways for assets in the Tarcoola Beach CMU on page 88 for Glendinning Road is to Monitor from now to 2070-2080 and Managed Retreat from 2080-2090 onwards for erosion. Managed Retreat of Glendinning Road may result in the cul-de-sacs adjacent to the Brand Highway road reserve to be opened as an alternative access. Further review would need to consider if these arrangements are possible and the land <u>required</u>.</p> <p>Further consideration of the ultimate road width required for the Brand Highway where it runs parallel to Glendinning Road. This will need to include if there will be a footpath and allow for future utility services and <u>relocation of potential utility services from Glendinning Road reserve to the Brand Highway road reserve</u>.</p>	Agreed	Uphold submission. The Final Geraldton CHRMAP Report will reflect asset ownership of John Willcock Link as Main Roads WA
					The City will assist Main Roads WA in this matter	Note the submission
					Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
					The City will assist Main Roads WA in this matter	Note the submission



Submission Information				Submission and Comment		
ID	Received	Responded	Submitter	Comment Submission	CGG Comment	Recommendation
				<p>Undertaking modelling to consider the impacts of the additional access points into the upcoming review of Brand Highway and undertaking a predictive assessment to indicate whether Brand Highway would no longer be under Main Roads control in the future.</p> <p>The report recognises that the risk to Chapman Road increases in the future. The road is currently a significant route into Geraldton CBD and in the event that the protection of the road became too costly, the North West Coastal Highway (NWC) may become the closest north south route to the coast. If or when there is evidence of this event occurring, land, transport and infrastructure planning should be considered for the NWC road corridor and surrounds.</p> <p>The report mentions that a separate study is being undertaken to consider the Chapman River catchment flooding levels. Main Roads are interested in understanding if there are any significant changes likely to the river upstream where the road bridges are located, considering combined events associated with the ocean and river during the identified periods in the report.</p> <p>Main Roads would be interested to know if a separate report to consider Greenough River catchment flooding levels may be undertaken by the City of Greater Geraldton for similar reasons to the Chapman River, on any significant changes to the river upstream.</p>	The City will assist Main Roads WA in this matter	Note the submission
					The City will assist Main Roads WA in this matter	Note the submission
					The City is undertaking a study of the Chapman River catchment flooding levels. The City will assist Main Roads WA in this matter	Note the submission
					The City is undertaking a study of the Greenough River catchment flooding. The City will assist Main Roads WA in this matter	Note the submission
156	10/09/2018		Department of Primary Industries and Regional Development	The plan has subdivided the coast north and south of Geraldton into Coastal Management Units and undertaken a risk assessment for each for unit in terms of coastal erosion and inundation across a range of man-made and natural assets present in each unit. The methodology used is evidence based, involving multiple criteria analysis of spatial data sets as well as community consultation to determine the community's value of the assets in each of the units. DPIRD does not raise any objections to the planning report.	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
157	3/09/2018	20/11/2018	Private submission	<p>I thank the City of Greater Geraldton (the City) for the opportunity to lodge submissions regarding the Coastal Hazard and Risk Assessment Report. I applaud the Council of the City for their foresight in taking on the contentious subject of climate change on the environmental, economic, social and cultural resources of our coastline. As is evident from the Coastal Planning Community Survey Report January 2018 A.2, at pages 4 and 5 that the wider community considers the beaches and associated coastal strip of paramount importance to their lifestyle and enjoyment. The quantum of State and Local Government investment in their quality assets located adjacent to the shoreline is testimony to their recognition of the importance of the beach to the greater community. The wider community's lifestyle and attractions are not expendable. Within the CHRMAP Report Appendices at A.7 Geraldton Economic Framework, page 3 table 2 the cost to the entire community for the acquisition of the residential properties, to facilitate Managed Retreat, over the timeframe of the report is \$333,000,000.00. The values of the properties within the report are significantly understated given current market value. A vacant lot on Kempton Street recently sold for \$550,000 and now a significant house has been built on that lot. Table 2 values that property at \$462,000. Therefore, it is not inconceivable that the actual cost of acquiring land could be more than doubled to at least \$700,000,000. Under the Western Australian legislative framework voluntary or compulsory acquisition is based on the value of the land and its improvements. Case law pertaining to compulsory acquisition judgments indicates that values paid usually far exceed current market value due to Courts also awarding on-costs like solatium, removal expenses and legal costs. So, when Council is determining whether to adopt a managed retreat option verse a protection option they will need to consider a more realistic Cost Benefit Analysis (CBA).</p> <p>Additional to the costs above are the costs of City's assets, listed in table 1 on page 2 of the Geraldton Economic Framework. The assets will need to be removed, relocated or reconstructed so the wider community can continue to enjoy the same level of facilities during a Managed Retreat. The foreshore will periodically resemble a construction site over the next 100 years. While the assets are itemised within table 1 no total figure of the assets can be found, so an accurate CBA cannot be established. There does not appear to have been any CBA to justify the position that Managed Retreat is more economically viable than protection. The City can install and maintain a lot of protection for \$333,000,000 plus. As a side issue, the Baird report appears to have missed one very important part of our coastline that is specifically referred to at page 14, para 3.6 of State Planning Policy 2.6, the Houtman Abrolhos.</p> <p>The Western Australian Planning Commission has published a "Draft Planned or Managed Retreat Guideline" to aid in consideration of this option. In formulating its preferred options the City and the Baird report appear to have applied this draft guideline as though it were a planning policy (As was stated in print in the "Geraldton Guardian" on 28 August 2018). The difference in these concepts is detailed in the Western Australian Planning Framework "attached to this submission". Protection for many of the Coastal Management Units doesn't appear to even have been considered, it is all about managed retreat. When considering the cost of the protection option please bear the following in mind: Part 2, Coastal Adaption Report Appendices, Geraldton CHRMAP Implementation, Section 15.1.3 at 3., Page105 "The CGG shall investigate coastal protection options to protect properties that are under direct erosion threat. The opportunity to recover the capital cost and ongoing maintenance through a beneficiary pays or differential rating scheme should be investigated by the CGG, to apportion the costs against the properties that are protected." This statement poses the question of who the beneficiaries are, and which are the properties protected. If one property in the firing line is protected, then so are the properties and any City infrastructure landward within the Special Control Area. Have, or will the 189 properties (Part 1, Appendices, Geraldton CHRMAP Economic Framework, Page 3) behind the seawalls on the Beresford foreshore and westward of the 2110 coastal processes setbacks line had their rates adjusted to pay for the works already completed? The question of "beneficiaries pays" was raised within the questions of the CIVIC 27 October 2015 to which the Chief Executive Officer responded: "The coastal protection measures will provide protection to local and state government owned infrastructure such as roads, electricity, water supply, sewerage and telecommunications. This infrastructure provides benefits to all residents - not just those in the immediate vicinity. Similarly, any improvement in amenity will also benefit all residents and visitors to our City. Where there is a consequential benefit to residents in the nearby vicinity, this will be reflected in their Gross Rental Valuation which will increase their proportional share of total rates collected by the City. For these reasons no consideration was given to require a direct contribution from nearby residents for the capital and operational costs associated with the infrastructure." The precedent established poses an obvious dilemma. When considering managed retreat v protection be aware of the following revised implications of the report verses Part 1.</p> <p>Part 2, Coastal Adaption Report, Executive Summary, Table E.1, Page v Indicates that over the lifetime of the report 707 residential and commercial properties will be determined as being at risk. The report states a very conservative 2017 figure of \$ 500,000 per residential property will be required for acquisition. Undervaluing the commercial properties that equates to, at a bare minimum, \$353,000,000. If we can believe that figure, over a 100-year timeframe the City has to spend/reserve \$3.53 million each year. As the end date of the time frame is 2110 and we should have been saving/spending for the last eight years. Next year the City will need to spend/reserve \$31,770,000 to catch up. No account is given for the legal expenses that will ensue. There is no total figure for the loss of 70 Council/Public properties and associated infrastructure but it will be very, very significant especially if the City is to maintain functioning beaches over the next 100 years. Every time a road, toilet block or dual use path (and all other assets) falls in the ocean, if the City is to maintain the current services for the beach to be utilised by the community, they must be replaced in the newly acquired coastal reserve. Add these costs to the severely understated \$353,000,000 and the City can do a lot of protection works over the next 100 years and are left with a foreshore reserve that they do not have to reconstruct every time it falls into the ocean. The protection works undertaken at Rundell Park/St Georges Beach are relatively inexpensive \$763,800 and have been identified within this report by CBA as a \$1,077,000 net benefit to the community. Why would the City consider any other option than protecting and enhancing their community and assets?</p> <p>SCA To establish a Special Control Area, which is a town planning instrument, requires a scheme amendment. The adoption of a scheme amendment opens the Local Authority up to claims for compensation if land within the area is detrimentally affected. While claims would have to be tested the possible litigation would be protracted and expensive. There are, if we can believe the reports, anywhere between 1006 and 707 properties that may be adversely affected within the Special Control Area which would indicate that their most efficient approach would be a class action.</p> <p>Our attraction to tourists both internationally and nationally is our sun, sand, wind and surf and those tourists input into the community benefits our wider community. If we lose our beaches we lose our appeal. It is short-sighted not to protect our assets and if Council does not support the protection option to deal with problems presented to us then from an economic, environmental, social and cultural perspective we will be worse off. It is common ground that the manmade infrastructure in and around our shoreline and ocean has increased the impact of the ocean on our shoreline. We now must find creative ways of dealing with these impacts and the additional consideration of the effects of climate change. There is a wealth of knowledge with in our community that should be utilised to adapt the coasts natural defences to protect our shoreline. Protecting the communities most prized asset, the beaches, can be done in creative ways that will increase their value to the community. For example, there is a shelter reef platform running from the Batavia Coast Marina to the northern end of Sunset Beach. By constructing a combination of geotextile and rock artificial reef extension on top of the platform in a manner that improves the existing surf breaks and increases the habitat for marine species this will stop the erosion of the beaches and possibly even grow the beaches. This same process can also be utilised to protect the residential cell at Drummond Cove. As the sea level rises the height of the reef would need to be increased, this is massively more cost effective than acquiring another 60 houses, bulldozing them, demolishing toilet blocks and rebuilding them plus all the other associated works necessary to maintain a functioning foreshore. Our family has been in, on around the ocean of the Western Australian coast for 2 generations and it has been our way of life. The ocean is a very unpredictable mistress and at times our understanding of her idiosyncrasies has been a matter of life and death, so we have, through necessity, watched her every movement. We offer every assistance in any further consideration of the design of protection structures to be installed. The Geraldton Community has an extensive wealth of knowledge, from career fishermen, to surfers, to mariners from all aspects of ocean construction, which can be utilised to establish creative solutions to protect our ever-changing coastline.</p>	Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
					Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
					Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission
					Acknowledgement of submission	Note the submission

## Geraldton Coastal Hazard Risk Management and Adptation Planning Project

Schedule of SurveyMonkey Submissions against 60-day Public Comment Period Tuesday 2 July - Tuesday 3 September

Date: 12 November 2018

Submission Information			Submission and Comment		
ID	Received	Submitter	Comment Submission	CGG Comment	Recommendation
1	3/09/2018	Private submission	More time needed to respond.	The development of the Geraldton CHRMAP report has had extensive community consultation. Community consultation will continue throughout the CHRMAP process.	Note Submission
			RE coastal erosion set back areas and stamping properties located within the 2070 to 2110 coastal erosion setback area: The modelling that the report has done is desk top modelling. Given the drastic financial implications of the coastal erosion set back lines for landowners, the inputs and variables in the models need to be checked via geophysical assessments to quantify the validity of the lines. Furthermore the results need to then be peer reviewed by independent coastal engineers. Our property is at _____, Drummond Cove. It is 250m from the current water line and is 9.5m above current sea level. Yet the report is telling us that it is at risk of being affected by costal erosion 50-90 years from now. This report can't be accurate predicting sea levels to rise that much that within 50 – 90 years the ocean will take 3 rows of houses in front of us, 2 rows of which are at an altitude of 4-5m. The values in the report need to be checked as it does not appear that altitude and contour lines have been properly taken into consideration. I request that the values in the report be checked and the lines be adjusted to be more realistic. Drawing those lines and proposing to stamp all the titles of those properties west of the 2110 line with a 70A will drastically affect property values. The city needs to be sure that this will hold up in court when there is a class action by people against the City because stamping 70A clauses on the titles devalues our properties to the point that mortgages on those properties are higher than the property values. This class action is particularly likely as the properties that were offered to people whose leases west of Whitehill Road were not renewed because of risk of coastal erosion and inundation, are now supposed to be stamped with a 70A clause. It is completely ridiculous and irresponsible to do this to people. First they have to vacate their properties and demolish their houses by 2016 because of risk of coastal erosion. A new subdivision east of Whitehill Road was established and they were offered a discount in that new subdivision, encouraged by the City. By 2018 that very land that they were encouraged to move to by the City is now supposedly all of a sudden also at risk of coastal erosion and the City is considering stamping it 70A which greatly devalues that land. The City should have known that years ago when it encouraged those people to move there. To stamp those blocks of land (of which _____ is one of them) with a 70A clause after first encouraging people to buy that land would be highly unethical! A number of years ago the city admitted that the rock groyne that it put in at the John Batten Hall caused the loss of Whitehill Road. Therefore the city in conjunction with the State Government needs to fix the issue of the properties east of the closed section of Whitehill road being at risk, rather than just stamping them with a 70A clause to get the city off the hook.	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note Submission
			Marine structures such as breakwaters and rock groynes are not the responsibility of local councils and therefore that rock wall at John Batten Hall should have never been put in! Furthermore, a number of years ago, the Port Authority acknowledged to the City in writing that the Port Enhancement Project which deepened and realigned the shipping channel contributed to the loss of sand on the Chapman Road foreshore. Furthermore, the extension of the northern breakwater which catches the sand that is being translocated from Pages Beach to Medallions Beaches is causing coastal erosion issues. Anything that occurs below the high water mark is the responsibility of State Government and not local council. Because coastal erosion occurs in an area beyond the local government boundary, rate payers should not bear the cost of remediation. Rate payers should not bear the cost by having their properties stamped 70A and they should also not bear the cost of coastal erosion. It is State Government responsibility and stamping our properties 70A just shifts the burden to rate payers.	The Coastal Protection Policy for Western Australia (A Department of Transport Operational Policy) identifies that the local coastal manager (ie the local government) shall accept ownership of protection works.	Note Submission
			Port Authority/ State Government should be held accountable for the effects that the Port Enhancement Project is having on our northern beaches. The sand which would normally naturally be deposited by the ocean on our northern beaches is now getting caught in the shipping channels because they have been deepened by the Port Authority. This is evidenced by the fact that sand is regularly being dredged out by the Port Authority. The Port Authority needs to be held responsible for this sand not ending up on our northern beaches anymore and needs to be requested to make up for this by regular sand replenishment programs. Yes, they are expensive, but those who caused the problem in the first place need to bear the cost, not the landowners who facing the risk of losing properties, losing beaches and having their properties devalued.	The Port Enhancement Project went through a Public Environment Review as part of the approvals process. The Port has an ongoing commitment to bypass 12,500m3 of sand from Pages Beach to the Northern Beaches between the Beresford Foreshore and the Chapman River annually.	Note Submission
			Further comments: It is important that the CofGG continues to engage with community going forward with the view to avoid at all costs, a fracturing of community. It is an unacceptable outcome that the city takes an approach that 'we know better' and pushes ahead with projects without community buy in and seek to avoid repeating its past mistakes at Drummond Cove. The DCPA community is well versed in understanding the CHRMAP process and seeking action. This is evidenced by holding the Geraldton Coastal Adaptation Planning Forum in 2014, a partnership between the Drummonds Cove Progress Association and Sunset Beach Coastcare groups. Followed by Application A15220 in 2015 by the Drummond Cove Progress Association (DCPA) for works north of the John Batten Hall to respond to coastal erosion. A community action grant was applied for to the Dept. of Transport in partnership with the CofGG and NACC for the coastal zone north of the John Batten Hall. It needs to be acknowledged that the CofGG has been well aware of the issues north of John Batten Hall/Whitehill Rd. and now need to act. It is my opinion that the scope of options and actions need to be fully explored with community, any action/response also include a thorough search for alternative/innovative approaches beyond the list of recommendations PR1-6. I strongly advise the CofGG look to other adopted approaches in other states and countries where the amenity of the coastal asset has been the highest priority. Options such as off-shore artificial reefs to mitigate wave action as the driver of coastal erosion, being just one example. As per State Planning Policy 2.6, Community consultation at every step of the way is recommended. The CofGG should seek to preserve the natural amenity and improve tourism potential wherever possible as this is the community priority. I ask the CofGG to put on a tourism lens as they view options and consider the CBA (Cost Benefit Analysis). An elevated rock sea wall significantly reduces the amenity and could have a negative impact on the community. Tourism potential will be diminished and real-estate investment impacted. However, such an approach will deliver coastal protection. This is an example where the CBA is presented too narrowly through the lens of economic rationalism and does not consider other data to support the building of a boat ramp into associated protection works. Abroholos Island access and northern boat launching access appears not to have been taken into consideration in this analysis by the Baird report and therefore should be re-evaluated to more accurately reflect BCR values. Coastal erosion and the CofGG's responses over the years indicate a knowledge of CHRMAP and from the Drummond Cove perspective, we are now well past the beginning of the journey that this Baird CHRMAP report represents. In closing, The significant underspend at Beresford for coastal protection works should be re-directed into coastal protection works at Drummond Cove, Bluff Point and Sunset Beach. It is State Govt. money (our taxes) that paid for Beresford, there were no rate rises recommended for them in the Baird report. Furthermore, there are no recommendations for 70A's clauses to be put on titles and no user pays scheme recommended for those land-owners. Any policy that adopts the Baird recommendations will need to consider this carefully.	Acknowledgement of submission	Note Submission
No. Not is this short time frame. More time is needed to the community to be able to read this report and respond. We all work full time.	The development of the Geraldton CHRMAP report has had extensive community consultation. Community consultation will continue throughout the CHRMAP process.	Note Submission			
More time and consultation is needed.	The development of the Geraldton CHRMAP report has had extensive community consultation. Community consultation will continue throughout the CHRMAP process.	Note Submission			
2	3/09/2018	Private submission	I don't believe the report considers the rate of erosion before and after a) the port was developed and b) the mariner was developed.	The factors used in the calculation are for coastal erosion and coastal inundation are identified in State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. In additional the Geraldton CHRMAP Report takes into account existing treatments such as the Northern Beaches Stabilisation Programme (NBSP) sand by-passing works undertaken each year by the Port Authority.	Note Submission
			I feel the report under values the actual cost of managed retreat, placing the rate payer at risk of unexpected rate hikes. I believe the City should have a policy of coastal protection, and start being pro active and imaginative at applying it. I am not confident that the report has really looked carefully at the costs of the three options. One of the costs of managed retreat is that we have a very unsightly and negative feeling beachfront, as has been seen in Drummonds, St Georges Beach and Greys Beach. This does not enhance Geraldton. The City have been very slow to respond to pockets of erosion, losing very valuable public space, before actually doing anything. Protection was put into place after the asset was lost (St Georges, Greys Beach carpark). This is very poor management of ratepayers money.	Acknowledgement of submission	Note Submission
			A section 70A notification placed on a property title will undoubtedly have an affect on the properties value. In effect it will reduce the value of the property in a single transaction whereas without the 'notification' the value will reduce over time and at the rate of coastal erosion and sea level rises. This will spread any financial losses over a number of owners. Is it fair that the current owners of the property wear the brunt of the loss of value and desirability when the City opened up that land for development.	Acknowledgement of submission	Note Submission
			I don't believe the report considers that well managed coastal protection should slow down rate of erosion considerably. I don't believe the report is clear on how it has valued properties. They seem under valued to me.	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report property values were based on the median price index for the locality from <a href="https://www.realestate.com.au/buy">https://www.realestate.com.au/buy</a> at the time of accessing the site. The report notes that there may be variation in property values within the locality.	Note Submission

