



Queens Park Caravan Park Revised Draft Master Plan

Consultation Report

Summary of submissions received January - May 2015

Executive summary

The following report details consultation activities undertaken and summarises feedback received in relation to the Great Ocean Road Coast Committee (GORCC) Revised Draft Master Plan for the Queen Park Caravan Park, Lorne which was released for consultation from April – May 2015 for a total of 9 weeks.

In total, 19 submissions were received. Most respondents (11) were regular campers, the remaining submitters were holiday home owners or permanent residents. All of these submissions were made by individual submitters, none were made on behalf of a group or organisations.

Feedback received has been grouped into key areas, issues and/or themes. These groups were:

KEY AREA, ISSUE OR THEME	NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS WHO COMMENTED ON THIS ISSUE
Calls for GORCC/the Committee to show consideration for current campers, and their history with and patronage of the park	15
Concerns regarding lack of car parking provided and/or location of car parks	15
Issues with group accommodation proposal (various)	14
Concerns regarding the reduction in number of campsites	12
Issues regarding proposed cabins (various)	11
Opposition to the proposed new playground site	10
Feedback on road upgrades (various)	9
Opposition to the conversion of powered to unpowered sites	8
View that basic upgrades/maintenance are required	8
Proximity or accessibility of walking tracks and attractions	7
Caretakers cottage (various)	6
BBQ and picnic areas/facilities (various)	6
Cabin outdoor cooking facilities/lounge is inappropriate, won't be used and/or is not inclusive.	6
Park entrance (various)	6
Occupancy and revenue will not increase or targets won't be reached	6
Natural environment must be protected or natural character maintained through sensitive planning/development	5
The proposed camp kitchen will become an eyesore (due to lack of cleanliness/maintenance) and/or is not required at all.	4
The proposed camp kitchen is not in an ideal location (not close enough to those who would use it)	4

Support for protection and enhancement of the Spotters Hut	4
Access (emergency, disabled and other)	4
Support for protection and enhancement of the Spotters Hut	4
Amenities block should be renovated rather than demolished	2
Concern that campers are not being or will not be properly heard by GORCC or the Committee	2
View that while the new revised draft was a better plan, more work was still required	2
Positive feedback (general)	2
Concerns regarding safety	1
Amenities block should be renovated rather than demolished	2

An analysis of these themes and examples of the comments received under each area can be found in Section 4. Feedback Themes.

Some respondents made comments that were not related to any of the key areas listed above, these comments have also been summarised in Section 4.

1. Background

The Great Ocean Road Coast Committee is undertaking a planning process for the Queens Caravan Park, Lorne. In 2013/2014 a draft master plan for the Lorne Foreshore Caravan Park was released. This included a preliminary draft master plan for the caravan park at Queens Park. The preliminary draft master plan was released for consultation in January 2014 and the feedback received was summarised in a consultation report.

Feedback received has been considered in the creation of a revised version of the draft. Since the previous consultation period the GORC Committee has also sought further advice and input from experts in a range of areas. These include a bushfire management consultant, Regional Planning and Design and other government stakeholders including Department of Environment, Land, Water and Primary Industry, the CFA and the Surf Coast Shire.

Consulting firm Spatial Design Studio was also engaged to bring planning and design expertise to the project consider and respond to feedback received via the consultation process, incorporate expert advice and stakeholder feedback and draw up a more detailed draft concept for consultation.

This process resulted in the development of the Queens Park Revised Draft Master Plan which was released for comment in January 2015. The preliminary and revised draft master plans and previous consultation reports can be viewed in full at www.gorcc.com.au.

2. Consultation activities

Submissions on the revised draft master plan were invited over the peak summer season on the coast (January/February 2015) and through to May 2015. This holiday period was selected due to high visitation rates and holiday home occupancy over this period ensuring as many regular visitors and property owners as possible were made aware of the consultation opportunity.