3	3/09/2018	Private submission	<p>In regards to the whole CHRMAP report and including this risk Assessment , I write this response in total disbelief that the question being put forward to the public is how much do we value our coastline. Not only that, but the working class residents including council members are then asked to sift through near on 500 alternating pages of data in their spare time that is of a forecast / predictive nature. To then ask to prove why we value our coastline as an asset in a summarized submission form all the while going about their normal day to day duties of contributing to this city as a citizen whom of most, are unaware of what the outcome of this CHRMAP report recommends to they're coastal lifestyle. This should be a given, not something that the public has to prove. The report clearly states that there is high community and cultural values for the coastline but overshadows this with the adaptation hierarchy, which I believe is developed with no regard for the underrated community sentiment for our coastline. The hierarchy process is backwards in this regard. The CHRMAPs data is predictive therefore any decision for adaptation past what is outstandingly obvious as far as the erosion issues north of the port is predictive. In this I mean State Government are willing to slap a 70a notice on properties within its predictive lines. These lines are far from professional for mine so in essence they are sending out messages of long lasting ill fated repercussions to residents on forecasts all the while shadowing the obvious protection that is needed right now. Trigger points have been past and if the control hierarchy is corrected, Geraldton's coastline will be protected as needed, not neglected out of forecast data. State Government's default option is to manage retreat as it is the option that from a cost benefit view delivers the least initial cost outlay. What isn't in the report is the sentiment brought about by this default option from the people of Geraldton and Western Australia alike. What message does this send to anyone potentially wanting to move to Geraldton? There is also little to no mention of potential tourism impacts of a managed retreat. This option will give Geraldton's beaches a disgraceful level of attention because any money spent there after to beautify or make safe in some cases would come from rate payers. Unsafe, inaccessible beaches don't mix well with tourist or potential residents. Also, what message does this send to potential future investors to the area that CofGG is willing to let any potential development fall into the ocean? The report puts a very large emphasis on Cost Benefit Analysis but its view is to shallow when taking in to consideration the tourism and investment dollar.</p>	<p>The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years. The Geraldton CHRMAP Report also provides Multi-Criteria Analysis (MCA) that looks at these values</p>	Note Submission
			<p>I truly believe the report has not enough emphasis has been put towards the impact of the Geraldton Port deepening and expansion vs erosion of our northern beaches. The report talks of traveling sand sediment and so on but at the end of the day if the Geraldton port/ State Government has put its hand up for funds for Beresford. This means the precedent has been set for the rest of our northern beaches. Also, the report does not report any activity in erosion before the dredging and expansion of the port to gain a measure of erosion speed. This touches on my point about predictive nature and 70a's. It is unacceptable that the Port Authority have clearly taken ownership of the erosion issues at the Beresford foreshore area and were willing to contribute significantly to protection works for that area, yet are nowhere to be seen when it comes to the rest of the northern beaches. The works that they have undertaken years ago at the port (of which this report does not take into account) included massive rock groyne sections and also the dredging and deepening of the channel into the port, have since been clearly starving the northern beaches of Geraldton of the vital sand supply that they need to be able to regenerate naturally through normal coastal processes. This is quite clearly evidenced by looking to Geraldton's southern beaches, which are fed with this same vital sand supply in an unrestrictive manner from the Southgates sand dunes (although they will end up with the same problem in the future if the mining of the sand dunes is allowed to continue).</p>	<p>The Port Enhancement Project went through a Public Environment Review as part of the approvals process. The Port has an ongoing commitment to bypass 12,500m3 of sand from Pages Beach to the Northern Beaches between the Beresford Foreshore and the Chapman River annually.</p>	Note Submission
			<p>In summary, This report is very in depth and a lot of hard work has been done to collect its vast range of data. This being said, as a community member I don't share the same view of the hierarchy control process as it lacks enough thought for the values of our beaches from community. If this weren't the case, then protect would be the first option, and then it would be up to the State Government to prove why they want to manage retreat or avoid. In my view, "Avoid" should only be applied only to those beaches that are yet to be developed by any homes or infrastructure. By trying to implement a policy including any other option than 'Protect' in CMU section's that have already been developed, the CofGG will be inviting a whole range of consequences that include legal implications, lack of investment, tourism decline and population decline just to name a few.</p>	<p>Acknowledgement of submission</p>	Note Submission
			<p>Sections are copied from the CHRMAP report for reference: Referencing the Coastal Planning Community Survey Report January 2018, particularly pages 4 and 5, the whole of our community and tourists alike considers the beaches and associated coastal strip of paramount importance to their lifestyle and enjoyment. Our attraction to tourists both internationally and locally in WA is our outdoor orientated climate, wind and surf and those tourism potentials into the economics that benefit community benefit everyone. During the community consultation phase of CHRMAP, the data clearly demonstrates that the Geraldton community at large values the beaches and foreshore of the municipality of Geraldton above all other assets. This view must expand to include all people in the entire region of the CofGG jurisdiction. Including, residents from the Shire of Chapman Valley who also enjoy the foreshore areas, particularly the connection to Drummond Cove. It is too narrow a perspective to view this CHRMAP report through the lens of only those residents living within coastal processes setback lines as affected. In response to the overall recommendations: 1.1, Raymon Proudlove, reject some of the recommendations of Managed Retreat. The CofGG has adopted the strategy of Managed Retreat for many years now in the absence of hazard mapping and CHRMAP reports and policy. This has resulted in trigger points being passed that have lost assets in Drummond Cove and I urge the CofGG to now act. It is not acceptable to me that the CHRMAP report is a justification for adopting Managed Retreat from this point forward as the CofGG has been well aware and has obligations under the Planning Act to land owners. We recommend that the CofGG explore with the DCPA and Drummond Cove Community via community consultation the CBA (Cost Benefit Analysis) of immediate strategies now, and longer term. Community consultation is essential to prevent further fracturing of community over the issue of coastal erosion. It is important to consider the Western Australian legislative framework that would result from voluntary or compulsory acquisition. Case law pertaining to compulsory acquisition judgments indicates that values paid usually far exceed current market value due to Courts also awarding on-costs like removal expenses and legal costs. 2.1 recommend a 'Protect' approach (Pr1-7): The values of the properties within the report are significantly understated given current market value, this needs to be clarified. Second, sufficient justification exists for permanent solutions of development on coastal land areas that are available to buffer areas 'at risk from coastal erosion and inundation.</p>	<p>Acknowledgement of submission</p>	Note Submission
			<p>Sections are copied from the CHRMAP report for reference: Referencing the Coastal Planning Community Survey Report January 2018, particularly pages 4 and 5, the whole of our community and tourists alike considers the beaches and associated coastal strip of paramount importance to their lifestyle and enjoyment. Our attraction to tourists both internationally and locally in WA is our outdoor orientated climate, wind and surf and those tourism potentials into the economics that benefit community benefit everyone. During the community consultation phase of CHRMAP, the data clearly demonstrates that the Geraldton community at large values the beaches and foreshore of the municipality of Geraldton above all other assets. This view must expand to include all people in the entire region of the CofGG jurisdiction. Including, residents from the Shire of Chapman Valley who also enjoy the foreshore areas, particularly the connection to Drummond Cove. It is too narrow a perspective to view this CHRMAP report through the lens of only those residents living within coastal processes setback lines as affected.</p>	<p>Acknowledgement of submission</p>	Note Submission
			<p>In response to the overall recommendations: 1.1, _____, reject some of the recommendations of Managed Retreat. The CofGG has adopted the strategy of M+D1Ganaged Retreat for many years now in the absence of hazard mapping and CHRMAP reports and policy. This has resulted in trigger points being passed that have lost assets in Drummond Cove and I urge the CofGG to now act. It is not acceptable to me that the CHRMAP report is a justification for adopting Managed Retreat from this point forward as the CofGG has been well aware and has obligations under the Planning Act to land owners. We recommend that the CofGG explore with the DCPA and Drummond Cove Community via community consultation the CBA (Cost Benefit Analysis) of immediate strategies now, and longer term. Community consultation is essential to prevent further fracturing of community over the issue of coastal erosion. It is important to consider the Western Australian legislative framework that would result from voluntary or compulsory acquisition. Case law pertaining to compulsory acquisition judgments indicates that values paid usually far exceed current market value due to Courts also awarding on-costs like removal expenses and legal costs. 2. I recommend a 'Protect' approach (Pr1-7): The values of the properties within the report are significantly understated given current market value, this needs to be clarified. Second, sufficient justification exists for permanent solutions of development on coastal land areas that are available to buffer areas 'at risk from coastal erosion and inundation. I, Raymon Proudlove, propose coastal protection works in zone 1 &amp; 2 as there is a need to preserve the Drummond Cove foreshore areas for all people in the CofGG. The CofGG should explore, with the direct involvement of community, protection works that consider public access, public safety, property and infrastructure as our coastal lifestyle is not expendable. In response to the following recommendation: • Require Section 70A notification to be placed on titles to alert prospective purchasers to the risk of coastal erosion and / or inundation. I recommend that the CofGG undertake immediately Geophysical studies of all the shoreline areas to examine presence of rock strata that could reduce the erodibility of critical sections over the longer term (estimate \$25,000) and apply that data to the setback lines to create an accurate representation of setback lines. The current setbacks are not accurate, specific height differences in adjacent areas not affected by setback lines indicate a broad-brush approach with significant perceived financial implications at stake. I understand that the purpose of this study is to provide 'scope of works' recommendations. However, more detailed data gathering is necessary that includes analysis of rock strata within the setbacks and accurate elevations to be included. This is essential before any 70A notifications be placed on titles as a policy directive. I advise caution to the CofGG to avoid possible class action from residents under the state planning act. It is a risk that 70A clauses on titles as recommended by such a broad-based 90 year timeframe and policy approach, the historical data doesn't even exist to provide certainty to the lines as they are currently presented. This will need to be taken into consideration as part of the CBA (Cost Benefit Analysis).</p>	<p>Acknowledgement of submission</p>	Note Submission
			<p>I agree with the recommendations of continued immediate Monitoring and Management outlined below: Recommend a geophysical study of the shoreline areas is undertaken to examine presence of rock strata that could reduce the erodibility of critical sections over the longer term; The foreshore reserve area offers a crucial natural buffer against coastal erosion and inundation for coastal assets located landward (houses, roads etc), as well as providing highly valued public amenity. Active monitoring and nature-based approaches (e.g. coastal revegetation, sand trapping fences) to increase resilience of this foreshore reserve from erosion are strongly recommended. Community groups and local organisations should be included / supported in the delivery of these programs, to provide opportunity to raise awareness and build ownership of the coastal adaptation requirements. Again, I urge the CofGG to consider the tourism impacts to the region and future economic consequences of any policy, particularly the consequences of a purely Managed Retreat paradigm. Some of the recommended actions will inevitably bring about the outcome of 'protection' at future trigger points. The CofGG needs to acknowledge that we are well past trigger points along Whitehill Rd, Drummond Cove. It is my opinion that the scope of options and actions need to be fully explored with community, any action/response also include a thorough search for alternative/innovative approaches beyond the list of recommendations PR1-6. I strongly advise the CofGG look to other adopted approaches in other states and countries where the amenity of the coastal asset has been the highest priority. Options such as off-shore artificial reefs to mitigate wave action as the driver of coastal erosion, being just one example. As per State Planning Policy 2.6, Community consultation at every step of the way is recommended. The CofGG should seek to preserve the natural amenity and improve tourism potential wherever possible as this is the community priority. I ask the CofGG to put on a tourism lens as they view options and consider the CBA (Cost Benefit Analysis).</p>	<p>Acknowledgement of submission</p>	Note Submission



			<p>In response to the statement below: 1. "The initial stages of the Geraldton CHRMAP project involved community and stakeholder engagement and a risk-based assessment, which examined coastal assets under threat from erosion and inundation in future planning timeframes. The outcomes of this initial CHRMAP phase were reported in the Coastal Hazard and Risk Assessment report (Baird 2018)" It is important that the CofGG continues to engage with community going forward with the view to avoid at all costs, a fracturing of community. It is an unacceptable outcome that the city takes a past approach that 'we know better' and pushes ahead with projects without community buy in and seek to avoid repeating its past mistakes at Drummond Cove. The DCPA community is well versed in understanding the CHRMAP process and seeking action. This is evidenced by holding the Geraldton Coastal Adaptation Planning Forum in 2014, a partnership between the Drummonds Cove Progress Association and Sunset Beach CoastCare groups. Followed by Application A15220in 2015 by the Drummond Cove Progress Association (DCPA) for works north of the John Batten Hall to respond to coastal erosion. A community action grant was applied for to the Dept. of Transport in partnership with the CofGG and NACC for the coastal zone north of the John Batten Hall. It needs to be acknowledged that the CofGG has been well aware of the issues north of John Batten Hall/Whitehill Road and now need to act. Following on from the above data, it is my position to explore specifically the following recommendations from the Baird report: Section 1 &amp; Section 2. Drummond Cove Road to Community Centre &amp; Community Centre to Seacrest Way – I agree with the following: "A coastal protection approach for Drummond Cove north of the Community Hall in front of the closed section of Whitehill Rd warrants further assessment. MCA and CBA analysis of options considered show a net return on investment on the value of assets protected on the landside is possible. The high value of property at risk of erosion in future planning periods and the values of the coast noted in the Community Engagement process underline the importance of this issue." Following on from the above, I would like to see the CofGG re-visit the foredune re-build strategy (Application A15220) for section 1 &amp; 2 of the Drummond Cove CMU. This course of action is reinforced by the Baird report which states: "Nature based approaches to increase resilience of shorelines and foreshore areas (eg sand trapping fences, revegetation). Recommended for section north of the Community Hall. CGG led programs supported through grant funding (estimated \$10,000 annually)."</p>	Acknowledgement of submission	Note Submission
			<p>I personally would like the CofGG to adopt the resolution of a future submerged seawall structure as part of the reclaimed foreshore works. Future proofing this area by building a below-ground seawall will provide the necessary peace of mind to the entire community. This would have to be done on the west side of the original Whitehill road line and I recommend to have it built further out in line with the rocks at the point of the Hall allowing reclaimed land behind it between the original Whitehill road line and new shore line giving tree and grassed areas for family activities running north of the Hall and providing a beach with no visible rocks. I would then recommend a north access car park from Drummond Cove road, a south access car park from Whitehill Road at the hall and a central car park from waterfront circle which would all surround a great family friendly common vegetated ad grassed space for the community to enjoy. This could then be north, south and east access points to a Central Park and beach area for families to enjoy therefore changing the overall mentality of this area as a track for illegal vehicles to cut through. These extra car park works for this area would be nothing more than using the road end points that are already there. The grassed and tree areas would be able to partly be acted on immediately with the current geo textile sand bag groins. Through community engagement I see this area as being a place for future fitness activities, family activities with maybe a bicycle/ pedestrian path linking through to promote triathlons routes and walking paths alike giving connection through the right means. Geraldton has only 30km of coastline not all of which has been inhabited within 2110 line. We do not need roads taking up these spaces rather than access car parks to take advantage of these areas once they are protected. This lets us use these areas to they're full potential, there are plenty of room for roads everywhere else. It is time to improve the amenity, provide confidence and the recommendations are there to do so.</p>	Acknowledgement of submission	Note Submission
			<p>In response to the economic analysis below: 3.4 Economic Analysis – Adaptation options for Erosion Protection for Whitehill Rd and Community Centre I seek further clarification as to how the fundamentals were calculated to rank these options. Of note, I am of the opinion that Boat Launch Stage 1&amp;2 has a much higher possibility of economic return by introducing a scope of works that has on-going revenue potential and tourism benefits for the whole region that have not been considered in this report. For example, an elevated rock sea wall significantly reduces the amenity and could have a negative impact on the community. Tourism potential will be diminished and real-estate investment impacted. However, such an approach will deliver coastal protection. This is an example where the CBA is presented too narrowly through the lens of economic rationalism and does not consider other data to support the building of a boat ramp into associated protection works. Abrolhos Island access and northern boat launching access appears not to have been taken into consideration in this analysis by the Baird report and therefore should be re-evaluated to more accurately reflect BCR values. In summary, Coastal erosion and the CofGG's responses over the years indicate a knowledge of CHRMAP and from the Drummond Cove perspective, we are now well past the beginning of the journey that this Baird CHRMAP report represents. In closing, the significant underspend at Beresford for coastal protection works should be re-directed into coastal protection works at Drummond Cove, Bluff Point and Sunset Beach. It is State Government money (our taxes) that paid for Beresford, there were no rate rises recommended for the Beresford residents in the Baird report. Furthermore, there are no recommendations for 70A's clauses to be put on titles in Beresford and no user pays scheme recommended for those land-owners. The precedent has been set with these actions, and therefore the actions and policies for the rest of the northern populated sections of the CMU's needs to follow suit. Any policy that adopts the Baird recommendations and does not recommend a protect option for these areas, will need to consider this carefully along with the many consequences of such an oversight.</p>	Acknowledgement of submission	Note Submission
4	3/09/2018	Private submission	<p>If an existing dwelling is removed to make way for a new dwelling on the site, is that sufficient, or do you propose to stop any new development on existing lands, and dramatically affect the value of the existing property, making it either a 'renovate and repair' option, but without the ability to demolish and rebuild?</p> <p>SPP2.6 at 5.8 i requires the CGG to "ensure that adequate opportunity is provided to enable the community to participate in coastal planning and management....." 5.8 ii goes on further to say that community consultation and engagement strategies should be developed to encourage informed community input....." I submit that adequate opportunity and engagement did not occur either as a result of the release of MRA 2016, or as a result of the Baird Reports collectively. I am told that it has been advertised or referred to: • on the CGG Facebook page; • The CGG website; • Flyers in key locations; • A leaflet included in 2017 Rates envelopes inviting parties to be notified in regard to any results or reports. The owners of the properties that are directly and adversely impacted, almost immediately, no matter what decision is ultimately made, ought to have been contacted both by letter and telephone, where practical, and advised to read the relevant documentation and recommendations. Given the report identifies a small number of dwellings at immediate risk, it would not have been an onerous task. The consequences of the CGG's decision will adversely impact many people, either directly or indirectly, financially, socially or larger volumes as a community.</p> <p>There is sufficient justification to have the properties in Bluff Point PROTECTED. The costs of the PROTECT option would be significantly cheaper than the costs of managed retreat and acquiring properties. The properties on Kempton Street are higher in value given their proximity to the ocean, as is the case with most properties wanting ocean frontage or views. Placing a S70A notification on the title immediately opens the Crown to claims of economic loss due to the loss of value on the properties. Where the recommendation of managed retreat and conditions disallowing any development to be built closer than the HSD to less than 26m (S1) is stated (page 38) this does not take into account eh current position of the landowners, being they are, able to, at law resume ownership of the portion of their land currently under water. Does the CGG intend to change that to disallow any infill of property to existing land ownership boundaries? Has there been any research as to when (I submit based on the information provided, it is actually now) the CGG will commence negotiations for acquisition of properties? Surely it is up to the CGG to put to effected parties their draft planning approval changes, prior to them being adopted. When would the CGG intend to have those discussions?</p> <p>Out of the 3 pathways , Protect is the least costly, and the most confirmatory. Do nothing will trigger a claim for lack of duty of care. Given these properties have been located where they are for many, many years, it is remiss of the CGG to have done nothing about protections thus far, instead dealing only with near town assets such as the Batavia Coast Marina and Beresford. 15.2 Planning actions- to propose that any new buildings are built so that they are 'transportable' is ridiculous. What happens with the current homes along Kempton Street, including those recently built? The community wants a pro active approach by the CGG, which would maintain tourism, investment and population. To allow the properties at risk to succumb to the natural forces would be at a huge economical cost to CGG (Crown).</p> <p>The example of the seawall for Bluff Point stops south of our properties, thus would offer no protection at all. The area immediately north of our home is a carpark (Crown) and to the south of our southerly neighbours, is an access way for surfers. The coastline directly in front of our properties has reef and rock deposits, thereby reducing the impact of storms and surges, given these act as a break for the velocity of the ocean when it reaches the shoreline. The seawall option has a lifespan of 50 years, with an initial cost estimate of 3.2M. The guesstimate for present value of property at extreme risk in Bluff Point is \$572,000. This figure is severely undervalued, when even a vacant block sold across the road within the last 2 years for approx. \$550,000. The CHRMAP states that detailed geotechnical data was not available for most coastal areas. Did Baird visit the areas concerned and undertake any geotechnical data?</p>	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note Submission
			<p>The development of the Geraldton CHRMAP report has had extensive community consultation. Community consultation will continue throughout the CHRMAP process.</p>		Note Submission
			<p>Acknowledgement of submission</p>		Note Submission
			<p>Acknowledgement of submission</p>		Note Submission
			<p>The coastal hazards maps are based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The Geraldton CHRMAP Report recommends undertaking geotechnical studies to inform whether coastal erosion set-back lines can be refined in line with the requirements of State Planning Policy No. 2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy</p>		Note Submission
5	3/09/2018	Private submission	<p>The CGG has failed in according procedural fairness to the most affected property owners of CMU4. At no time were we notified by post/ email. The CGG needs to propose a transparent path moving forward. The costs to the CGG of doing nothing would mean lower GRV values, with a S70A notification on titles. This would also mean a loss of income to the CGG, where the increase in value of all homes PROTECTED would result in higher GRV and more funds being raised by CGG by way of rates. Have elements of the community engagement strategy been implemented fully. This report is very community focused yet I (as a resident) don't feel like I've been informed / understand the impact of coastal erosion</p> <p>Strongly support recommendations for a geophysical study of shoreline areas. Placement of section 70A notification on titles based on this 'high level' report is very concerning to me as a resident. Community engagement required to explain the effect of recommendations which affect so many residents</p> <p>Concern that management of risk will limit development of coastal areas unnecessarily. Concern that 70a notice will unnecessarily devalue my property without evidence that my property is indeed at risk of erosion.</p> <p>This report is lengthy and repetitive yet I struggle to understand the impact of "managed retreat". Due to the wide spread nature of erosion in Geraldton, a greater emphasis on community engagement is needed to explain the implications of adopting these recommendations. I didn't note any recommendations to address short term actions, such as sand nourishment, to protect our assets.</p>	The development of the Geraldton CHRMAP report has had extensive community consultation. Community consultation will continue throughout the CHRMAP process.	Note Submission
			<p>Acknowledgement of submission</p>		Note Submission
			<p>Acknowledgement of submission</p>		Note Submission
			<p>This would come under 'build resilience'</p>		Note Submission
5	3/09/2018	Private submission	<p>I note that the report at 2.2.1 quotes the State Coastal Planning Policy (SPPP 2.6) as "encouraging innovative approaches to managing coastal hazard risk". With rapid changes in technology and coastal erosion causing serious problems around the world, it is likely that the development of innovative responses to coastal erosion will accelerate into the future. The planning for the Geraldton coastal erosion should accommodate this anticipated acceleration of innovative responses. I note that at Table 5.5 under Geotechnical Conditions it states: "Detailed geotechnical data is not available for most of the coastal areas. In the absence of site specific data, coastal areas have been assessed as Sandy Coast under the SPP2.6 guidelines. " In the relation to the foreshore areas adjacent to Bluff Pt, there is substantial rock and reef structure that may play a significant role supporting future investments in alleviating coastal erosion. Should these structures be considered further? Page 23 the reference to the impacts on coastal erosion of geotextile groynes in stabilising the foreshore area. This seems to be a relatively cost-effective method of alleviating erosion that could be extended further along the foreshore. Also new innovations may arrive that improve the effectiveness of these interventions. These options could be considered for future planning. Table 8.1 page 44: The range of Protect options is listed that can be employed to mitigate risks of coastal erosion. Different combinations of these options to protect our coast may prove to be more cost effective in the long term that the Managed Retreat option, particularly if the arrival of new innovations is factored in. It may prove to be wise to remain open to these options rather than lock in to specific activities that accommodate only current Protect options.</p>	Acknowledgement of submission	Note Submission

			<p>Page vi The report refers to the “uncertainty about sea level rise and also shoreline response”. This suggests that given that the report also states that there is a lack of geotechnical and geophysical data and goes on to say: “It is important to consider the uncertainty in relation to future sea level rise projections and also shoreline response in each coastal compartment. Given the number of properties that are potentially at risk in the 2030 to 2110 time within the Drummond Cove, Sunset Beach and Bluff Point CMU’s, a site-specific assessment of shoreline change into the future which incorporates geotechnical and geophysical data is warranted. This is a high priority recommendation from this study”. Give the high priority rating of this recommendation, it would seem unduly hasty to make firm decisions about the CCG’s response to coastal erosion in the absence of this information. Page VII The Cost Benefit analysis showed a net return from the investment in groynes to protect Rundle Park and houses landward. Could a similar net return be found for similar investments further along the foreshore? Page xix I recommend that the gap in definition of trigger points in relation to the erosion and accretion processes during and after the short term storm events needs to be resolved by the relevant authorities. I suggest that firm decisions about the CCG’s response to the risks of coastal erosion should be delayed until such data is available. This may be particularly important in relation to Bluff Point risks. My main concern is that there seems to firm decision being made about the CCG’s actions when there is insufficient information on which to base these decisions.</p>	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note Submission
6	3/09/2018	Anonymous	No comments	Acknowledgement of submission	Note Submission
7	3/09/2018	Private submission (x2)	The whole of Geraldton and the wider community place high value on our coastal lifestyle and resulting tourism. Too much time and money has been wasted on community surveys and 'what if' scenarios. It is not possible even with the best science in the world to predict what will be inundated or eroded ten to one hundred years from now. One certainty is the coast needs protection now, we have passed the trigger points. Mangaged retreat will cost more in the long run (with clean ups and possible law suits if properties are re-possessed) and ruin our beautiful coastline and destroy tourism	Acknowledgement of submission	Note Submission
			I see the Managed Retreat as a step backwards. It is too late to hide our heads in the sand and adopt this 'wait and see' attitude. We recommend the Protect Approach using buried seawalls, geotextile groynes and off shore artificial reefs. The boat launch options will benefit the wider community with possible economic returns whilst offering protection to the beach	Acknowledgement of submission	Note Submission
			Once again the managed retreat option proposed for so many of the affected areas gives the impression despite this report the battle is seen to be lost. Work at Beresford foreshore is a shining example of what can be achieved and has added to Geraldtons appeal. Many people I have spoken to can't wait for it to be completed. This solution is what all residents would like and because of expense would need to be implemented in stages, the most urgent cases first. The underspend at Beresford should be redirected to coastal protection for Drummond Cove, Bluff Point and Sunset Beach. This does not need to be voted on by the community, the money has already been allocated for coastal restoration work so should be used for this immediately.	Unfortunately, the State will not allow savings from the Beresford Foreshore Project to be transferred to other City projects	Note Submission
			We feel this detailed lengthy report is unnecessarily complicated and relies on too much information that is likely to be outdated within ten years. Many of the maps and tables are guess work based on the uncertain climatic patterns of the future. Countour lines and rock strata have not been taken into account when drawing the set back lines rendering them inaccurate. (eg limestone ridge Drummond Cove) We would like to see the final report have a more positive approach using information we have now. Hopefully this will lead to a Protect Approach attitude rather than an, 'I give up one' as is the case with Managed Retreat.	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note Submission
8	3/09/2018	Anonymous	The whole of Geraldton and the wider community place high value on our coastal lifestyle and resulting tourism. Too much time and money has been wasted on community surveys and 'what if' scenarios. It is not possible even with the best science in the world to predict what will be inundated or eroded ten to one hundred years from now. One certainty is the coast needs protection now, we have passed the trigger points. Mangaged retreat will cost more in the long run (with clean ups and possible law suits if properties are re-possessed) and ruin our beautiful coastline and destroy tourism	Acknowledgement of submission	Note Submission
			I see the Managed Retreat as a step backwards. It is too late to hide our heads in the sand and adopt this 'wait and see' attitude. We recommend the Protect Approach using buried seawalls, geotextile groynes and off shore artificial reefs. The boat launch options will benefit the wider community with possible economic returns whilst offering protection to the beach (Drummond Cove)	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note Submission
			Once again the managed retreat option proposed for so many of the affected areas gives the impression despite this report the battle is seen to be lost. Work at Beresford foreshore is a shining example of what can be achieved and has added to Geraldtons appeal. Many people I have spoken to can't wait for it to be completed. This solution is what all residents would like and because of expense would need to be implemented in stages, the most urgent cases first. The underspend at Beresford should be redirected to coastal protection for Drummond Cove, Bluff Point and Sunset Beach. This does not need to be voted on by the community, the money has already been allocated for coastal restoration work so should be used for this immediately.		Note Submission
			We feel this detailed lengthy report is unnecessarily complicated and relies on too much information that is likely to be outdated within ten years. Many of the maps and tables are guess work based on the uncertain climatic patterns of the future. Countour lines and rock strata have not been taken into account when drawing the set back lines rendering them inaccurate. (eg limestone ridge Drummond Cove) We would like to see the final report have a more positive approach using information we have now. Hopefully this will lead to a Protect Approach attitude rather than an, 'I give up one' as is the case with Managed Retreat.	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note Submission
9	3/09/2018	Anonymous	No comments	Acknowledgement of submission	Note Submission
10	3/09/2018	Private submission	Being a property owner within the areas of concern along Willcock Drive and Glendinning Road, I am most upset that the Report advocates putting a Section 70a notification on these titles. Future buyers of my properties need no such fore-notice, unless you have no intention whatsoever of protecting the coastline along which I live. What is the point of 70a? Did anyone look at aerial photos from the past? Many shade shelters along Tarcoola Beach and the Back Beach are now many metres under. That's not erosion ... it's deposition. The natural deposition by the current along these beaches seems to have been ignored by a report written by non-locals. The dunes are building and provide a natural barrier to minimally rising sea levels. Hard engineering of large rocks walls has to be the go to. They are effective and cost efficient. Rock walls have been the mainstay around the world. Soft engineering has been inefficient in Geraldton as everyone has dramatically seen along Chapman Road and at St George's Beach. The new housing area of Glenfield, west of Volute Street needs ACTION NOW because of existing erosion. The erosion of dunes along Outrigger Esplanade puts that road itself at imminent risk. These home owners were granted Council Approval to build and the houses are brand new. Why was the subdivision approved when these issues were clearly known about? So unfair to landholders to have done this to them.	The coastal hazards maps are based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy	Note Submission
			While I understand the need for a report of this nature, why is a doomsday approach taken. Section 70a is such a thing.	In line with State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy, new coastal protection works can be progressed only after all other options for avoiding and adapting to coastal hazards had been fully explored, as part of a comprehensive coastal hazard risk management process	Note Submission
				The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note Submission
11	3/09/2018	Private submission	There is wide concern about the communication of the report to the residents of the areas affected. The coast is an extremely valuable asset to the nation and one which should be protected; doing nothing or undergoing a managed retreat do not seem to be the solutions. People take joy in our coastline every day, regardless of where they live, not to forget the fact that it's a tourist mecca for windlovers who travel halfway across the world to enjoy our coast line for the summer months and spend their money in Geraldton. It also seems difficult to discern what is natural erosion and what is man made which makes the do nothing option a bitter pill.	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note Submission
			Surely protect can be the only option; the city, residents of the 12 management units and the residents of the greater city all have a vested interest in our coastline.	In line with State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy, new coastal protection works can be progressed only after all other options for avoiding and adapting to coastal hazards had been fully explored, as part of a comprehensive coastal hazard risk management process	Note Submission
			A plan of this nature cannot be solely based on a monetary cost analysis. Things of more unquantifiable natures must be taken into account such as quality of life, tourism, protection of ecosystems, future investment and growth of Geraldton.	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report provides Multi-Criteria Analysis (MCA) that looks at these values	Note Submission
			Ongoing communication and consultation with the community is vital, this is too important a decision to make without our input.	The development of the Geraldton CHRMAP report has had extensive community consultation. Community consultation will continue throughout the CHRMAP process.	Note Submission
12	3/09/2018	Private submission	No submission attached	Not applicable	Not applicable
13	3/09/2018	Private submission	Have government agencies with infrastructure in the area provided cost analysis of replacement infrastructure? It's a very simplistic formula to say replacement of a metre of pipe = \$/m, when replacement of certain pipe/poles may result in changes to the overall scheme increasing dollar value significantly.	Government agencies have been kept informed of the CHRMAP process to assist them with their coastal adaptation decision making	Note Submission
			I purchased a block of land in 2015 on Volute Street, when assessing the risk the coastal erosion presented I viewed a document on the CCG website showing a change in ground conditions from sand to limestone on the western side of Volute Street. Is this geotechnical information incorrect or not forwarded to the people creating the report? Strongly recommend adaption of the recommendation to perform further geotechnical works to form an educated response.	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report recommends undertaking geophysical investigations for key coastal locations	Note Submission
			My vacant property on the east side of Volute Street is cut in half by the 2070 line. We had planned on commencing building our home on the block next year, the uncertainty created by this report affects our ability to plan and possibly to finance the build. This is a result of somebody performing a desktop study and placing the line 6-10m inside the property boundary. The works being completed on the Beresford foreshore will (historically shown) affect the coastline north of this point. Do we have to then wait for another 5 years before an "educated" response is formulated.	The coastal hazards maps are based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy	Note Submission
			Without accurate geotechnical information, infrastructure estimates and no estimated costs of possible protection measures creates unnecessary scaremongering within the community. Hopefully with further investigation the proposals and outcomes can have a more solid foundation than those presented by the report	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report recommends undertaking geophysical investigations for key coastal locations	Note Submission
14	3/09/2018	Private submission	Caveat should be removed	Acknowledgement of submission	Note Submission
15	3/09/2018	Anonymous	No comments	Not applicable	Not applicable