- The draft plan was made available for viewing at the following locations:
- The Great Ocean Road Committee (GORCC) office (35 Bell Street, Torquay).
- On the GORCC website – www.gorcc.com.au
- On signs in Queens Park (including in amenities blocks and at the communal BBQ area)
- At the Lorne Foreshore Caravan Park office (2 Great Ocean Road, Lorne)

Opportunities to have input into the draft plan were communicated via:

- The GORCC Website (front page and internal page)
- Letter (mail out) to all recent Queens Park campers (last 18months) and Lorne residents
- Targeted email contact with key stakeholders including the Committee for Lorne, the Lorne Business and Tourism Association, Friends of Lorne and the Lorne Historical Society.
- The GORCC Newsletter (1700 subscribers) – articles in three separate editions.
- Large signs and posters displayed in and around Queens Park and at the Lorne Foreshore Caravan Park office.
- Social media (Facebook and Twitter posts plus a Facebook ad sent out to 2900 users within a 40km radius of Torquay VIC resulting in 72 post clicks through to web page and plans).
- Articles (editorial) in the Surf Coast Times.

In addition to the above communications, a FAQ document was created for campers, providing detailed information regarding proposed changes to campsite configuration and numbers. This document was made available both at the Lorne Foreshore Caravan Park office, GORCC office (in Torquay) and on the GORCC website.

This was the second stage of consultation for this planning process. In January 2014, consultation was undertaken on the preliminary draft plan and activities included a survey and open house event in Lorne. The results of this initial consultation phase were considered in the development of the revised draft plan. The consultation report for this previous phase can be viewed at www.gorcc.com.au.

3. About the submitters

The demographic breakdown of the individual submitters is detailed below:

- All submissions were made by individuals – there were no submissions made on behalf of a group or organisation.
- 11 were regular campers, 6 were holiday home owners and 2 were permanent residents.
- Most submitters (eight in total) were aged between 45-54 years of age. Six were aged 55-64, two were aged 35-44, two were aged 65-74 and one was aged 75 years or more.

4. Feedback received

Analysis of the feedback received uncovered several strong themes and areas of consensus among the submissions made. Other areas were more contentious, with a wider range of views expressed. These themes are detailed and described below and examples of comments received under each theme have been provided.

ISSUE RAISED OR TYPE OF COMMENT MADE	SUMMARY OF COMMENTS MADE	NO OF RESPONDENTS WHO COMMENTED	EXAMPLES OF COMMENTS RECEIVED
1. Calls for GORCC/the	Respondents who touched on	15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whilst I acknowledge the need for GORCC to raise revenue to

<p>Committee to show consideration for current campers, and their history with and patronage of the park</p>	<p>this issue called for consideration of their long term connection with and investment into the park and raised concerns about campers being disregarded in the reduction of sites (see also section on camp site reduction).</p> <p>Some acknowledged that upgrades and change was necessary but expressed concern about the changes being at the expense of the camping experience.</p> <p>Some of these respondents also felt that the changes reflected a consideration for revenue only and disregarded concepts of equitable access for all groups by increasing costs to users.</p> <p>Respondents commenting on this issue often expressed concern regarding the reduction in number of campsites proposed (see theme 4)</p>		<p>maintain the parks, why does this have to come at the expense of the people who are the users of this facility?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Only those that can afford to pay for a cabin are now able to enjoy ocean views. This is an elitist move that reflects the rest of how Lorne is enjoyed by the wealthy.” • “I hope that if this plan goes ahead you will be able to accommodate the needs of the long term campers who have come to love the Queens Park Caravan Park with great passion and affection over many years. In many cases particular families have been camping at Queens Park for several decades incorporating multiple generations.” • “Camping is also about community. Some people have been coming to Queens Park for decades with their families and friends. How does the Master Plan take these factors in to account?” • “As Lorne is characterised as an elite location for the wealthy, places such as Queens Park provide opportunities for all sectors of society to partake in its beauty. Whilst the Master Plan may be designed to increase revenue from the Park how is it democratic?” • “The (provision of a lodge and cabins) at Queens Park (is) at the expense of the current clientele, who will not be able to replicate their experience, is a deliberate move to remove campers and purely gain revenue. • “Reducing the number of sites by more than half will not only result in a huge loss of revenue but also leave many long term campers without a site. Over the years I estimate that we have contributed at least \$20,000 in site fees to GORCC and probably more to the retailers of Lorne.” • “One of the valuable attributes of Queens Park that seems yet to be recognised in the draft plan is that it is more than simply a commercial park, it is a community that has a history going multiple generations.”
<p>2. Concerns regarding lack of car parking provided and/or location of car parks</p>	<p>Most comments regarding car parking were in relation to respondents believing that insufficient car parking had been provided for the number of park users expected. There was particular concern expressed</p>	<p>15</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “The number of car parking spaces appears to be inadequate. This will cause overflow into residential areas already under pressure in peak periods. The plan should cater adequately for expected parking requirements” • “Although they (the people in the cabins) ...unlike most of the rest of the park...will have a car park. It just won't be in a realistic or accessible place. Not very upmarket at all.”