16	2/09/2018	Private submission	<p>In regards to the whole CHRMAP report and including this risk Assessment , I write this response in total disbelief that the question being put forward to the public is how much do we value our coastline. Not only that, but the working class residents including council members are then asked to sift through near on 500 alternating pages of data in their spare time that is of a forecasted/ predictive nature. To then ask to prove why we value our coastline as an asset in a summarized submission form all the while going about their normal day to day duties of contributing to this city as a citizen whom of most, are unaware of what the outcome of this CHRMAP report recommends to they're coastal lifestyle. This should be a given, not something that the public has to prove. The report clearly states that there is high community and cultural values for the coastline but overshadows this with the adaptation hierarchy, which I believe is developed with no regard for the underrated community sentiment for our coastline. The hierarchy process is backwards in this regard. The CHRMAPs data is predictive therefore any decision for adaptation past what is outstandingly obvious as far as the erosion issues north of the port is predictive. In this I mean State Government are willing to slap a 70a notice on properties within its predictive lines. These lines are far from professional for mine so in essence they are sending out messages of long lasting ill fated repercussions to residents on forecasts all the while shadowing the obvious protection that is needed right now. Trigger points have been past and if the control hierarchy is corrected, Geraldton's coastline will be protected as needed not neglected out of forecasted data. Governments default option is to manage retreat as it is the option that from a cost benefit view delivers the least initial cost outlay. What isn't in the report is the sentiment brought a bout by this default option from the people of Geraldton and Western Australia alike. What message does this send to anyone potentially wanting to move to Geraldton? There is also little to no mention of potential tourism impacts of a managed retreat. This option will give Geraldton's beaches a disgraceful level of attention because any money spent there after to beautify or make safe in some cases would come from rate payers. Unsafe, inaccessible beaches don't mix well with tourist or potential residents. The report puts a very large emphasis on Cost Benefit Analysis but its view is to shollow when taking in to consideration the tourism dollar. I truly believe the report has not enough emphasis has been put towards the impact of the Geraldton Port deepening and expansion vs erosion of our northern beaches. The report talks of traveling sand sediment and so on but at the end of the day if the Geraldton port/ State Government has put its hand up for funds for Beresford than I'm sorry but for me that means has set the standard for the rest of our northern beaches. The report does not report before the dredging to gain a measure of erosion speed. This touches on my point about predictive nature and 70a's. In summary, This report is very in depth and a lot of hard work has been done to collect its vast range of data, the members involved must be applauded. This being said, as a community member I don't share the same view of the hierarchy control process as it lacks enough thought for the values of our beaches from community. If this weren't the case, than protect would be the first option then it would be up to the government to prove why they want to manage retreat or avoid. "Avoid" should only be applied only to those beaches that are yet to be developed by any homes or infrastructure. Referencing the Coastal Planning Community Survey Report January 2018, particularly pages 4 and 5, the whole of our community and tourists alike considers the beaches and associated coastal strip of paramount importance to their lifestyle and enjoyment. Our attraction to tourists both internationally and locally in WA is our outdoor orientated climate, wind and surf and those tourism potentials into the economics that benefit community benefit everyone. During the community consultation phase of CHRMAP, the data clearly demonstrates that the Geraldton community at large values the beaches and foreshore of the municipality of Geraldton above all other assets. This view must expand to include all people in the entire region of the CofGG jurisdiction. Including, residents from the Shire of Chapman Valley who also enjoy the foreshore areas, particularly the connection to Drummond Cove. It is too narrow a perspective to view this CHRMAP report through the lens of only those residents living within coastal processes setback lines as affected.</p>	Acknowledgement of submission	Note Submission
			<p>In response to the overall recommendations: I, _____ reject some of the recommendations of Managed Retreat. The CofGG has adopted the strategy of Managed Retreat for many years now in the absence of hazard mapping and CHRMAP reports and policy. This has resulted in trigger points being passed that have lost assets in Drummond Cove and I urge the CofGG to now act. It is not acceptable to me that the CHRMAP report is a justification for adopting Managed Retreat from this point forward as the CofGG has been well aware and has obligations under the Planning Act to land owners. We recommend that the CofGG explore with the DCPA and Drummond Cove Community via community consultation the CBA (Cost Benefit Analysis) of immediate strategies now, and longer term. Community consultation is essential to prevent further fracturing of community over the issue of coastal erosion. It is important to consider the Western Australian legislative framework that would result from voluntary or compulsory acquisition. Case law pertaining to compulsory acquisition judgments indicates that values paid usually far exceed current market value due to Courts also awarding on-costs like removal expenses and legal costs. I recommend a 'Protect' approach (Pr1-7): The values of the properties within the report are significantly understated given current market value, this needs to be clarified. Second, sufficient justification exists for permanent solutions of development on coastal land areas that are available to buffer areas 'at risk from coastal erosion and inundation. I, _____ propose coastal protection works in zone 1 &amp; 2 as there is a need to preserve the Drummond Cove foreshore areas for all people in the CofGG. The CofGG should explore, with the direct involvement of community, protection works that consider public access, public safety, property and infrastructure as our coastal lifestyle is not expendable.</p>	Acknowledgement of submission	Note Submission
			<p>In response to the following recommendation: Require Section 70A notification to be placed on titles to alert prospective purchasers to the risk of coastal erosion and / or inundation. I recommend that the CofGG undertake immediately Geophysical studies of all the shoreline areas to examine presence of rock strata that could reduce the erodibility of critical sections over the longer term (estimate \$25,000) and apply that data to the setback lines to create an accurate representation of setback lines. The current setbacks are not accurate, specific height differences in adjacent areas not affected by setback lines indicate a broad-brush approach with significant perceived financial implications at stake. I understand that the purpose of this study is to provide 'scope of works' recommendations. However, more detailed data gathering is necessary that includes analysis of rock strata within the setbacks and accurate elevations to be included. This is essential before any 70A notifications be placed on titles as a policy directive. I advise caution to the CofGG to avoid possible class action from residents under the state planning act. It is a risk that 70A clauses on titles as recommended by such a broad-based 90 year timeframe and policy approach, the historical data doesn't even exist to provide certainty to the lines as they are currently presented. This will need to be taken into consideration as part of the CBA (Cost Benefit Analysis).</p>	Acknowledgement of submission	Note Submission
			<p>In response to the statement below: "The initial stages of the Geraldton CHRMAP project involved community and stakeholder engagement and a risk-based assessment, which examined coastal assets under threat from erosion and inundation in future planning timeframes. The outcomes of this initial CHRMAP phase were reported in the Coastal Hazard and Risk Assessment report (Baird 2018)" It is important that the CofGG continues to engage with community going forward with the view to avoid at all costs, a fracturing of community. It is an unacceptable outcome that the city takes a past approach that 'we know better' and pushes ahead with projects without community buy in and seek to avoid repeating its past mistakes at Drummond Cove. The DCPA community is well versed in understanding the CHRMAP process and seeking action. This is evidenced by holding the Geraldton Coastal Adaptation Planning Forum in 2014, a partnership between the Drummonds Cove Progress Association and Sunset Beach Coastcare groups. Followed by Application A15220in 2015 by the Drummond Cove Progress Association (DCPA) for works north of the John Batten Hall to respond to coastal erosion. A community action grant was applied for to the Dept. of Transport in partnership with the CofGG and NACC for the coastal zone north of the John Batten Hall. It needs to be acknowledged that the CofGG has been well aware of the issues north of John Batten Hall/Whitehill Rd. and now need to act.</p>	Acknowledgement of submission	Note Submission
			<p>Following on from the above data, it is my position to explore specifically the following recommendations from the Baird report: Section 1 &amp; Section 2. Drummond Cove Road to Community Centre &amp; Community Centre to Seacrest Way – I agree with the following: "A coastal protection approach for Drummond Cove north of the Community Hall in front of the closed section of Whitehill Rd warrants further assessment. MCA and CBA analysis of options considered show a net return on investment on the value of assets protected on the landside is possible. The high value of property at risk of erosion in future planning periods and the values of the coast noted in the Community Engagement process underline the importance of this issue." Following on from the above, I would like to see the CofGG re-visit the foredune re-build strategy(Application A15220) for section 1 &amp; 2. This course of action is reinforced by the Baird report which states: "Nature based approaches to increase resilience of shorelines and foreshore areas (eg sand trapping fences, revegetation). Recommended for section north of the Community Hall. CCG led programs supported through grant funding (estimated \$10,000 annually)."</p>	Acknowledgement of submission	Note Submission
			<p>I personally would like the CofGG to adopt the resolution of a future submerged seawall structure as part of the reclaimed foreshore works. Future proofing this area by building a below-ground seawall will provide the necessary peace of mind to the entire community. This would have to be done on the west side of the original Whitehill road line and I recommend to have it built further out in line with the rocks at the point of the Hall allowing reclaimed land behind it between the original Whitehill road line and new shore line giving tree and grassed areas for family activities running north of the Hall and providing a beach with no visible rocks. I would then recommend a north access car park from Drummond Cove road, a south access car park from Whitehill Road at the hall and a central car park from waterfront circle which would all surround a great family friendly common vegetated ad grassed space for the community to enjoy. This could then be north, south and east access points to a Central Park and beach area for families to enjoy therefore changing the overall mentality of this area as a track for illegal vehicles to cut through. These extra car park works for this area would be nothing more than using the road end points that are already there. The grassed and tree areas would be able to partly be acted on immediately with the current geo textile sand bag groins. Through community engagement I see this area as being a place for future fitness activities, family activities with maybe a bicycle/ pedestrian path linking through to promote triathlons routes and walking paths alike giving connection through the right means. Geraldton has only 30km of coastline not all of which has been inhabited within 2110 line. We do not need roads taking up these spaces rather than access car parks to take advantage of these areas once they are protected. This lets us use these areas to they're full potential, there are plenty of room for roads everywhere else. It is time to improve the amenity, provide confidence and the recommendations are there to do so.</p>	Acknowledgement of submission	Note Submission
			<p>In response to the economic analysis below: 3.4 Economic Analysis – Adaptation options for Erosion Protection for Whitehill Rd and Community Centre null I seek further clarification as to how the fundamentals were calculated to rank these options. Of note, I am of the opinion that Boat Launch Stage 1&amp;2 has a much higher possibility of economic return by introducing a scope of works that has on-going revenue potential and tourism benefits for the whole region that have not been considered in this report. For example, an elevated rock sea wall significantly reduces the amenity and could have a negative impact on the community. Tourism potential will be diminished and real-estate investment impacted. However, such an approach will deliver coastal protection. This is an example where the CBA is presented too narrowly through the lens of economic rationalism and does not consider other data to support the building of a boat ramp into associated protection works. Abroholos Island access and northern boat launching access appears not to have been taken into consideration in this analysis by the Baird report and therefore should be re-evaluated to more accurately reflect BCR values. In summary, Coastal erosion and the CofGG's responses over the years indicate a knowledge of CHRMAP and from the Drummond Cove perspective, we are now well past the beginning of the journey that this Baird CHRMAP report represents.</p>	Acknowledgement of submission	Note Submission
			<p>In closing, The significant underspend at Beresford for coastal protection works should be re-directed into coastal protection works at Drummond Cove, Bluff Point and Sunset Beach. It is State Govt. money (our taxes) that paid for Beresford, there were no rate rises recommended for them in the Baird report. Furthermore, there are no recommendations for 70A's clauses to be put on titles and no user pays scheme recommended for those land-owners. Any policy that adopts the Baird recommendations will need to consider this carefully along with its consequences.</p>	Acknowledgement of submission	Note Submission



17	2/09/2018	Private submission	<p>In regards to the whole CHRMAP report and including this risk Assessment , I write this response in total disbelief that the question being put forward to the public is how much do we value our coastline. Not only that, but the working class residents including council members are then asked to sift through near on 500 alternating pages of data in their spare time that is of a forecasted/ predictive nature. To then ask to prove why we value our coastline as an asset in a summarized submission form all the while going about their normal day to day duties of contributing to this city as a citizen whom of most, are unaware of what the outcome of this CHRMAP report recommends to they're coastal lifestyle. This should be a given, not something that the public has to prove. The report clearly states that there is high community and cultural values for the coastline but overshadows this with the adaptation hierarchy, which I believe is developed with no regard for the underrated community sentiment for our coastline. The hierarchy process is backwards in this regard. The CHRMAPs data is predictive therefore any decision for adaptation past what is outstandingly obvious as far as the erosion issues north of the port is predictive. In this I mean State Government are willing to slap a 70a notice on properties within its predictive lines. These lines are far from professional for mine so in essence they are sending out messages of long lasting ill fated repercussions to residents on forecasts all the while shadowing the obvious protection that is needed right now. Trigger points have been past and if the control hierarchy is corrected, Geraldton's coastline will be protected as needed not neglected out of forecasted data. Governments default option is to manage retreat as it is the option that from a cost benefit view delivers the least initial cost outlay. What isn't in the report is the sentiment brought a bout by this default option from the people of Geraldton and Western Australia alike. What message does this send to anyone potentially wanting to move to Geraldton? There is also little to no mention of potential tourism impacts of a managed retreat. This option will give Geraldton's beaches a disgraceful level of attention because any money spent there after to beautify or make safe in some cases would come from rate payers. Unsafe, inaccessible beaches don't mix well with tourist or potential residents. The report puts a very large emphasis on Cost Benefit Analysis but its view is to shollow when taking in to consideration the tourism dollar. I truly believe the report has not enough emphasis has been put towards the impact of the Geraldton Port deepening and expansion vs erosion of our northern beaches. The report talks of traveling sand sediment and so on but at the end of the day if the Geraldton port/ State Government has put its hand up for funds for Beresford than I'm sorry but for me that means has set the standard for the rest of our northern beaches. The report does not report before the dredging to gain a measure of erosion speed. This touches on my point about predictive nature and 70a's. In summary, This report is very in depth and a lot of hard work has been done to collect its vast range of data, the members involved must be applauded. This being said, as a community member I don't share the same view of the hierarchy control process as it lacks enough thought for the values of our beaches from community. If this weren't the case, than protect would be the first option then it would be up to the government to prove why they want to manage retreat or avoid. "Avoid" should only be applied only to those beaches that are yet to be developed by any homes or infrastructure. Referencing the Coastal Planning Community Survey Report January 2018, particularly pages 4 and 5, the whole of our community and tourists alike considers the beaches and associated coastal strip of paramount importance to their lifestyle and enjoyment. Our attraction to tourists both internationally and locally in WA is our outdoor orientated climate, wind and surf and those tourism potentials into the economics that benefit community benefit everyone. During the community consultation phase of CHRMAP, the data clearly demonstrates that the Geraldton community at large values the beaches and foreshore of the municipality of Geraldton above all other assets. This view must expand to include all people in the entire region of the CofGG jurisdiction. Including, residents from the Shire of Chapman Valley who also enjoy the foreshore areas, particularly the connection to Drummond Cove. It is too narrow a perspective to view this CHRMAP report through the lens of only those residents living within coastal processes setback lines as affected.</p>	Acknowledgement of submission	Note Submission
			<p>In response to the overall recommendations: I _____ reject some of the recommendations of Managed Retreat. The CofGG has adopted the strategy of Managed Retreat for many years now in the absence of hazard mapping and CHRMAP reports and policy. This has resulted in trigger points being passed that have lost assets in Drummond Cove and I urge the CofGG to now act. It is not acceptable to me that the CHRMAP report is a justification for adopting Managed Retreat from this point forward as the CofGG has been well aware and has obligations under the Planning Act to land owners. We recommend that the CofGG explore with the DCPA and Drummond Cove Community via community consultation the CBA (Cost Benefit Analysis) of immediate strategies now, and longer term. Community consultation is essential to prevent further fracturing of community over the issue of coastal erosion. It is important to consider the Western Australian legislative framework that would result from voluntary or compulsory acquisition. Case law pertaining to compulsory acquisition judgments indicates that values paid usually far exceed current market value due to Courts also awarding on-costs like removal expenses and legal costs. I recommend a 'Protect' approach (Pr1-7): The values of the properties within the report are significantly understated given current market value, this needs to be clarified. Second, sufficient justification exists for permanent solutions of development on coastal land areas that are available to buffer areas 'at risk from coastal erosion and inundation. I _____ propose coastal protection works in zone 1 &amp; 2 as there is a need to preserve the Drummond Cove foreshore areas for all people in the CofGG. The CofGG should explore, with the direct involvement of community, protection works that consider public access, public safety, property and infrastructure as our coastal lifestyle is not expendable.</p>	Acknowledgement of submission	Note Submission
			<p>In response to the following recommendation: Require Section 70A notification to be placed on titles to alert prospective purchasers to the risk of coastal erosion and / or inundation. I recommend that the CofGG undertake immediately Geophysical studies of all the shoreline areas to examine presence of rock strata that could reduce the erodibility of critical sections over the longer term (estimate \$25,000) and apply that data to the setback lines to create an accurate representation of setback lines. The current setbacks are not accurate, specific height differences in adjacent areas not affected by setback lines indicate a broad-brush approach with significant perceived financial implications at stake. I understand that the purpose of this study is to provide 'scope of works' recommendations. However, more detailed data gathering is necessary that includes analysis of rock strata within the setbacks and accurate elevations to be included. This is essential before any 70A notifications be placed on titles as a policy directive. I advise caution to the CofGG to avoid possible class action from residents under the state planning act. It is a risk that 70A clauses on titles as recommended by such a broad-based 90 year timeframe and policy approach, the historical data doesn't even exist to provide certainty to the lines as they are currently presented. This will need to be taken into consideration as part of the CBA (Cost Benefit Analysis).</p>	Acknowledgement of submission	Note Submission
			<p>I agree with the recommendations of continued immediate Monitoring and Management outlined below: Recommend a geophysical study of the shoreline areas is undertaken to examine presence of rock strata that could reduce the erodibility of critical sections over the longer term; The foreshore reserve area offers a crucial natural buffer against coastal erosion and inundation for coastal assets located landward (houses, roads etc), as well as providing highly valued public amenity. Active monitoring and nature-based approaches (e.g. coastal revegetation, sand trapping fences) to increase resilience of this foreshore reserve from erosion are strongly recommended. Community groups and local organisations should be included / supported in the delivery of these programs, to provide opportunity to raise awareness and build ownership of the coastal adaptation requirements. Again, I urge the CofGG to consider the tourism impacts to the region and future economic consequences of any policy, particularly the consequences of a purely Managed Retreat paradigm. Some of the recommended actions will inevitably bring about the outcome of 'protection' at future trigger points. The CofGG needs to acknowledge that we are well past trigger points along Whitehill Rd, Drummond Cove. It is my opinion that the scope of options and actions need to be fully explored with community, any action/response also include a thorough search for alternative/innovative approaches beyond the list of recommendations PR1-6. I strongly advise the CofGG look to other adopted approaches in other states and countries where the amenity of the coastal asset has been the highest priority. Options such as off-shore artificial reefs to mitigate wave action as the driver of coastal erosion, being just one example. As per State Planning Policy 2.6, Community consultation at every step of the way is recommended. The CofGG should seek to preserve the natural amenity and improve tourism potential wherever possible as this is the community priority. I ask the CofGG to put on a tourism lens as they view options and consider the CBA (Cost Benefit Analysis).</p>	Acknowledgement of submission	Note Submission
			<p>In response to the statement below: "The initial stages of the Geraldton CHRMAP project involved community and stakeholder engagement and a risk-based assessment, which examined coastal assets under threat from erosion and inundation in future planning timeframes. The outcomes of this initial CHRMAP phase were reported in the Coastal Hazard and Risk Assessment report (Baird 2018)" It is important that the CofGG continues to engage with community going forward with the view to avoid at all costs, a fracturing of community. It is an unacceptable outcome that the city takes a past approach that 'we know better' and pushes ahead with projects without community buy in and seek to avoid repeating its past mistakes at Drummond Cove. The DCPA community is well versed in understanding the CHRMAP process and seeking action. This is evidenced by holding the Geraldton Coastal Adaptation Planning Forum in 2014, a partnership between the Drummonds Cove Progress Association and Sunset Beach Coastcare groups. Followed by Application A15220in 2015 by the Drummond Cove Progress Association (DCPA) for works north of the John Batten Hall to respond to coastal erosion. A community action grant was applied for to the Dept. of Transport in partnership with the CofGG and NACC for the coastal zone north of the John Batten Hall. It needs to be acknowledged that the CofGG has been well aware of the issues north of John Batten Hall/Whitehill Rd. and now need to act.</p>	Acknowledgement of submission	Note Submission
			<p>Following on from the above data, it is my position to explore specifically the following recommendations from the Baird report: Section 1 &amp; Section 2. Drummond Cove Road to Community Centre &amp; Community Centre to Seacrest Way – I agree with the following: "A coastal protection approach for Drummond Cove north of the Community Hall in front of the closed section of Whitehill Rd warrants further assessment. MCA and CBA analysis of options considered show a net return on investment on the value of assets protected on the landside is possible. The high value of property at risk of erosion in future planning periods and the values of the coast noted in the Community Engagement process underline the importance of this issue." Following on from the above, I would like to see the CofGG re-visit the foredune re-build strategy(Application A15220) for section 1 &amp; 2. This course of action is reinforced by the Baird report which states: "Nature based approaches to increase resilience of shorelines and foreshore areas (eg sand trapping fences, revegetation). Recommended for section north of the Community Hall. CGG led programs supported through grant funding (estimated \$10,000 annually)."</p>	Acknowledgement of submission	Note Submission
			<p>I personally would like the CofGG to adopt the resolution of a future submerged seawall structure as part of the reclaimed foreshore works. Future proofing this area by building a below-ground seawall will provide the necessary peace of mind to the entire community. This would have to be done on the west side of the original Whitehill road line and I recommend to have it built further out in line with the rocks at the point of the Hall allowing reclaimed land behind it between the original Whitehill road line and new shore line giving tree and grassed areas for family activities running north of the Hall and providing a beach with no visible rocks. I would then recommend a north access car park from Drummond Cove road, a south access car park from Whitehill Road at the hall and a central car park from waterfront circle which would all surround a great family friendly common vegetated ad grassed space for the community to enjoy. This could then be north, south and east access points to a Central Park and beach area for families to enjoy therefore changing the overall mentality of this area as a track for illegal vehicles to cut through. These extra car park works for this area would be nothing more than using the road end points that are already there. The grassed and tree areas would be able to partly be acted on immediately with the current geo textile sand bag groins. Through community engagement I see this area as being a place for future fitness activities, family activities with maybe a bicycle/ pedestrian path linking through to promote triathlons routes and walking paths alike giving connection through the right means. Geraldton has only 30km of coastline not all of which has been inhabited within 2110 line. We do not need roads taking up these spaces rather than access car parks to take advantage of these areas once they are protected. This lets us use these areas to they're full potential, there are plenty of room for roads everywhere else. It is time to improve the amenity, provide confidence and the recommendations are there to do so.</p>	Acknowledgement of submission	Note Submission