	<p>regarding the issue of overflow onto adjacent residential streets.</p> <p>Two respondents also advocated that the cabin car parking was placed in a location offered the best views and that this was a waste of this asset.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Walk in camp sites for groups arriving by bus walk in is fantastic. For all other tent campers a car is necessary. How do you propose that these campers bring all of their camping gear if they do not have a car? I have not seen many backpackers arrive at Queens Park during peak season carrying their tents and equipment on their backs.” • “The allocation of one on site car parking space per camping space is insufficient and is clearly demonstrated by the number of campers’ vehicles that are continuously parked in Armytage St during the busy periods....the incorporation of a dormitory style of group accommodation suggests that busloads of campers may be expected and that, of course, leads to a requirement for a bus parking area within walking distance of the accommodation...” • “Car parking for both the occupants and visitors is much less than required and will adversely impact the neighbourhood.” • “Your response to draft masterplan regarding car parking avoids the concerns raised as the only constraints on the site is the density usage of the proposed development. Where will visitors park as there are no spaces available in Armytage Street (resident permit only)?” • “Why would anyone plan to put car parks for the cabins where some of the most breathtaking views can be found? Where the cabins are located on the plan has views obstructed by trees unless of course GORCC intends to remove trees - although the plan states that this is not the intention. “
<p>3. Issues with group accommodation proposal (various)</p>	<p>While a small amount of support was shown for the concept of group accommodation (two respondents indicated general agreement with the wider concept), other comments in relation to these proposed facilities indicated a varied range of concerns. There were a range of issues raised, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerns regarding the lack of car or bus parking provided (see also above section on car 	<p>14</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “My only concern re this is again lack of car parking.” • “Add insult to injury – why don’t we put group accommodation in front of these “exclusive” cabins, so the people paying premium prices for the cabins have no view.” • “Instead of adding car parking so people can get their families to the beach, you are going to remove them, and most of the existing powered sites, to create a place for school groups.” • “Instead of adding car parking so people can get their families to the beach, you are going to remove them, and most of the existing powered sites, to create a place for school groups.” • “My experience with school groups (35 years a teacher) is that current trends are to remove students from their comfort zones and into tents and campfire cooking which is not allowed in the park.”

	<p>parking)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns regarding the location of the building which they felt is at the expense of camp sites and/or parking (some respondents felt it should be moved to an upper level to replace cabins or sit on the tier below them) View that the facility will not attract high use due to factors such as Queens Park’s location, terrain, the crossover between school groups and workers and schools’ desire for nature-based camping experiences rather than dormitories. Belief that the facility would not result in an increase revenue in comparison to current camp sites in that location which respondents felt had high occupancy already. Opinion that the siting of the accommodation building would block cabin views. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> “Which school is going to bring their kids to a site on the side of a hill, with limited visibility for supervision, and where the beach ... is down a steep hill, and across the Great Ocean Road next to a major corner? The only safe way to get kids anywhere will be by bus. Except there is nowhere to put one.” “I would love to see how the same accommodation suitable for school groups for say a week will be suitable for “seasonal workers”. How will you supply adequate facilities for both adult workers and school kids in the same facility? When do you move them all out? Summer workers are still needed after the school term has started.” “From our year-on-year observations all of these sites (#23 to #27) are currently booked up in the high and shoulder seasons (December through to Easter) by families just like our own. We fail to see how the lost revenue can be recuperated from a 40-Bed Dormitory...” “The building of a dormitory so that groups can use this during the year is a good idea but it may be better placed up on the upper levels (in place of some of the cabins situated at 15 on the map). The area marked for the lodge accommodation could then be used for sites. People wanting a cabin experience can obtain this in other town based parks and accommodation options “The need to provide this at Queens Park at the expense of the current clientele, who will not be able to replicate their experience, is a deliberate move to remove campers and purely gain revenue.” “The lodge would be better located out of the central area of the park and does need car parking spaces allocated to support all the possible uses referred to – some seasonal workers will have car, construction workers will have a car, school groups will have transport... Not providing parking for uses of this facility will just put pressure on the camp and will impact the safety for people and the amenity of trying to cater for cars in places they are not meant to be parked.”
<p>4. Concerns regarding the reduction in number of campsites</p>	<p>These respondents expressed their disappointment at the reduction in campsites proposed and asked the Committee to consider their long term history with the park. These comments</p>	<p>12</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> “I understand that Queens Park needs an upgrade but our family is very distressed to see that in a terrace you are planning on cutting the number of sites from 11 down to just 7. Over the years we have built strong relationships with many of the other regular camping families along a terrace and our children have all grown up together forging lifelong friendships.”

	<p>were related to the comments summarised above regarding calls for consideration of current campers.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • So why are you planning to go from approximately 70 fully powered sites, all except one of which can take a normal sized caravan, to end up with 12 unpowered camping sites, and only 21 caravan sites ? You will lose 60% of your existing customers!” • “The current sites are small and irregular and bringing them to Australian Standards is welcome and will obviously result in a reduction in camp sites. However the huge reduction in sites from 71 to 21 powered and 12 unpowered is extreme.” • “21 powered sites is totally inadequate for the current demand over the summer and Easter period. I don't know the exact numbers but there must be about 60 powered sites that are fully booked for at least four weeks in summer. Deposits are paid a year in advance and full payment is happily paid in September by hundreds of families.” • “When plans are drawn up to abolish sites that have existed for generations the planners should recognise the impact they will have on lives. Every effort should be made to avoid damage to this community.”
<p>5. Cabins (various)</p>	<p>Comments on cabins varied widely. The main themes arising from comments regarding this aspect of the plan were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Moving the cabins to the top tier is a good step (some support shown for the cabins in general by several respondents) • Cabins need to include kitchen facilities and cabin users won't want to use a communal outdoor kitchen. • Cabin car parking is taking up a prime view/position and should be relocated and/or it's positioning is not accessible to the cabins. • Cabin development in this 	<p>11</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “It's a shame that some of the sites that offer such panoramic views have been proposed for designated parking areas. Couldn't 'cabin parking' as shown (2 x #14) facilities be examined to be placed beyond site #63? Nice timber stairways could be built to access the Luxury Single Cabins on the top deck?” • “Luxury Family (self-contained) Cabins – We support this proposal in principle. Positioning self-contained cabins on idyllic sites that are presently under-utilised during the high season in this park is a positive step. Campervans, caravans and other camper-trailers struggle to access the steep gravel inclines to these upper levels.” • “The strategic location and design of each of these proposed self-contained cabins will be critical to ensuring some resemblance of the significant 'forest nature' of this historic park is not further diminished. “ • “Whilst I can see how cabins can increase the ability to utilise the park throughout the year, I feel that the creation of luxury cabins seems more designed as revenue raising rather than increasing occupancy in un-utilised periods ...Considering that cabins have been allocated to this area which will be used all year resulting in more vehicle traffic, I

	current location needs to be sensitive and could detract from the natural forest-like values of Queens Park.		<p>question how this will protect, maintain and enhance the Park's existing values, and in particular its strong natural values (Key Objectives 1)."</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "This is a good use for this terrace. Cabins at the top as long as they are well designed would be attractive and may provide some off season revenue. Consider a separate cabins only entrance from Charles Street."
6. Opposition to the proposed new playground site	Respondents strongly indicated they felt the siting of the playground proposed is inappropriate and unsafe due to its location and several suggested that the old playground should be updated instead	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "The location of this facility is not suitable. My experience is the location of the playground in a busy area like near the amenities block is suitable. With this option, kids do not need to go to an isolated area of the park to get to the playground and they will get opportunities to play while perhaps other activities like the laundry or dishes are being managed." • "I have grave concerns regarding the location of the playground (13). The playground appears to be located on the edge of Queens Park and I have concerns regarding the proximity of playground to open bushland. As a parent I feel very uncomfortable with the playground being on the border and not located in a more central location. I feel that this is a recipe for disaster. Even if there were to be a fence around the playground I feel it still needs to be in a more central and visible location." • "A "new" playground on the side of a 30 foot drop, with zero line of sight from any point in the park? How could such a blatant error get through the checks GORCC made before this was published? Why don't you improve the one you have, which caters for the many families who were always the mainstay of this park" • "A, there is an approx. 20-metre drop off, within metres of this proposed Children's Playground, too close to the steep embankment and not central nor ideal for proper parental supervision." • "Further yet another quality grassy area will be lost! The current playground area is absolutely fine and could do with some newer, more modern children's play furniture commensurate with the children that, thankfully, have started to return to this wonderful camping facility."
7. Feedback on road upgrades (various)	Various comments were made regarding the proposed upgrades	9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "Sealing any of the roads will utterly ruin the bush ambience and the appreciation of the natural terrain. It will be ugly and heat attracting."