			In response to the economic analysis below: 3.4 Economic Analysis – Adaptation options for Erosion Protection for Whitehill Rd and Community Centre null I seek further clarification as to how the fundamentals were calculated to rank these options. Of note, I am of the opinion that Boat Launch Stage 1&2 has a much higher possibility of economic return by introducing a scope of works that has on-going revenue potential and tourism benefits for the whole region that have not been considered in this report. For example, an elevated rock sea wall significantly reduces the amenity and could have a negative impact on the community. Tourism potential will be diminished and real-estate investment impacted. However, such an approach will deliver coastal protection. This is an example where the CBA is presented too narrowly through the lens of economic rationalism and does not consider other data to support the building of a boat ramp into associated protection works. Abrohos Island access and northern boat launching access appears not to have been taken into consideration in this analysis by the Baird report and therefore should be re-evaluated to more accurately reflect BCR values. In summary, Coastal erosion and the CofGG's responses over the years indicate a knowledge of CHRMAP and from the Drummond Cove perspective, we are now well past the beginning of the journey that this Baird CHRMAP report represents.	Acknowledgement of submission	Note Submission
			In closing, The significant underspend at Beresford for coastal protection works should be re-directed into coastal protection works at Drummond Cove, Bluff Point and Sunset Beach. It is State Govt. money (our taxes) that paid for Beresford, there were no rate rises recommended for them in the Baird report. Furthermore, there are no recommendations for 70A's clauses to be put on titles and no user pays scheme recommended for those land-owners. Any policy that adopts the Baird recommendations will need to consider this carefully along with its consequences.	Acknowledgement of submission	Note Submission
18	2/09/2018	Anonymous	People of Geraldton and surrounding districts see the coastal lifestyle along with associated tourism as its most valuable asset. For this reason protection is important to address inundation and erosion risks. We see the suggested measures, groynes, offshore reefs and sea walls as a step in the right direction. Beresford restoration works have shown how the coast can be enhanced and protected. We now need the other areas identified to receive the same treatment. Managed retreat is not an option the result being an expensive cleanup with risks of law suits in the future if properties are resumed Therefore protect approach is the only option to ensure all of Geraldton enjoys our wonderful coast.	Acknowledgement of submission	Note Submission
			We feel the setback lines are not accurate as they don't follow contour lines and do not take into account natural limestone ridges. Therefore we suggest a geophysical survey be carried out to give a more accurate picture of future risks Management suggestions for protection, offshore reefs, buried seawalls and geotech bag groynes although expensive will provide a cheaper option than managed retreat in the long run	Acknowledgement of submission	Note Submission
			Managed retreat is not an option. We have passed the trigger points and now need urgent protection before this problem becomes a massive one, We just can't wait and see any longer.	Acknowledgement of submission	Note Submission
			The CHRMAP report is very long and detailed but does not address the urgency of this issue. Money is being wasted on stop gap measures (sand replenishment) community surveys ( road options and personal opinions) when this should be going to coastal protection. We think the final CHRMAP report should concentrate on possible protection measures not the scenarios that may change dramatically over the next twelve to fifty years and more.		Note Submission
19	2/09/2018	Private submission	I strongly believe that through successive council & government decisions in approving works to infrastructure along the coastline from the Geraldton port to medalians beach has caused the ongoing erosion along the northern beaches. I feel it's entirely the responsibility of the council to stop this erosion at their expense & not the rate payers.		Note Submission
20	2/09/2018	Anonymous	No comments	Acknowledgement of submission	Note Submission
21	2/09/2018	Private submission	It's not ok to allow blocks to be sold, provide building permits and then devalue them in this way. The council needs to provide beach protection by seeking funding from federal and state and also the Port.	Acknowledgement of submission	Note Submission
			How is it that the council have protected Chapman Road where the properties will not be devalued but the same may not happen for properties further north? This is grossly unfair The amount of \$450,000 estimate for the value of the purchase of each property is too low. My own property cost \$800,000 - 3 years ago. The building of the Port and Marina have blocked the flow of sand to the beaches north so now our properties are devalued because of it. The Port should pay for the protection of the northern beaches I propose that all property owners who's properties are devalued as the council will not protect them should cease to pay rates immediately I understand that information regarding beach degradation is only shown POST the building of the marina. Can the council provide information regarding degradation before the marina was build and also the Port. Why have the council waited for assets to be washed away before taking action	The primary driver for the Beresford Foreshore Project was to protect State and Local Government assets and utilities at risk from coastal erosion. The project was funded through the Royalties for Regions funding. The City committed \$1.85M to improvement of the amenity to address a deficiency in POS amenity for the Beresford locality.	Note Submission
22	2/09/2018	Private submission	The study looked very well done but was too long for me to read totally. It looks quite negative though on my family home I hope that good decisions can be made from this report and process as some bad ones have been made in the past affecting my home suburb of Sunset Beach	Acknowledgement of submission	Note Submission
			I see Bluff Point, not far from us is extreme risk and we are not. I hope any works undertaken in Bluff Points takes into account the impact it will have in Sunset Beach Why has there been no work done at Sunset beach but some in Beresford, St George's and Drummonds Cove? Our beach and the park between the caravan park is ugly and we had the toilet block demolished. Great! The ugly gates and signs on the dunes look terrible. Why does the Council not look after its premium assets, like Sunset Beach, like they do in Perth? I can see mum and Dad are down at the moment with this report and the erosion threat. How can they retire when the house is worthless? How can we come home when the house is falling in the sea? Geraldton is not looking a good place to return to. Do you want us to leave and stay away? Don't you want investors? Please protect our family house. There was no mention I could see about coastal engineers being consulted. Please get them in, not the people whom have advised the council about the coast so far. They have made a mess.		Note Submission
			Managed retreat would not be an option for Sunset Beach. The houses are too valuable and the suburbs lifestyle would be destroyed. My family would leave town and never return. Please get the right people to advise you and make the right decisions. Please protect my house!	Acknowledgement of submission	Note Submission
			It is time to spend money at Sunset Beach. None has been spent there for a long time. The beach looks ugly and the suburb looks tired. I was born and raised at Sunset and I would like to return to my family home often. My family and I are not second class citizens in Sunset but it looks that way with the lack of spending here compared to elsewhere.	Acknowledgement of submission	Note Submission
23	2/09/2018	Private submission	The report looked very comprehensive although quite lengthy	Acknowledgement of submission	Note Submission
			The idea of having 12 CMU's looks great but there appears to be no report on the interactions between the units, such as, how altering one may affect another. For example, how works south of Sunset beach where my family home is, can affect our beach and dune system. This has an impact on managed retreat or protection systems instituted. I would like our recommendation changed from Managed retreat to protection. I am studying in Perth and I love coming home to the house I was born and raised in. Clearly, my folks love living there!	Acknowledgement of submission	Note Submission
			I would like the section 70A removed from the title at time of sale. This would have a very detrimental affect on the value and prospective value. What will Mum and Dad retire on if they can't downsize the house? Dad has also spent a fortune renovating the house and has been quite disheartened by recent events Please protect this house and our family home.	Acknowledgement of submission	Note Submission
			I note that that millions of dollars have been spent on the Beresford foreshore, sandbags at Drummonds and St George's, which is great, but nothing has been spent at our beach. I have seen our Triton Place toilet block demolished, ugly signs and gates put on the dune, and that is it for us. Now is ours, Sunset Beach's turn please	In line with State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy, the Beresford Foreshore Project, as new coastal protection works has progressed only after all other options for avoiding and adapting to coastal hazards had been fully explored, as part of a comprehensive coastal hazard risk management process	Note Submission
			I realise coastal erosion is a global problem. This can be managed by getting the right advice from qualified coastal marine engineers. We do not need the mess that has been created so far, for example, the Drummonds Cove hall and Whitehill road. Look to Noosa and Queensland, Mandurah whom seem to have it right Well done on doing the report, but PLEASE listen to the right people whom know what they are talking about	Acknowledgement of submission	Note Submission
24			Also, please get the Port to do sand renourishment on our beach as it all went downhill since the harbour was deepened and groynes installed in the new marina	The Port Enhancement Project went through a Public Environment Review as part of the approvals process. The Port has an ongoing commitment to bypass 12,500m3 of sand from Pages Beach to the Northern Beaches between the Beresford Foreshore and the Chapman River annually.	Note Submission
25	2/09/2018	Private submission (x2)	I understand the impact that erosion is having on the area in which we live and now want feedback and decisions to be made on actions that are to be undertaken.	Acknowledgement of submission	Note Submission
			I feel that in Bluff Point we have the same rights as what Beresford has in protecting their coastlines. I pay a significant amount in rates for both my homes in Bluff Point and would want to see some benefit in paying these by having action taken to protect my homefronts.	In line with State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy, the Beresford Foreshore Project, as new coastal protection works has progressed only after all other options for avoiding and adapting to coastal hazards had been fully explored, as part of a comprehensive coastal hazard risk management process	Note Submission
			We plan to be long term residents in Bluff Point and certainly oppose notifications on my title. I certainly want action to ensure that our coastline is protected to aid us in staying here long term.	Acknowledgement of submission	Note Submission
			We have a house on Kempton and a house on Hungerford in Bluff Point and heard about this from a neighbour! No letterbox drop, no social media, no door knock to notify us. Having an advertisement in the Guardian or West Australian to notify does not suffice.	The development of the Geraldton CHRMAP report has had extensive community consultation. Community consultation will continue throughout the CHRMAP process.	Note Submission
26	2/09/2018	Private submission (x2)	yes. If we know that the south gates dunes will disappear by 2070 why are we still allowing sand removal	The section of Southgate Dunes that is contributing to the supply of sand feeding the beaches north of the dune system is not being mined, and will not be going into the future.	Note Submission
			Is there a parallel between the sand removed from south gates and the lifetime of the sand dune system	No	Note Submission
			If the south gates dunes are expected to be gone by 2070 if we stop mining of sand now will that extend the life of the dunes and therefore ensure Tarcoola beach stays a accreting beach for longer	The section of Southgate Dunes that is contributing to the supply of sand feeding the beaches north of the dune system is not being mined, and will not be going into the future.	Note Submission
27	2/09/2018	Private submission	The report does not reflect what the workshops summary report requested which was 'protect', specifically our area which is Regional Park, which happens to be a very unique biodiversity. Your statistics only go back interestingly to 1992, which is when the Port was built (DPI took responsibility for increased erosion and paid the Council off -which interestingly you chose to use the \$ only on the small area of the foreshore, therefore moving the erosion problem further north. Erosion Data actually goes back to 1936, which sure would give a more accurate projection for the next 100 years, as opposed to only the last 25 years.	The Geraldton CHRMAP report looks at aerial photographs back to 1942	Note Submission
			There is good justification to have most of the areas 'protect' (using seawall/artificial reef, dune rehab and geo textile containers), as it does not make sense not only financially but for the future development of Geraldton. Not to do so will kill Geraldton.	Acknowledgement of submission	Note Submission
			Protect is the least costly and least damaging to the city and future of Geraldton. We have to use a sensible pro active approach giving the best outcome for the whole of Geraldton and those visiting.	Acknowledgement of submission	Note Submission
			I recently purchased a property in the high risk zone. We were not informed of any 'report' at that time which would effect the possession of the property and its future, despite you having data at that time. We are yet to build and the S70 will directly effect us like no other residents in Geraldton, not only financially but physically, due to the building restraints.	The coastal hazard maps that cover Bluff Point were completed and made publicly available in March 2016	Note Submission
28	2/09/2018	Private submission	Yes, that initial period of consultation has been lacking in critical areas. To state there has been extensive community consultation is flawed. I live on Kempton Street, my property is one identified as being at risk. Why were we not contacted directly for comment? The mayor states "they could not have done more", he must be misinformed as the first I heard about this was via a flyer from a concerned resident. Protection of existing property is the only option my Council should be considering. We already pay a differential rate. When Council approve subdivision and development then they have implied agreement and responsibility for protection of that area. To suggest the placing of a S70 notice retrospectively on title deeds and thereby devaluing those properties is not acceptable, this has to be done prior to releasing land prior to development.		Note Submission

			<p>My submission relates solely to the alternatives of coastal management. To be potentially considering a managed retreat is totally unacceptable. When I purchased my property, on a council approved lot, subdivision approved by council, I believe there is an implied responsibility of my council to ensure that land is protected. To suggest a S70 notice is put on my deeds retrospectively is a disgrace, it is distressing, even the suggestion will have devalued my home, this is unacceptable. The council spends a great deal of money on amenities and assets I do not use, yet they are considering an option that residential properties and other assets are not worth protecting?? How do other councils around the world manage to do far more to protect their coastline from erosion? Most of which have a far harder and more expensive task than Geraldton City Council.</p> <p>Totally unacceptable to retrospectively place a S40 notice on properties deeds. Council has a responsibility to protect land they approve for development, any intention to not do so has to be made at time of releasing that land. For my area Bluff point, the protection of the foreshore is a very economical and easy to achieve, we have capstone/bedrock on the surface along the whole foreshore.</p> <p>It appears to be giving council the opportunity to absolve themselves of one of their primary responsibilities, protection of property, the town and established amenities should take priority over other nice to have spending. It is achieved world wide, in far harder areas to protect than Geraldton, why are we considering a managed retreat in such easily protected suburbs? I do not agree with sandbag protection as this is not a permanent option, requiring further ongoing investment, more permanent structure, whether groynes or rock walls should be investigated. These are proven systems of protection world wide.</p>	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note Submission
			<p>Very pleased that the CGG has undertaken this study.</p> <p>No I believe everything that has come out of it has been thoroughly considered.</p> <p>No - very needed to plan for the future</p> <p>Yes. Re: Drummond Cove - Seacrest Way beach access to the south - as far as Glenies Point access by off road vehicles should cease. The constant traffic flow which has increased over the years is not only unsafe for young families and dogs but prohibiting coastal plant life to regenerate and retain soil.</p>	Acknowledgment of Submission	Note Submission
29	2/09/2008	Private submission		Acknowledgment of Submission	Note Submission
				Acknowledgment of Submission	Note Submission
				Acknowledgment of Submission	Note Submission
					Note Submission
30	1/09/2018	Private submission	<p>The report does not reflect what the workshops summary report requested which was 'protect', specifically our area which is Regional Park, which happens to be a very unique biodiversity. Your statistics only go back interestingly to 1992, which is when the Port was built (DPI took responsibility for increased erosion and paid the Council off -which interestingly you chose to use the \$ only on the small area of the foreshore, therefore moving the erosion problem further north . Erosion Data actually goes back to 1936, which sure would give a more accurate projection for the next 100 years, as opposed to only the last 25 years.</p> <p>There is good justification to have most of the areas 'protect' (using seawall/artificial reef, dune rehab and geo textile containers), as it does not make sense not only financially but for the future development of Geraldton. <b>Not to do so will kill Geraldton.</b></p> <p>Protect is the least costly and least damaging to the city and future of Geraldton. We have to use a sensible pro active approach giving the best outcome for the whole of Geraldton and those visiting.</p> <p>I recently purchased a property in the high risk zone. We were not informed of any 'report' at that time which would effect the possession of the property and its future, despite you having data at that time. We are yet to build and the S70 will directly effect us like no other residents in Geraldton, not only financially but physically, due to the building restraints.</p>		Note Submission
				Acknowledgment of Submission	Note Submission
				The coastal hazard maps that cover Bluff Point were completed and made publicly available in March 2016	Note Submission
31	1/09/2018	Private submission	<p>My family and I have lived in this area for almost four years. Within this time the coastline has eroded at an exceptional rate. Prior to purchasing our property we contacted the CoGG on a number of times to ensure coastal erosion would not be a future problem for us and our home. Staff at CoGG were evasive and provided no feedback on whether there were any known issues in this area. After purchasing our property, and subsequent current erosion, we have come to learn that there is a massive problem here in Drummond Cove and it has been happening for several years. The worse part about it is that the CoGG not only knew but have openly admitted to contributing to the issue by placing rocks around the Batten Hall and surrounding infrastructure. These initial Emergency Works (a Managed Retreat option), undertaken by the CoGG, have largely contributed to coastal erosion that is now threatening our properties right now. What we, and others in the community, were expecting from the CHRMAP report was to create new Policy directing to the PROTECTION of our properties and other community assets not a Managed Retreat option which clearly has not worked in the past. We were expecting detailed engineering advice on what should be done now to repair the coastline in which CoGG had contributed to the hastening of coastline degradation. We have been patiently waiting for this report and now it seems the recommendations from this report favour a do nothing approach (a Managed Retreat option). This is unacceptable. The whole of our community, and tourists, consider the beaches and associated coastal strip of paramount importance to their lifestyle and enjoyment. Our attraction to tourists both internationally and locally in WA is our outdoor orientated climate, wind and surf and those tourism potentials into the economics that benefit community benefit everyone. It was made clear during the community consultation phase, which I attended and participated, of CHRMAP the Geraldton community at large values the beaches and foreshore of the municipality of Geraldton above all other assets. This view must expand to include all people in the entire region of the CoGG jurisdiction. Including, residents from the Shire of Chapman Valley who also enjoy the foreshore areas, particularly the connection to Drummond Cove. It is too narrow a perspective to view this CHRMAP report through the lens of only those residents living within coastal processes setback lines as affected. There are a number of concerns I would like to take up with the CoGG in response to the overall recommendations to the Draft CHRMAP Report. Please find these listed below in detail. This response was written by myself but also with the considered input and consensus from other community members.</p> <p>I _____ reject some of the recommendations of Managed Retreat. The CoGG has adopted the strategy of Managed Retreat for many years now in the absence of hazard mapping and CHRMAP reports and policy. This has resulted in trigger points being passed that have lost assets in Drummond Cove and I urge the CoGG to now act. It is not acceptable to me that the CHRMAP report is a justification for adopting Managed Retreat from this point forward as the CoGG has been well aware and has obligations under the Planning Act to land owners. We recommend that the CoGG explore with the Drummond Cove Community via community consultation the CBA (Cost Benefit Analysis) of immediate strategies now, and longer term. Community consultation is essential to prevent further fracturing of community over the issue of coastal erosion. It is important to consider the Western Australian legislative framework that would result from voluntary or compulsory acquisition. Case law pertaining to compulsory acquisition judgments indicates that values paid usually far exceed current market value due to Courts also awarding on-costs like removal expenses and legal costs. I recommend a 'Protect' approach (Pr1-7): The values of the properties within the report are significantly understated given current market value, this needs to be clarified. Second, sufficient justification exists for permanent solutions of development on coastal land areas that are available to buffer areas 'at risk from coastal erosion and inundation. I Meagan Thompson propose coastal protection works in zone 1 &amp; 2 as there is a need to preserve the Drummond Cove foreshore areas for all people in the CoGG. The CoGG should explore, with the direct involvement of community, protection works that consider public access, public safety, property and infrastructure as our coastal lifestyle is not expendable.</p> <p>In response to the following recommendation: Require Section 70A notification to be placed on titles to alert prospective purchasers to the risk of coastal erosion and / or inundation. I recommend that the CoGG undertake immediately Geophysical studies of all the shoreline areas to examine presence of rock strata that could reduce the erodibility of critical sections over the longer term (estimate \$25,000) and apply that data to the setback lines to create an accurate representation of setback lines. The current setbacks are not accurate, specific height differences in adjacent areas not affected by setback lines indicate a broad-brush approach with significant perceived financial implications at stake. I understand that the purpose of this study is to provide 'scope of works' recommendations. However, more detailed data gathering is necessary that includes analysis of rock strata within the setbacks and accurate elevations to be included. This is essential before any 70A notifications be placed on titles as a policy directive. I advise caution to the CoGG to avoid possible class action from residents under the state planning act. It is a risk that 70A clauses on titles as recommended by such a broad-based 110 year timeframe and policy approach, the historical data doesn't even exist to provide certainty to the lines as they are currently presented. This will need to be taken into consideration as part of the CBA (Cost Benefit Analysis). Further more on completion of PROTECTION works setback lines will change. Once 70a Notifications are placed on titles this will devalue our properties even more.</p> <p>I agree with the recommendations of continued immediate Monitoring and Management outlined below: Recommend a geophysical study of the shoreline areas is undertaken to examine presence of rock strata that could reduce the erodibility of critical sections over the longer term; The foreshore reserve area offers a crucial natural buffer against coastal erosion and inundation for coastal assets located landward (houses, roads etc), as well as providing highly valued public amenity. Active monitoring and nature-based approaches (e.g. coastal revegetation, sand trapping fences) to increase resilience of this foreshore reserve from erosion are strongly recommended. Community groups and local organisations should be included / supported in the delivery of these programs, to provide opportunity to raise awareness and build ownership of the coastal adaptation requirements. Again, I urge the CoGG to consider the tourism impacts to the region and future economic consequences of any policy, particularly the consequences of a purely Managed Retreat strategy. Some of the recommended actions will inevitably bring about the outcome of 'protection' at future trigger points. The CoGG needs to acknowledge that we are well past trigger points along Whitehill Rd, Drummond Cove. It is my opinion that the scope of options and actions need to be fully explored with community, any action/response also include a thorough search for alternative/innovative approaches beyond the list of recommendations PR1-6. I strongly advise the CoGG look to other adopted approaches in other states and countries where the amenity of the coastal asset has been the highest priority. Options such as off-shore artificial reefs to mitigate wave action as the driver of coastal erosion, being just one example. As per State Planning Policy 2.6, Community consultation at every step of the way is recommended. The CoGG should seek to preserve the natural amenity and improve tourism potential wherever possible as this is the community priority. I ask the CoGG to put on a tourism lens as they view options and consider the CBA (Cost Benefit Analysis).</p> <p>Section 1 &amp; Section 2. Drummond Cove Road to Community Centre &amp; Community Centre to Seacrest Way – I agree with the following: "A coastal protection approach for Drummond Cove north of the Community Hall in front of the closed section of Whitehill Rd warrants further assessment. MCA and CBA analysis of options considered show a net return on investment on the value of assets protected on the landside is possible. The high value of property at risk of erosion in future planning periods and the values of the coast noted in the Community Engagement process underline the importance of this issue. " I would like the CoGG to think of implementing protections works, both immediately and in long term, such as a below ground seawall structure to provide the necessary protection and peace of mind to the entire community. Also for the CoGG to consider the construction of an artificial reef situated directly off the coast north of the Community Hall area. Not only will this provide the much needed protection of this area by a amenity, such as beach area, for the whole community to access and enjoy. In response to the economic analysis below:</p> <p>3.4 Economic Analysis – Adaptation options for Erosion Protection for Whitehill Rd and Community Centre. I seek further clarification as to how the fundamentals were calculated to rank these options. Of note, I am of the opinion that Boat Launch Stage 1&amp;2 has a much higher possibility of economic return by introducing a scope of works that has on-going revenue potential and tourism benefits for the whole region that have not been considered in this report. For example, an elevated rock sea wall significantly reduces the amenity and could have a negative impact on the community. Tourism potential will be diminished and real-estate investment impacted. However, such an approach will deliver coastal protection. This is an example where the CBA is presented too narrowly through the lens of economic rationalism and does not consider other data to support the building of a boat ramp into associated protection works. Abroholos Island access and northern boat launching access appears not to have been taken into consideration in this analysis by the Baird report and therefore should be re-evaluated to more accurately reflect BCR values.</p>	Acknowledgement of submission	Note Submission
				Acknowledgement of submission	Note Submission
				Acknowledgement of submission	Note Submission
				Acknowledgement of submission	Note Submission