	<p>and changes to roads.</p> <p>There was, in particular, disagreement regarding the sealing of roads, with some respondents strongly supporting this and others strongly opposing it.</p> <p>Two respondents opposed the proposed roundabout, indicating it was unnecessary or its positioning could be rethought.</p>		<p>We completely object to sealing any roads in Queens Park.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Formalisation and upgrades to roads will create more legible vehicular circulation and pedestrian way finding, further enhancing park movement” • “Good sealed roads at the entrance to the park would be good but a large roundabout and sealed roads at this end of the park will detract from the bush character of the park. Such a large turnaround is not necessary as the plan states that Queen’s Park will only be suitable for small caravans.” • “The sealing of the main access roads is strongly supported” • “We strongly support the sealing of roads within the area however as the area to the east of the proposed amenity block is shown as unsealed we request that it be sealed to prevent the use of the paving pebbles from being thrown down on to Armytage St properties.” • Storm water drains must be upgraded and maintained (for secondary access roads) • “I welcome the installation of a roundabout (4) to ease manoeuvrability around the park but I am not sure whether the placement is beneficial. I wonder whether there is a need for one where road 3 meets the sealed road.”
8. Opposition to the conversion of powered to unpowered sites	<p>Some respondents expressed strong opposition to converting powered sites to unpowered site, stating that they felt unpowered sites would attract very little use.</p>	8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “I seriously question the rationale behind ‘converting’ the current powered sites #17 to #22 to unpowered group camping/tent only sites! Our observations over the past 20+ years, campers, backpackers, vans, caravans, motorhomes almost without exception, the growing trend is they all require power.” • “These sites would meet the powered site size standards (9x9m) as outlined. If GORCC insist on taking this irrational direction and you believe you can afford to lose the annual revenue generated by the ‘seasonal’ family campers who currently frequent these sites, and move to ‘unpowered’ sites, Hey, just arrange to have the power turned off to these sites – simple!” • “Our observations over the high occupancy Easter holiday season the only QP sites vacant were the indeed the un-powered sites.” • “Considering that the current unpowered sites are often empty at peak times it seems very questionable to have 12 unpowered sites.”
9. View that basic	<p>Some respondents expressed</p>	8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “So, you must be expecting massive usage and income from the

<p>upgrades/maintenance are required</p>	<p>that they would like to see more maintenance and upgrades of current facilities and several indicated that any facilities would require more investment and ongoing attention than previously had been shown to park assets.</p>		<p>cabins and shared accommodation. However, to maintain premium prices, you must also maintain your assets. The track record has been appalling.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “At least this year you finally filled in some of the gaps in the toilet block ceiling. They have been there since the old block was replaced. Can’t remember when that was. Must have run out of motivation though. There was a clamp left attached to one of the beams, and some gaps still left in the roof” • “The present amenities block, to put it mildly, is an absolute disgrace and is now hardly fit for human use! There’s been very little maintenance around this facility, bar the odd tap and attempted door lock replacement in the past seven years and must be upgraded to a more acceptable, suitable health and hygienic standard for all QP visitors, regardless.”
<p>10. Proximity or accessibility of walking tracks and attractions</p>	<p>Some respondents stated that attractions the plan promoted as close to or accessible from Queens Park were actually either far away or (in the case of the ‘Teddys Lookout Track’) not in existence.</p> <p>One respondent suggested that the natural experience of the park could be found within its natural forest-like state and was not necessarily connected to regional attractions.</p>	<p>7</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “And hikers ... yes there are some plans to enhance hikes around Teddy’s lookout which could be accessed easily from Queens Park. After all, it is part of the overall park reservation. But comments about the Otway tree walk (80 kilometres away!) and Erskine river walk (terminates in Kia Ora caravan park!) are ludicrous.” • “Teddies (sic) Lookout Track? – Not likely, this is currently an Emergency Access, adjacent to the current site #38, cleared annually and used regularly by walkers to gain access to either the Great Ocean Road or the Tramway Track to the Georges River pathways.” • “Erskine Falls hikes are nowhere near Queens Park Caravan Park- access is actually via Kia Ora Caravan Park for those walking in to the falls. Queens Park provides access to St George River walks! That is unless you have access to a car to drive in to Erskine Falls” • “Teddy’s Lookout walking trail - I am assuming this is to be constructed as it does not exist at the present time!”
<p>11. Caretakers cottage (various)</p>	<p>Respondents had a number of thoughts and suggestions regarding this element of the draft plan. These included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Move the building to above the amenities block • General support for the 	<p>6</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “There is some modest support to this proposal. I seriously question the cost-benefit-analysis for this expense. But, if GORC Committee insists, this residence should not be squeezed onto the old ablutions block site. May we respectfully request the ‘Cottage’ could be built atop of the current amenities building? The rationale? Save cost, space and more importantly, the resident caretaker/s will have improved views of the entire QP complex, offering greater security of