			In Summary Coastal erosion and the CofGG's responses over the years indicate a knowledge of CHRMAP and from the Drummond Cove perspective, we are now well past the beginning of the journey that this Baird CHRMAP report represents. In closing, The significant underspend at Beresford for coastal protection works should be re-directed into coastal protection works at Drummond Cove, Bluff Point and Sunset Beach. It is State Govt. money (our taxes) that paid for Beresford, there were no rate rises recommended for them in the Baird report. Furthermore, there are no recommendations for 70A's clauses to be put on titles and no user pays scheme recommended for those land-owners. Any policy that adopts the Baird recommendations will need to consider this carefully.	Acknowledgement of submission	Note Submission
32	1/09/2018	Private submission	Instead of worrying about what might happen in 50 or 100 years just deal with what is happening now and that is coastal erosion caused by the changes made around the harbour and town area. Most of the damage is occurring on the north side of the town which is the way tide, wind,swell and current move and the alterations to the harbour have disrupted the natural flow of replenishing sand to these areas.	Acknowledgement of submission	Note Submission
			The council have done some great work in helping to stabilize the area from Midalia beach through to St Georges and the need to continue that work as the managed retreat and doing nothing is really not an option. Geotextile groins seem to be proving themselves as a good low cost option and perhaps a series of these at strategic points between St Georges and Drummonds may be an option.	Acknowledgement of submission	Note Submission
			Placing caveats on properties is not really a viable option as you would immediately devalue those properties and possibly leave the council open to litigation. Unless there is irrefutable evidence that we are going to be inundated with rising water in the next 10 to 20 we should just deal with the now.	Acknowledgement of submission	Note Submission
			I would like acknowledgment that you have received this sent to _____	Acknowledgement of submission	Note Submission
33	1/09/2018	Anonymous	No comments	Acknowledgement of submission	Note Submission
34	1/09/2018	Private submission	Overall a well balanced & laid out report. However, I do not support the recommendations of the CHRMAP report for managed retreat of Sunset Beach unit. From the report itself, you can see that there is sufficient justification for The Sunset Beach management unit to be classified as PROTECT rather than accommodate/managed retreat. 1. CHRMAP examined the economic case for coastal protection at both St Georges Beach & Drummond Cove as examples of management strategies. Their cost benefit analysis demonstrated that protection in the form of geotextile groynes (+/-) a seawall would 'deliver a net return on investment when taking into account the value of the property and public land that is protected (appendix A.5 & p116 part 2). Sunset Beach would be no different, having equally the same if not more significant commercial, public utilised land and home properties. 2. Sunset Beach is reported in The Coastal Adaption Report as having 'no risk of inundation'. I understand that as a consequence of no inundation, Sunset Beach is likely to do better from a PROTECT approach than possibly some other management units. 3. Community and Cultural values of the coastal zones. a managed retreat DOES NOT support local community values.	Acknowledgement of submission	Note Submission
			Sunset Beach is reported in The Coastal Adaption Report as having 'no risk of inundation'. I understand that as a consequence of no inundation, Sunset Beach is likely to do better from a PROTECT approach than possibly some other management units. At the Community Value Workshop it was identified that loss of residential property & community area would have a 'catastrophic impact'. As a voting member of the community, I ask "is it not the Geraldton City Council's responsibility to endeavor to support the needs of it's community?" PROTECT is what the members of Sunset Community have been asking for, for many years. I have supporting documents from 2006 when we raised the issue of beach erosion & protection to the council. The response was one of 'we will manage it in an appropriate manner when the time arises'. We as community members, put our trust in you as The City Council, to do your utmost to support us... PROTECT SUNSET BEACH.	The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops were undertaken to provide the opportunity for the community to identify and prioritise assets and values of importance to them in the coastal zone. The CHRMAP Community Values Workshops also explained the Coastal Adaptation Types and provided the opportunity for the community participants to suggest adaptation measures for each adaptation type. This provided information for the consultant to identify the long term adaptation pathway for the assets and values in the coastal zone.	Note Submission
			PROTECT SUNSET BEACH	Acknowledgement of submission	Note Submission
35	31/08/2018	Anonymous	No comment	Acknowledgement of submission	Note Submission
36	31/08/2018	Private submission	Hi Yes as a resident of bluff point I have seen the Erosion of the foreshore over the last ten years or so . Most of this caused by the effects of the port. As there is reef in front of bluff point which mitigates the wave action to a large degree protecting the sand would be reasonably easy using large boulders easily available locally to the council Yes I am horrified that all the residents of bluff point, who pay their rates could be put in a position where the council will not protect their largest and most precious asset . On top of this that the council could have the affront to put a section 70 on our deeds which would possibly decrease the value of our homes by as much as 50 %. This is an outrageous proposition The land costs and rates for bluff point should allow us the benefit of the council protecting our most prized assets our beloved homes We live and work in Geraldton and expect to be looked after by our council. Not left to our own devices and abandoned with the indignity of the council then putting a section 70 on our deeds. This is outrageous Having lived in the UK for 30 years and seen the amount and effort made by all councils to protect people's prized possessions on all coastal ares of the Uk .This seems to me to be a draconian view There is only one option in my opinion ,the council having let people buy land and build houses in Bluff point now have a moral responsibility to protect these people's homes as council ratepayers. Not to wash their hands of them and then slap them in the face with a section 70 notice. Outrageous!! I hope to see some common sense applied to the situation and have seen no mention of the port helping with the costs as it seems to me that a lot of the problems have been caused by the port . Which makes considerable money and profits from it,s existence and therefore should be partly responsible for the adverse effects it has on coastal erosion	Acknowledgement of submission	Note Submission
				Acknowledgement of submission	Note Submission
				Acknowledgement of submission	Note Submission
				The Port Enhancement Project went through a Public Environment Review as part of the approvals process. The Port has an ongoing commitment to bypass 12,500m3 of sand from Pages Beach to the Northern Beaches between the Beresford Foreshore and the Chapman River annually.	Note Submission
37	29/08/2018	Private submission	I'm a land owner on glenfield beach drive water front and I want the protection options	Acknowledgement of submission	Note Submission
38	29/08/2018	Department of Primary Industries and Regional Development	Thank you for the opportunity to provide comment on the City of Greater Geraldton (CGG) Coastal Management Risk Management Adaptation Plan (CHRMAP) prepared by the civil engineering company Baird Australia Pty Ltd. The Department of Primary Industry and Regional Development (DPIRD) has examined the CHRMAP and notes how thorough and detailed the document is. The CHRMAP appears to take a proactive risk management approach to erosion and inundation for the coastal strip from Cape Burney (Greenough River mouth) to Drummond Cove which should assist CGG to prepare for the worst impacts of inundation and erosion before they occur. While DPIRD has no more specific comments to make about the CHRMAP, it would like to point out that it has a State-wide interest in coastal management issues through its participation on the Coastal Management Advisory Group (CMAG), which was established by the then Department of Planning in April 2016. CMAG is tasked with seeking a whole of government solution to dealing with coastal erosion hot spots. DPIRD is represented on and is particularly interested in the impact of erosion on communities outside of the Perth Metropolitan Region. DPIRD notes that there are major variations in the topography of the coastal strip covered by the CHRMAP and breaking it down into 12 coastal management units takes account of this.	Acknowledgement of submission	Note Submission
				Acknowledgement of submission	Note Submission
39	28/08/2018	Private submission	This and the Coastal Adaptation Reports are too lengthy and complex for many ratepayers to read and understand. The City needs to conduct public information sessions with a relevant digest of the Reports distributed to participants beforehand. This will allow effective participation and understanding. The Draft CHRMAP should not be accepted and endorsed by the City until the sessions are held and more time is allowed for adequate ratepayer feedback.	The development of the Geraldton CHRMAP report has had extensive community consultation. Community consultation will continue throughout the CHRMAP process.	Note Submission
40	16/08/2018	Private submission	I am responding to this report as a very concerned property owner whos house is only just outside the 2110 erosion line. As a small business owner and someone who spends a lot of time working to make the business successful, and as a family / parents with 2 school age children, we do not have a lot of time to keep abreast of the council happenings. As such we have missed the initial stages of the Community Coastal Planning Survey and Workshops. We also must be outside of the zone residential properties that received the Flyers that were hand delivered to residents/homeowners residing on the ocean side of coastal roads. I am disappointed not too have received a letter in the post notifying us of all the workshops etc as some of the scenarios and consequences of this report will have an enormous economic impact on us individually as well as an enormous social and economic impact on the local community of drummond cove. I would agree with the report that there is Extreme Immediate action required to eliminate or reduce the Unacceptable / Intolerable risk to acceptable levels for Key Assets at Risk in the Drummond Cove (CMU1) affecting Houses and Properties, Beaches, John Batten Hall, Sand Dunes and Vegetation Drummond Cove is a very beautiful part of the world to live in and raise a family, but recently with the extreme erosion thats occurred it has become very hazardous to launch a boat at the gravel boat ramp and all the beaches have become much shorter in length and also much steeper and on a whole less user friendly for young families. If all properties within the SCA will require a Section 70A notification to be placed on title to alert prospective purchasers to the risk of coastal erosion and /or coastal inundation, this will massively devalue every property both inside the SCA as well as all properties near the line will also be effected and this will have a flow on effect as it will become very difficult to sell any property in or around the 2110 SCA line. We have worked hard over our lives and have saved and planned with the aim of owning our house in a great suburb (drummond cove). The prospect of now having all houses inside the 2110 SCA now having a section 70 notice being put on the title will effectively mean that our existing house will now be valued so lo that it will not be economic to sell and we will effectively have to stay put. We will not be able to borrow any money against the value of our house in the future and hence will be at a great disadvantage in investing for our familys future. We have brought a vacant block of land off the city greater geraldton in the land swap deal to get rid of the old beach houses on the west side of whitehill road. It now seems very unlikely that this block of land will ever be allowed to be built on and as such has been an enourms waste of money. It is important to consider the uncertainty in relation to future sea level rise projections and also shoreline response in each coastal compartment. If there is continued uncertainty along teh coast of geraldton regarding the erosion risk then there will be very low rates of investment in these areas which in turn will not be good for teh local economy. Recalculation of shoreline position in future revisions of the CHRMAP, will further increase investor uncertainty in the area going foward unless steps are taken to ensure that erosion is not going to be a factor into the future. If a managed retreat position is taken by the City I believe it will incur reputational damage as a place to live. I would be in favour of the development of a boat launch ramp in Drummond Cove as a multi benefit souldtion to the erosion risk. There is no boat launch facility north of the city centre and hence a new facility in drummond cove would take the pressure off the use on the existing one. This would become a large asset to the area and thee would be many Unquantified benefits the report has not factored in such as: Increasing values for the beach and parkland saved from erosion; Improved usage values for the boat ramp; Environmental values. Can the council please ensure that Geraldton remains a great place to live and work and stop the risk of ersoion from negativly impacton on our futures. A managed retreat is not a option. A managed retreat is not a option This will effect a lot more than just 707 residential or commercial properties in the study area and the flow on effect to the prosperity of Geraldton will last a lifetime (good or bad depending on the resolutions adopted by council)	Acknowledgement of submission	Note Submission
				Acknowledgement of submission	Note Submission
				Acknowledgement of submission	Note Submission
				The development of the Geraldton CHRMAP report has had extensive community consultation. Community consultation will continue throughout the CHRMAP process.	Note Submission
41	23/08/2018	Private submission	The only option is for active prevention and repair to the already and future erosion areas, caused by the deepening of the shipping channel. The city centre shoreline has been protected however it has only moved the problem further North causing erosion to Sunset Beaches and Drummonds Cove. None of this erosion had occurred before the dredging. The onus is on those who authorized the Port deepening not on the land holders. Managed retreat is not an option. Protect is the only option and as it has been implemented in the town center it should also be implemented along the coast. Protective structures should be put in place to protect our coast line and properties. Protect is the only option to benefit Geraldton. Do nothing will incur irreparable damage and legal costs and greater problems to Geraldton. Planned retreat will be far too costly with know greater outcome. Protect will be the greatest benefit to the City of Geraldton as a whole and to the home owners not just at risk but to Geraldton as a City, community and encourage tourism. Surprised and disappointed that the residents of Geraldton especially the residents affected by this report weren't notified about this. Especially when the original time to comment was so short.	The Beresford Foreshore project coastal protection structures have been designed not to interrupt the sediment flow northwards from Beresford	Note Submission
				Acknowledgement of submission	Note Submission
				Acknowledgement of submission	Note Submission
				The development of the Geraldton CHRMAP report has had extensive community consultation. Community consultation will continue throughout the CHRMAP process.	Note Submission

42	23/08/2018	Private submission	With the large reef off the Kempton street front beach this should stop most of the erosion in this area? All the years the two houses on the very front near Kempton/ fuller st they have never had a problem. Surely having a large natural reef that runs from the beach to about 150m + off shore should stop erosion in these area's. Seems like a yellow line has been draw from south to north and put everyone in the same basket.	The coastal hazards maps are based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy	Note Submission
43	21/08/18	Private submission	Please consider the community of Sunset Beach and other surrounding suburbs that will be affected by the proper Coastal Hazard and Risk Assessment Report. We have taken years to save a deposit for our family home that we had hope to pass down to our family. however now after reading your report has caused stress and financial burden upon not only our families but other families that will be affected if the Council choses the buy option. We will not only be left homeless but with a mortgage to a house that we will no longer own or will be inundated by water over years to come. Yes please consider the communities comments and let them have a say, don't make the choice for them in saving what happens to our communities homes of Sunset Beach.	Acknowledgment of Submission	Note Submission
44	21/08/2018	Private submission	Defend and protect Drummonds Cove foreshore.	Acknowledgment of Submission	Note Submission
45	21/08/2018	Private submission	Defend and protect Drummond Cove foreshore.	Acknowledgment of Submission	Note Submission
46	21/08/2018	Private submission	No comments.	Acknowledgment of Submission	Note Submission
47	20/08/2018	Private submission	I recommend a 'Protect' approach (Pr1-7): The values of the properties within the report are significantly understated given current market value. Second, sufficient justification exists for permanent solutions development on coastal land areas that are available to buffer areas 'at risk from coastal erosion and inundation. I propose coastal protection works as there is a need to preserve the Drummond Cove foreshore areas for all people in the CofGG. The CofGG should explore, with the direct involvement of community, protection works that consider public access, public safety, property and infrastructure as our coastal lifestyle is not expendable. Referencing the Coastal Planning Community Survey Report January 2018, particularly pages 4 and 5, the whole of our community and tourists alike considers the beaches and associated coastal strip of paramount importance to their lifestyle and enjoyment. Our attraction to tourists both internationally and locally in WA is our outdoor orientated climate, wind and surf and those tourism potentials into the economics that benefit community benefit everyone. During the community consultation phase of CHRMAP, the data clearly demonstrates that the Geraldton community at large values the beaches and foreshore of the municipality of Geraldton above all other assets. This view must expand to include all people in the entire region of the CofGG jurisdiction. Including, residents from the Shire of Chapman Valley who also enjoy the foreshore areas, particularly the connection to Drummond Cove. It is too narrow a perspective to view this CHRMAP report through a lens of only those residents living within coastal processes setback lines as affected	Acknowledgment of Submission	Note Submission
			It is important that the CofGG continues to engage with community going forward with the view to avoid at all costs, a fracturing of community. It is an unacceptable outcome that the city takes an approach that 'we know better' and pushes ahead with projects without community buy in and seek to avoid repeating it's past mistakes. The DCPA community is well versed in understanding the CHRMAP process and seeking action. This is evidenced by holding the Geraldton Coastal Adaptation Planning Forum in 2014, a partnership between the Drummonds Cove Progress Association and Sunset Beach Coastcare groups. Followed by Application A15220 in 2015 by the Drummond Cove Progress Association (DCPA) for works north of the John Batten Hall. A community action grant in partnership with the CofGG and NACC for the coastal zone north of the John Batten Hall. It needs to be acknowledged that the CofGG has been well aware of the issues north of John Batten Hall/Whitehill Rd. and now need to act to comply with State Planning requirements. Following on from the above data, it is my position to explore specifically the following recommendations from the Baird report: Section 1 & Section 2. Drummond Cove Road to Community Centre & Community Centre to Seacrest Way – We agree with the following: "A coastal protection approach for Drummond Cove north of the Community Hall in front of the closed section of Whitehill Rd warrants further assessment. MCA and CBA analysis of options considered show a net return on investment on the value of assets protected on the landside is possible. The high value of property at risk of erosion in future planning periods and the values of the coast noted in the Community Engagement process underline the importance of this issue." Following on from the above, implement the foredune re-build strategy (Application A15220) for section 1 & 2 to implement a foredune re-build for both sections 1 & 2. This course of action is reinforced by the Baird report which states: "Nature based approaches to increase resilience of shorelines and foreshore areas (eg sand trapping fences, revegetation). Recommended for section north of the Community Hall. CGG led programs supported through grant funding (estimated \$10,000 annually)."	Acknowledgment of Submission	Note Submission
			I would like the CofGG to adopt the resolution presented to council in July to re-establish a north south link and adjust the associated, planned works to reference CHRMAP and DCPA recommendations. Second, adjust any detailed plans to include creation of a natural buffer as planned in A15220 by the DCPA Coastcare group and NACC concept stage from 2015. Implement the above as a short/medium term approach and improve the amenity as this scope of works can be acted on immediately.	Acknowledgment of Submission	Note Submission
			I agree with the recommendations of continued immediate Monitoring and Management outlined below. Recommend a geophysical study of the shoreline areas is undertaken to examine presence of rock strata that could reduce the erodibility of critical sections over the longer term; The foreshore reserve area offers a crucial natural buffer against coastal erosion and inundation for coastal assets located landward (houses, roads etc), as well as providing highly valued public amenity. Active monitoring and nature-based approaches (e.g. coastal revegetation, sand trapping fences) to increase resilience of this foreshore reserve from erosion are strongly recommended. Community groups and local organisations should be included / supported in the delivery of these programs, to provide opportunity to raise awareness and build ownership of the coastal adaptation requirements. Again, I urge the CofGG to consider the tourism impacts to the region and future economic consequences of any policy, particularly the consequences of a Managed Retreat paradigm. Some of the recommended actions will bring about the outcome of 'protection' at a trigger point. The CofGG needs to acknowledge that we are well past trigger points at Whitehill Rd.	Acknowledgment of Submission	Note Submission
48	16/08/2018	Private submission	I reject the recommendations of Managed Retreat. The CofGG has adopted the strategy of Managed Retreat for many years now in the absence of a hazard mapping and CHRMAP reports. It has passed trigger points that have lost assets in Drummond Cove and must now act. It is not acceptable that the CHRMAP report is a justification for adopting Managed Retreat from this point forward as the CofGG has been aware and has obligations under the Planning Act to land owners. We recommend that the CofGG explore with the DCPA via community consultation the CBA (Cost Benefit Analysis) of strategies now, short term and long term. Considering Under the Western Australian legislative framework voluntary or compulsory acquisition is based on the value of the land and its improvements. Case law pertaining to compulsory acquisition judgments indicates that values paid usually far exceed current market value due to Courts also awarding on-costs like removal expenses and legal costs.	Acknowledgment of Submission	Note Submission
			I recommend a 'Protect' approach (Pr1-7): The values of the properties within the report are significantly understated given current market value. Second, sufficient justification exists for permanent solutions development on coastal land areas that are available to buffer areas 'at risk from coastal erosion and inundation. I propose coastal protection works as there is a need to preserve the Drummond Cove foreshore areas for all people in the CofGG. The CofGG should explore, with the direct involvement of community, protection works that consider public access, public safety, property and infrastructure as our coastal lifestyle is not expendable. In response to the following recommendations:	Acknowledgment of Submission	Note Submission
			Require Section 70A notification to be placed on titles to alert prospective purchasers to the risk of coastal erosion and / or inundation. I recommend that the CofGG undertake immediately Geophysical studies of all the shoreline areas to examine presence of rock strata that could reduce the erodibility of critical sections over the longer term (estimate \$25,000) and apply that data to the setback lines to create an accurate representation of setback lines. The current setbacks do not fit with specific height differences in adjacent areas not affected by setback lines indicating a broad-brush approach with significant financial implications at stake. I understand that the purpose of this study is to provide scope of works recommendations. However, more detailed information is necessary that includes analysis of rock strata within the setbacks and accurate elevations to be included. This is essential before any 70A notifications be placed on titles. I advise caution to the CofGG to avoid possible class action under the state planning act. Which will be triggered by a broad-based policy approach that de-values land by placing 70A notifications on titles. Such action as applying 70A's will require the CofGG to consider the legal costs associated with lengthy process of legal action. This will need to be taken into consideration as part of the CBA (Cost Benefit Analysis). I agree with the recommendations of continued immediate Monitoring and Management outlined below.	Acknowledgment of Submission	Note Submission
			I recommend a geophysical study of the shoreline areas is undertaken to examine presence of rock strata that could reduce the erodibility of critical sections over the longer term; The foreshore reserve area offers a crucial natural buffer against coastal erosion and inundation for coastal assets located landward (houses, roads etc), as well as providing highly valued public amenity. Active monitoring and nature-based approaches (e.g. coastal revegetation, sand trapping fences) to increase resilience of this foreshore reserve from erosion are strongly recommended. Community groups and local organisations should be included / supported in the delivery of these programs, to provide opportunity to raise awareness and build ownership of the coastal adaptation requirements. Again, I urge the CofGG to consider the tourism impacts to the region and future economic consequences of any policy, particularly the consequences of a Managed Retreat paradigm. Some of the recommended actions will bring about the outcome of 'protection' at a trigger point. The CofGG needs to acknowledge that we are well past trigger points at Whitehill Rd. It is my opinion that the scope of options and actions need to be fully explored, any action/response also include a thorough search for alternative/innovative approaches beyond the list of recommendations. I strongly advise the CofGG look to other adopted approaches in other states where the amenity of the coastal asset is the highest priority. Options such as off-shore artificial reefs to mitigate wave action as the driver of coastal erosion, being just one example. I implore the CofGG seek to preserve the natural amenity and improve tourism potential wherever possible. I ask the CofGG to put on a tourism lens as they view options and consider the CBA (Cost Benefit Analysis).	Acknowledgment of Submission	Note Submission
			In response to the statement below: 1. "The initial stages of the Geraldton CHRMAP project involved community and stakeholder engagement and a risk-based assessment, which examined coastal assets under threat from erosion and inundation in future planning timeframes. The outcomes of this initial CHRMAP phase were reported in the Coastal Hazard and Risk Assessment report (Baird 2018)" It is important that the CofGG continues to engage with community going forward with the view to avoid at all costs, a fracturing of community. It is an unacceptable outcome that the city takes an approach that 'we know better' and pushes ahead with projects without community buy in and seek to avoid repeating it's past mistakes. The DCPA community is well versed in understanding the CHRMAP process and seeking action. This is evidenced by holding the Geraldton Coastal Adaptation Planning Forum in 2014, a partnership between the Drummonds Cove Progress Association and Sunset Beach Coastcare groups. Followed by Application A15220 in 2015 by the Drummond Cove Progress Association (DCPA) for works north of the John Batten Hall. A community action grant in partnership with the CofGG and NACC for the coastal zone north of the John Batten Hall. It needs to be acknowledged that the CofGG has been well aware of the issues north of John Batten Hall/Whitehill Rd. and now need to act to comply with State Planning requirements.	Acknowledgment of Submission	Note Submission
			Following on from the above data, it is my position to explore specifically the following recommendations from the Baird report: Section 1 & Section 2. Drummond Cove Road to Community Centre & Community Centre to Seacrest Way – We agree with the following: "A coastal protection approach for Drummond Cove north of the Community Hall in front of the closed section of Whitehill Rd warrants further assessment. MCA and CBA analysis of options considered show a net return on investment on the value of assets protected on the landside is possible. The high value of property at risk of erosion in future planning periods and the values of the coast noted in the Community Engagement process underline the importance of this issue." Following on from the above, implement the foredune re-build strategy (Application A15220) for section 1 & 2 to implement a foredune re-build for both sections 1 & 2. This course of action is reinforced by the Baird report which states: "Nature based approaches to increase resilience of shorelines and foreshore areas (eg sand trapping fences, revegetation). Recommended for section north of the Community Hall. CGG led programs supported through grant funding (estimated \$10,000 annually)."	Acknowledgment of Submission	Note Submission
			I would like the CofGG to adopt the resolution presented to council in July to re-establish a north south link and adjust the associated, planned works to reference CHRMAP and DCPA recommendations. Second, adjust any detailed plans to include creation of a natural buffer as planned in A15220 by the DCPA Coastcare group and NACC concept stage from 2015. Implement the above as a short/medium term approach and improve the amenity as this scope of works can be acted on immediately.	Acknowledgment of Submission	Note Submission

49	16/06/2018	Private submission	<p>I reject the recommendations of Managed Retreat. The CofGG has adopted the strategy of Managed Retreat for many years now in the absence of a hazard mapping and CHRMAP reports. It has passed trigger points that have lost assets in Drummond Cove and must now act. It is not acceptable that the CHRMAP report is a justification for adopting Managed Retreat from this point forward as the CofGG has been aware and has obligations under the Planning Act to land owners. We recommend that the CofGG explore with the DCPA via community consultation the CBA (Cost Benefit Analysis) of strategies now, short term and long term. Considering Under the Western Australian legislative framework voluntary or compulsory acquisition is based on the value of the land and its improvements. Case law pertaining to compulsory acquisition judgments indicates that values paid usually far exceed current market value due to Courts also awarding on-costs like removal expenses and legal costs.</p> <p>I recommend a 'Protect' approach (Pr1-7): The values of the properties within the report are significantly understated given current market value. Second, sufficient justification exists for permanent solutions development on coastal land areas that are available to buffer areas 'at risk from coastal erosion and inundation. I John Niemeyer propose coastal protection works as there is a need to preserve the Drummond Cove foreshore areas for all people in the CofGG. The CofGG should explore, with the direct involvement of community, protection works that consider public access, public safety, property and infrastructure as our coastal lifestyle is not expendable.</p> <p>In response to the following recommendations: Require Section 70A notification to be placed on titles to alert prospective purchasers to the risk of coastal erosion and / or inundation. I recommend that the CofGG undertake immediately Geophysical studies of all the shoreline areas to examine presence of rock strata that could reduce the erodibility of critical sections over the longer term (estimate \$25,000) and apply that data to the setback lines to create an accurate representation of setback lines. The current setbacks do not fit with specific height differences in adjacent areas not affected by setback lines indicating a broad-brush approach with significant financial implications at stake. I understand that the purpose of this study is to provide scope of works recommendations. However, more detailed information is necessary that includes analysis of rock strata within the setbacks and accurate elevations to be included. This is essential before any 70A notifications be placed on titles. I advise caution to the CofGG to avoid possible class action under the state planning act. Which will be triggered by a broad-based policy approach that de-values land by placing 70A notifications on titles. Such action as applying 70A's will require the CofGG to consider the legal costs associated with lengthy process of legal action. This will need to be taken into consideration as part of the CBA (Cost Benefit Analysis).</p> <p>I agree with the recommendations of continued immediate Monitoring and Management outlined below: Recommend a geophysical study of the shoreline areas is undertaken to examine presence of rock strata that could reduce the erodibility of critical sections over the longer term; The foreshore reserve area offers a crucial natural buffer against coastal erosion and inundation for coastal assets located landward (houses, roads etc), as well as providing highly valued public amenity. Active monitoring and nature-based approaches (e.g. coastal revegetation, sand trapping fences) to increase resilience of this foreshore reserve from erosion are strongly recommended. Community groups and local organisations should be included / supported in the delivery of these programs, to provide opportunity to raise awareness and build ownership of the coastal adaptation requirements. Again, I urge the CofGG to consider the tourism impacts to the region and future economic consequences of any policy, particularly the consequences of a Managed Retreat paradigm. Some of the recommended actions will bring about the outcome of 'protection' at a trigger point. The CofGG needs to acknowledge that we are well past trigger points at Whitehill Rd. It is my opinion that the scope of options and actions need to be fully explored, any action/response also include a thorough search for alternative/innovative approaches beyond the list of recommendations. I strongly advise the CofGG look to other adopted approaches in other states where the amenity of the coastal asset is the highest priority. Options such as off-shore artificial reefs to mitigate wave action as the driver of coastal erosion, being just one example. I implore the CofGG seek to preserve the natural amenity and improve tourism potential wherever possible. I ask the CofGG to put on a tourism lens as they view options and consider the CBA (Cost Benefit Analysis).</p> <p>In response to the statement below: 1. "The initial stages of the Geraldton CHRMAP project involved community and stakeholder engagement and a risk-based assessment, which examined coastal assets under threat from erosion and inundation in future planning timeframes. The outcomes of this initial CHRMAP phase were reported in the Coastal Hazard and Risk Assessment report (Baird 2018)" It is important that the CofGG continues to engage with community going forward with the view to avoid at all costs, a fracturing of community. It is an unacceptable outcome that the city takes an approach that 'we know better' and pushes ahead with projects without community buy in and seek to avoid repeating it's past mistakes. The DCPA community is well versed in understanding the CHRMAP process and seeking action. This is evidenced by holding the Geraldton Coastal Adaptation Planning Forum in 2014, a partnership between the Drummonds Cove Progress Association and Sunset Beach Coastcare groups. Followed by Application A15220 in 2015 by the Drummond Cove Progress Association (DCPA) for works north of the John Batten Hall. A community action grant in partnership with the CofGG and NACC for the coastal zone north of the John Batten Hall. It needs to be acknowledged that the CofGG has been well aware of the issues north of John Batten Hall/Whitehill Rd. and now need to act to comply with State Planning requirements.</p>	Acknowledgment of Submission	Note Submission
				Acknowledgment of Submission	Note Submission
				Acknowledgment of Submission	Note Submission
				Acknowledgment of Submission	Note Submission
				Acknowledgment of Submission	Note Submission
50	15/08/2018	Private submission	<p>Following on from the above data, it is my position to explore specifically the following recommendations from the Baird report: The beach, residential properties, and recreational assets of our coast are highly valued assets of our community. The CHRMAP needs to be updated to reflect what is important to the community by changing valuable assets such as houses, parks, beaches, paths to PROTECT. CMU10 - The recommendation to place a 70A notification on title would devalue the properties currently of the front streets, negatively affecting current resale value. The community has recommended a proactive approach to protect the properties and beaches, this would benefit the City of Greater Geraldton encouraging tourism and investment. Our Geraldton coast as a whole is our greatest asset and needs to be protected.</p>	Acknowledgment of Submission	Note Submission
51	14/08/2018	Private submission	No comments.	Acknowledgment of Submission	Note Submission
52	14/08/2018	Private submission	<p>That report was a complete waste of taxpayers money and should have been obvious to anyone who knows anything about coastal geomorphology. Moreover this should have been conducted when the port was expanded 8 years ago.</p> <p>It's is immensley obvious rock piers need to be built at regular intervals along the coastline. Once you build one you need to keep building them until you are outside of the town. This was the case in Perth and Fremantle and is the most obvious and cost effective solution that should have been implemented 5 years ago. As a marine scientist with a major in coastal geomorphology I saw these problems caused by the local port authority coming years ago and I am shocked it has taken so long for anything to be done.</p>	Acknowledgment of Submission	Note Submission
				In line with State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy, new coastal protection works can be progressed only after all other options for avoiding and adapting to coastal hazards had been fully explored, as part of a comprehensive coastal hazard risk management process	Note Submission
53	14/08/2018	Private submission	<p>The increased risk had been created by Port authority developments and should never have happened in the first place. Too many pen pushers who know theory, not practice and here we go again.</p> <p>The whole development so far is a waste of time and has demonstrated more about beautification of the coastal strip I.e Michel and brown area and little about actually preventing coastal erosion by real means. We we have lost our beaches to rocks and pathways and have not prevented coastal erosion</p> <p>As the water rises and erodes beaches, instead of breaking the beaches and doing little to stop the wave action, instead put the rocks on top of the existing reef, raising the natural reef level and breaking the wave action, creating airation of the solid water and reducing erosion of the beach front. It will also create marine wildlife, diving spots, increase fishing and we still have our natural beaches, not high rise rock wall being pounded by waves.</p>	The Port Enhancement Project went through a Public Environment Review as part of the approvals process. The Port has an ongoing commitment to bypass 12,500m3 of sand from Pages Beach to the Northern Beaches between the Beresford Foreshore and the Chapman River annually.	Note Submission
				In line with State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy, the Beresford Foreshore Project, as new coastal protection works has progressed only after all other options for avoiding and adapting to coastal hazards had been fully explored, as part of a comprehensive coastal hazard risk management process	Note Submission
				Acknowledgment of Submission	Note Submission
54	12/08/2018	Private submission	<p>As a resident of Drummond Cove, I feel that the Baird reports recommendation of a managed withdrawal does not take into account the views of Geraldton residents as a whole. Our beaches are a valuable asset that belong to all and should be defended at all costs. While the cost of defending is high, the cost of a managed retreat is even higher, just spread out over a longer period. In Drummonds Cove 100 homes will be affected by 2070.</p> <p>Defend Drummond Cove at all costs. It is a valuable community asset used by many. The economic and social cost of not defending it will be huge. The legal ramifications of a managed retreat could see a class action against the City that would benefit few, but cost everyone. Please defend Drummond Cove properly. We live here. It is our home and deserves more than temporary short term works. The report is comprehensive and provides for many options. Ultimately the Council works for the ratepayers and ratepayers want protection.</p>	Acknowledgement of Submission	Note Submission
				Acknowledgment of Submission	Note Submission
55	11/08/2018	Private submission	<p>I attended the Coastal Adaptation Planning workshops held on Saturday 14 October 2017. Nowhere during this workshop was it made clear that the City was intending to compulsorily acquire affected properties and or put caveats on titles of properties that may be affected in the "30 and or 70 year inundation / erosion zones" somewhere somehow the shire has apparently contacted landowners North of Sunset and told them they would have their properties resumed? Is this correct? Now apparently as a result the people in Kempton st who are only marginally affected in the immediate future (70 year inundation line) are thinking they will have caveats placed on their titles and are forming an action group. I am in an unaffected zone so do not have any personal axe to grind but I am extremely disappointed if the above comments are accurate re the way the shire has gone about this. (Compulsory acquisition and caveats on titles)</p> <p>ALSO the entire central town precinct has apparently been excluded from any action despite the fact that the AHD datum at Marine Terrace is approx 400mm below that at Kempton st. (Shops and businesses in town experienced flooding during the last remnant the Indian Ocean Tsunami '2004', there were no such problems in Kempton st although from memory properties at the Marina estate were affected prompting future development at that site to be elevated)</p>	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note Submission
				The Geraldton CBD is protected from coastal erosion through buried sea walls. The report covers coastal inundation of the Geraldton CBD	Note Submission
56	10/08/2018	Private submission	<p>We are writing to initially express our disappointment that the persons most effected by any coastal erosion at Bluff Point (i.e. the people who have properties along Kempton Street) were not directly informed of the options that the council were considering to address the potential coastal erosion problems. We only heard by chance (and only a few days ago, which has given us and many other people very little time to read and understand the implications of the documentation) through a fellow neighbour, who also only heard through a fellow neighbour. We have been advised that notice had been given via face-book and on the Geraldton Council website, but not everyone accesses/has access to this kind of media, such as ourselves. A distribution through letter boxes (as is done for elections) would have enabled everyone to be advised of the coastal erosion and how it would affect us all, especially on such an important issue as this is and the potential effect it could have on home owners.</p> <p>Our thoughts are that the most cost effective and long term solution to addressing this problem would be for the council to undertake Option C to protect the coastal area at Bluff Point by the use of rock walls and/or sand bags, as well as continual replanting in the dune areas. In the Report it is recommended that communities/businesses become involved with such projects, and we think this is an excellent idea. We would only be too willing to help (in our small way), where we can, such as more community planting days than are currently undertaken each year.</p>	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note Submission
				Acknowledgment of Submission	Note Submission
57	10/08/2018	Private submission	<p>I think implementing a special control area is important as it alerts those interested in building new homes or businesses that there is a risk. It will also assist them to accommodate their build to make their structures more resilient. A notification on titles is also reasonable as again, it notifies people who haven't done their due diligence prior to buying that there is a potential concern. In regards to managed retreat I agree this is an appropriate approach. I however, do not believe rates should be used to build either short-term mitigation or long-term protection works for private property. If differential rates were applied to the property owners whose properties are at risk in the medium term that would be worth implementing.</p> <p>I believe the argument that people didn't know their properties would be at risk ad they are owed protection or even compensation as they have paid rates is not justifiable. Climate change, rising sea level, coastal erosion and inundation have been in the news for at least two decades. At some stage people have to be held accountable for their own actions, or in this case inaction. Living along the coast, or rovers for that matter, come at a risk. To expect others to foot the bill for their ignorance or denial regarding coastal erosion and inundation is unacceptable.</p>	Acknowledgment of Submission	Note Submission
				Acknowledgment of Submission	Note Submission
58	10/08/2018	Private submission	<p>Could have engaged local fishers, surfers, kitesurfers, divers &amp; other ocean user groups. Any group that may value add to sea wall, artificial reef, groyne development or sand redistribution. In these group you will also find historical data.</p>	The development of the Geraldton CHRMAP report has had extensive community consultation. Community consultation will continue throughout the CHRMAP process.	Note Submission



			The possible link between between removing sand from southgates for agriculture & loss of beaches past seperation point to greys has not been discussed.	The section of Southgate Dunes that is contributing to the supply of sand feeding the beaches north of the dune system is not being mined, and will not be going into the future.	Note Submission
			The link between sand build up on page beach, the port authoritys channel dredging & the complete change in bathometry has been overlooked. With the current generally moving north along the coast, there are now massive barriers blocking this with the port & a much deeper channel. Sunset beach sand is now caught in pergatory.	The Port Enhancement Project went through a Public Environment Review as part of the approvals process. The Port has an ongoing commitment to bypass 12,500m3 of sand from Pages Beach to the Northern Beaches between the Beresford Foreshore and the Chapman River annually.	Note Submission
			With predominant northerly currents moving sand constantly north, would it make sense to start mitigation at the most northerly point & work south, emergency repairs exemp. -Could sand pumping from pages to the northern beaches be discussed? Trucking sand has had little effect. To pump sand now would also make easier the ports work long term as this sand would not fill in the harbour. -If sand dune mining at south gates is effecting beach replentishment could it moved to a sanddune blowout away from town & infrastructure? -If coastal erosion is to be tackled with civil works could we experiment with offshore artificial reef & groynes that also create fish habitat, dive platforms & virgin surfing waves. In turn creating recreation, tourism & job opportunities. We have a unique opportunity to create something world class. Request interest from local surfing, windsurfing, stand up paddle, diving & fishing groups. I beg you to look outside the box. Turn a negative into an amazing positive.	Acknowledgment of Submission	Note Submission
59	10/08/2018	Private submission	To many , the report is a total joke and the so called experts didnt even go onsite , didnt even leave their city desk. because they have shown the same distance of coastal erision future predictions for areas that are flat 1-2m above sea level to the same findings for areas that have natural 50m hills and sandunes infront of them. In 2016 when the CGG was going to pull down the public toilet at Triton Place Sunset Beach they said that the beach had eroded 3m over 15 years from ariel photgraphs and this report is stating Sunset beach is eroding at 1.5m annually . Different figures , no proof just made up modelling. Try asking the people who have lived there for the past 20-30 years and get actual proof and facts. In this report they claim that the new sub divisions at Sunset & Glenfield will be gone by 2030 , so what does the CGG plan to do with those new sub division now ? and what about the current houses all along Gerladton that this report will all be gone within 12 years ?? There are plenty of old photos of Geraldton , I have detailed photos of Sunset beach over the past 10 years . Use them as a dat base to compare against over the next 5 - 10 years to actually see what is the factual rate of erosion . Fact over the past 50 yrs , some areas have eroded worse than others and worse at different times but it is not an actually yearly progression it is simply monther nature doing what she has done for 1000yrs or millions of years.	Acknowledgment of Submission	Note Submission
			The same comments where printed for every beach area no specific difference was commented between each area , another example of how this report was done from the city desks and not looked at or studied why and how each beach area is being effected currently or in the past. I cant wait to see how Geraldton is going to look like in 2030-2070 , not sunburbs will be left and no CBD on this far out predictions	Acknowledgment of Submission	Note Submission
			To many , not worth the money that was spent. The CGG should get another opinion or get report done by another company to compare predictions. Or try a simple method and take photos of coastline every year for the next 5 years and actually see if there is any changes ?	Acknowledgment of Submission	Note Submission
60	10/08/2018	Private submission	After reading all the documents in the draft CHRMAP report I wish to respond as a very concerned house and land owner in Drummond Cove. This report was largely expected by the Drummond Cove community to give the advice and recommendations required to give the council and councillors direction as to the most appropriate course of action to take to protect the assets that are been threatened in northern Drummonds by rapid erosion that has taken place in the last 5 years. We have lost a huge amount of coastline in a very short time frame in this area including the loss of part of Whitehill road. It has been acknowledged by council that this erosion has been largely caused by the initial emergency works to protect the hall which have had the downstream effect to the north of that. What I and others were expecting in this report was detailed coastal engineering advice as to what should be done to halt this erosion now and repair this coastline. We have been very patient waiting for this report and now it seems the recommendations from this report favour a do nothing approach (managed retreat). This report should be independent from government or council influence otherwise the advice from these experts is tainted and the report becomes questionable. The lack of recommendations in the report is what I am most concerned about. The community has long been told to be patient and wait for this report as it will have a choice of recommendations. The only action this report recommends to do is to put 70a clauses on our houses thus devaluing them. The sit back and wait approach has been going on for 5 years now and we have seen the loss a road, carparks, beach shelters, trees, sand dunes and a huge section of coastline. Waiting for another 5 years is not an option for us as we may have waves breaking in our driveways. There is much agreement amongst land owners particularly in low lying parts of Drummonds that the managed retreat option is an unacceptable solution. It is just kicking the can down the road hoping someone else will pick it up. In the cost analysis part of the report it is outlined that several options to protect this coastline are much cheaper options than potentially buying back houses as they fall into the sea. There is not a council in Australia that would let recently built homes be put in grave risk of inundation due to inaction. The cost analysis options that were costed to the dollar certainly give council a range of options to consider. I believe that BAIRD need to stop sitting on the fence and list these options as recommendations that should be considered immediately. My preference from the list of options in the cost analysis is the proposed 2 stage marina. It has many benefits. It not only protects our coastline and homes but also valuable council infrastructure that lies between our homes and the coastline. The other benefit is obviously providing a much needed protected boat launching facility in the area. There is no boat ramp on the northern side of Geraldton that doesn't require a heavy duty 4wd and a lot of risk. The closest proper ramp to us is nearly 20kms away in the town centre. Boaties in Drummonds are always getting into trouble bogging 4wds etc trying to launch boats here. It is just a matter of time before a serious accident happens here from someone getting into trouble beach launching. A good facility north of town would not only benefit tourism in the area but would be a great benefit to ratepayers. It would also encourage more people to move to the area. Having a quality boat launch facility close to a family friendly suburb is also a great way of growing the area. The other option I would be content with is the geotextile bags backed by a rock wall. This should protect our homes for the long term. Going to this much work without providing a launching facility seems like a shame to me but my main concern is that we stop the erosion and protect the assets. If by doing that we can gain other benefits all well and good. I look forward with interest to reading the final version of the CHRMAP report. I certainly expect that all the views and opinions of residents who have taken the time to read the report and comment on it are taken into account before writing the final version. I would like to see a range of solutions to the erosion in north Drummonds recommended in the final report that are of the protection strategy. This will give the council, councillors and state government the required direction to make an informed decision on this very concerning issue	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note Submission
61	9/8/18	Anonymous	No comments.	Acknowledgment of Submission	Note Submission
62	09/08/2018	Private submission	The report highlights the need for action to protect not just manage. I strongly believe that protecting the coastline of the northern beaches is the best option. I understand that rates may change to accommodate the costs but I would be willing to pay extra. In the long term the costs of managed retreat and purchasing properties would possibly be more difficult/costly for the CGG. Ideally No homes should be lost. I also like the idea of the assessment of the geophysical structures to ascertain erosion buffers so perhaps avoiding the Section 70A being placed on properties. All residents need to understand this in terminology for the lay person	Acknowledgment of Submission	Note Submission
63	09/08/2018	Private submission	During the 1980's and early 1990's Pages Beach would erode the land away from adjacent to the Fisheries building. A concrete revetment mattress wall was built along this foreshore to protect these buildings from further erosion. During this time the channel into the harbour had to be dredged to remove excess drift sand so that ships could get in and out. In the 90's the port authority reclaimed about 15 to 20 acres of ocean to pump blasted rock and sand from the channel so that the larger iron ore ships could get into the harbor. Now Pages beach is some 200 metres wide and has tens of thousands of tonnes of drift sand held up that prior to the reclaim of this land used to drift to the northern beaches to keep them naturally rehabilitated. Any development on a foreshore will have a detrimental effect on the adjacent foreshore. The Port Authority development into the ocean is more responsible for the problems on the northern foreshores north of the marina.	The Port Enhancement Project went through a Public Environment Review as part of the approvals process. The Port has an ongoing commitment to bypass 12,500m3 of sand from Pages Beach to the Northern Beaches between the Beresford Foreshore and the Chapman River annually.	Note Submission
64	09/08/2018	Private submission	The report primarily recommends Managed Retreat as the strategy for the preferred adaptation option for Drummond Cove. This recommendation is made not because it is the best option for Drummond Dove but because Managed Retreat is government policy anyway. There are no recommendations made for any infrastructural Protective action. Instead, the report appears to be delaying outcomes further by adopting this wait and watch (and report 5 yearly) approach.	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note Submission
			There is a significant omission in the report for shorter term low cost infrastructural options for Drummond Cove. Accommodation measures written in the report do not offer or describe what the shire can do until further studies have been completed. Accommodate options in the report are limited to 70A classifications. Active Accommodation measures such as temporary geotex bags, tree planting, creation of sand dunes etc.. should be described and costed. At present the shire councillors have no active measures to choose and vote among. The omission of these active short term measures also creates a 'do nothing' perception of this report by the community. I applaud the shire for deciding to use geotex bags for short term use. They had to do this though without any advice from the CHRMAP report. We need to have some recommended options at our disposal.	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note Submission
			It is not explained in the report how or when the shire are supposed to progress from an Accommodate approach to a Protect approach. The risk analysis and cost benefit analysis both demonstrate that there is a need to intervene rather than retreat in Drummond Cove. Why has the Protect approach not yet been adopted?	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note Submission
			A cost benefit analysis in the report of the assets and infrastructure in the Drummonds cove Whitehill area shows that it would be cheaper to adopt a Protect measure and spend \$4mil. The cost of the houses alone (98 homes x the estimated \$292K per house) is far greater than the cost of any of the 5 Protection options that are described. Why has this not been adopted?	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note Submission
			As a home owner on Estuary way I favour the Protect options 3.3.4 Geotex bags backed by a sea Wall as well as 3.3.5 Boat launch with sand nourishment. I believe that these options (but in particular the boat launch and subsequent marina) would offer three positive outcomes. It would firstly protect the current assets and infrastructure, it would increase the value of the immediate and greater area. It would allow capacity to build or rebuild beach access to all.	Acknowledgment of Submission	Note Submission
			Time frames need to be quantified in the report. The report states that further research is required before long term recommendations can be made for North Drummonds. David Taylor from BAIRD advises me that this would be in the form of a 'Coastal Setback Study'. And that they will not make any specific protective infrastructural recommendations until this is done. Therefore this next study need to be conducted immediately and stated in the report that this is a next step and given a time frame.	The coastal hazards maps are based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy	Note Submission
65	7/08/2018	Anonymous	Its quite confusing	Acknowledgment of Submission	Note Submission
66	07/08/2018	Private submission	A clear policy position is going to be essential considering that 'Managed Retreat' will at some point require intervention. A high level of specific detail will be needed to cater for each individual location along the coast.	Acknowledgment of Submission	Note Submission
			It is clear that each zone has slightly different risks to assets. The recommendations are broad and provide scope for specific differences. I can see that this will need to be carefully managed and communicated. Public comment will need to be narrowed to ensure each community affected has opinion considered	Acknowledgment of Submission	Note Submission
			Lets look at policy for now as the implementation will need to be innovative considering the high cost of current practices. The city will need to look outside the box in some instances.	Acknowledgment of Submission	Note Submission
			Get moving - time is a ticking and eroding away.	Acknowledgment of Submission	Note Submission

67	7/08/2018	Private submission	I wish to have an extension of 3 months as i was not informed and hence have not had time to review the report. I do not wish to comment without sufficient time to review the document.	The development of the Geraldton CHRMAP report has had extensive community consultation. Community consultation will continue throughout the CHRMAP process.	Note Submission
68	07/08/2018	Private submission	We need an extension to the deadline of at least 3 months as we were not informed and have not had sufficient time to study the information and would not wish to comment at this stage.	The development of the Geraldton CHRMAP report has had extensive community consultation. Community consultation will continue throughout the CHRMAP process.	Note Submission
69	06/08/2018	Private submission	I don't think you should try to stop coastal erosion, it won't work. Move the paths and community facilities further in from the beach. Title notifications should be included, it's only fair for future buyers. Current land in predicted inundation zones should not be taken back from property owners, they built there knowing the risks of the ocean. Community facilities should be moved at the rate payers expense, but private residences should be left alone to make their own decisions.	Acknowledgment of Submission	Note Submission
70	01/08/2018	Private submission	I regarded the CHRAP as a very comprehensive document. The authors appear very competent. I will restrict my comments though to the Sunset CUM as this is where I have a vested and most interest. However: 1. I would have liked a more accurate erosion rate as per the sunset dune. I have a major asset, namely _____, deemed West Volute Street, and accurate information is appreciated.  I note the CUM of Sunset is deemed "Managed Retreat". I would like the changed to "Protect at all costs" given the value and number of houses in this affected area. On the west of Volute St, the drop in value alone with the release of the report I would expect to be at least \$200,000 each amounting to \$2M just with these houses, let alone East Volute Street and rendering the properties virtually unsealable. I have recently undertaken renovations of 49 Volute st as it was in bad need of repair. Maybe I should have left it contributing to the drabness of what should be, a bristling area of Sunset Beach. Truncated sand dunes are a hazard with potential crumbling not identified. Gating and signage will only deter tourism and reduce the aesthetics of what should be, a prime asset of the Midwest coast. Events such as last year's National Titles for Stand Up Paddleboarding would be deterred. The Bosley St carpark, caravan parks are all correctly identified as at risk. The report does not take into account the lifestyle that sunset residents have. This is why we moved there. Access to the beach is paramount for us and we have a lifestyle second to none, recreational and aesthetics are excellent. I am a windsurfer whom moved the Sunset Beach from NZ in the late 80's for this reason. The report is quite a blow for us. I would have liked the report to address a cost analysis of loss of asset value vs cost of protective measures. This would be quite a surprise I would think. It is well documented and acknowledged in the Report and even in the Geraldton Guardian 01/08/2018, that Geraldton's natural coast has been altered by the Port, groynes, and now the Beresford rejuvenation to the south of us. We as ratepayers and residents, it seems, are to set to bare this cost. Our rates have increased, the values of properties has decreased, and Managed Retreat is our option. This is not fair and not good enough. This point of liability was not stressed enough. Clearly the Port of Geraldton and the various State Government Departments plus the City of Greater Geraldton, with the harbour deepening, ad hoc planning of the Marina and the series of Groynes which have clearly shifted the problem North as identified by measures at St Georges in the form of the Geotextile bag sand trapping groyne. The report did not identify whom should conduct restoration studies or the work itself. This should be conducted by and managed by MARINE Engineers, not Civil Engineers and should be Third parties to the City of Greater Geraldton	The coastal hazards maps are based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy  The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note Submission
71	30/07/2018	Private submission	The report and all of the appendices are of excellent standard. They present the information in a concise manner and deal with the critical issues at hand. An excellent job all round. I thought the recommendations were highly appropriate and well thought through. I applaud the City in getting this report done and managing this big issue for locals.	Acknowledgment of Submission	Note Submission
72	29/07/2018	Private submission	As can be seen from the report a permanent solution is required at Drummond Cove, A permanent sea / harbour wall with boat ramp would have many cost offsets. Including protection of Drummond Cove. As before a enclosed harbour with seawall and boat ramp would have a net return over time.  Agree with the plan to protect drummond cove with a sea wall.  The community should have a couple of workshops in case some people can't make one.	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.  The primary driver for the Beresford Foreshore Project was to protect State and Local Government assets and utilities at risk from coastal erosion. The project was funded through the Royalties for Regions funding. The City committed \$1.85M to improvement of the amenity to address a deficiency in POS amenity for the Beresford locality.  The development of the Geraldton CHRMAP report has had extensive community consultation. Community consultation will continue throughout the CHRMAP process.	Note Submission Note Submission Note Submission
73	27/07/2018	Private submission	Yes lets just get it done lots of talking this should have happened 30 yrs ago, Sunset beach in particular could be made at Triton park could be save and turned into a lovely public open area. Renew Triton park area at sunset beach turn land into open public space adapt it now time to act.  Really lets just get on with it i think council doing a great job along chapman road keep doing it along coast.	Acknowledgment of Submission Acknowledgment of Submission In line with State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy, the Beresford Foreshore Project, as new coastal protection works has progressed only after all other options for avoiding and adapting to coastal hazards had been fully explored, as part of a comprehensive coastal hazard risk management process	Note Submission Note Submission Note Submission
74	26/07/2018	Anonymous	This report does not take into consideration catastrophic events associate with the melting of polar Icecaps and breaking of ice into the oceans causing instantaneous sea level rises. The council should not expect rate payers to pay for people who want ocean front living and refuse to consider these risks. The council should never have released the land around drummonds cove. Errorsion is everybodys fault and the coucil should warn people of the risk.. No expect other rate payers to pay for the stupid decisions of the council and greedy people who want ocean front blocks. Dont make rate payers pay for the councils stupid land release decisions. The council is at fault. Do not release anymore land in vulnerable areas and don't buy back houses from people who wanted acean front. Their choice, their risk. The coucil is just greedy.	Acknowledgment of Submission Acknowledgment of Submission Acknowledgment of Submission	Note Submission Note Submission Note Submission
75	11/07/2018	Private submission	The main concerns I have are in regards to traffic in the Drummond Cove area. If the boat launch is the preferred option, then I would like to see traffic calming put in place on Waterfront Circle to slow traffic down and make it a safe place for residents to walk and play outside their homes. It's bad enough as it is with cars flying down that road without increasing the traffic for a boat launch. It's good to see that all aspects of effect have been considered.  There was very little information regarding the underwater artifical reef. This was an option for Champion Bay 12 years ago at a cost of \$1.5m with the council of the time choosing to put in a cheap groyne and then replenish sand. Now there are \$23m worth of works happening along the foreshore because of the extended erosion. I hope the artificial reef is not being ignored as an option. It could produce some great tourism opportunities and recreation activities for locals.	Acknowledgment of Submission Acknowledgment of Submission The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note Submission Note Submission Note Submission
76	10/07/2018	Private submission	I don't seem to be able to see if any compensation is available to home owners who are trying to sell their house at a heavily reduced prices, but this report is scaring off any future potential buyers... If our houses are now worth nothing, what are our rates based on also? Mortgage repayments don't stop whilst trying to sell and there doesn't seem to be a time frame as to how quickly a seawall will be put in out at Drummonds, this lengthy process is costing us \$\$ daily, losing \$\$ daily.	Acknowledgment of Submission	Note Submission
77	10/7/2018	Private submission	Clearly identifies something needs to be done north of John batten hall to protect assets. Great way to segment the problem and deal with each area accordingly.	The Geraldton CHRMAP Report is based on the requirements of State Planning Policy No.2.6 - State Coastal Planning Policy. The report looks at the potential risks to twelve Coastal Management Units over three planning timeframes which will guide sustainable decision-making over the coming years.	Note Submission