	<p>inclusion of this element.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opposition to having a caretaker's residence at all. 		<p>the facilities and in turn, the residents.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “An ‘official’ presence at Queen’s Park should assist with security, especially during the high season.” • I question the need for a caretaker's residence. The security on call arrangements work well through the summer and the space allocated to the residence could be made into two camping sites. Perhaps a small residence could be built above the amenities block thus leaving more space for camping.” • “Caretakers residence. This is an unnecessary expense. No caretaker has been in residence at Queens Park for as long as I can remember and I have never felt it to be necessary.”
12. BBQ and picnic areas/facilities (various)	<p>Respondents expressed a number of thoughts regarding the provision of BBQ areas, including that having these kind of facilities near the Spotter’s Hut may detract from its natural beauty/amenity, that current facilities needed upgrades (and a new BBQ area was not needed) and that BBQs and picnic facilities should be more spread throughout the park.</p>	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Maintaining the grassed area in front of the historic Spotter’s Hut is essential. Relocating the Electric BBQs to this specific area needs to be given serious thought.” • “There is no argument/debate relating to the current BBQ shelter. It is poorly designed, poorly located, lack character and the appearance is not in keeping with the general symmetry of QP. We have NEVER used these facilities, choosing to invite our fellow campers and guests to a BBQ on our site.” • “Accommodating the electric BBQs into this specific area in front of the Spotter’s Hut so as not to denigrate the area will be a challenge. “ • “An upgrade of the existing BBQ facilities is all that is necessary and would be welcome.” • “BBQ and picnic area, Spotters Hut and Camp kitchen and BBQ area • Why are 3 BBQ areas being provided-all in the same area? If 3 BBQ areas are required then surely they should be spread throughout the park for every campers' use. None of the BBQ areas are central, they are on the outer edge of the park-up the hill from most sites.”
13. Comments that the cabin outdoor cooking facilities/lounge is inappropriate, won't be used and/or is not inclusive.	<p>Respondents that commented on the communal cabin kitchen proposed</p>	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “This is a folly! It is unlikely that cabins without a kitchen will attract rental especially during the bitter Lorne winters. No one wants to leave their cabin to go to another building to cook. It is interesting that you are trying to encourage socialisation among the cabin users but you are totally dismantling the already established long term community of campers. “ • “Seriously??? If the cabins are self-contained WHY are you providing another BBQ area? The cabin lounge is to encourage user

			<p>socialisation? I don't believe that couples utilizing the luxury double cabins are there to socialise with their neighbours....This lounge is elitist and non-inclusive.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “You want to add exclusive cooking areas and an “outside lounge”? We keep getting told open fires are now banned in the park, so I can't see these being used any time except during summer months. Unless of course the open fire in the “lounge” was not part of the plan ... in which case they probably won't get used at all.” • “If GORCC's aim is to attract year-around cabin occupancy then we fail to see this specific facility being a useful and/or a cost effective, viable utility. Further, it also occupies yet another attractive idyllic site which could be better utilised for another income-producing self-contained cabin or two? “ • “Propose that you have 1 camp kitchen only and combine the proposed 17. Cabin Lounge and Kitchen with the 12. Camp Kitchen & BBQ in a more appropriate location near the campers. Combining these proposed facilities will create a better sense of community rather than isolating the cabin people from the camping people.”
14. Park entrance (various)	<p>Various comments were made regarding the park entrance, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That the caretaker's cottage should be located near here. • That the upgrades to the entrance were supported (mentions of it being safer and more secure) • That sealing or upgrading this section or road were supported but that drainage also needed upgrading. • That a roundabout at this end would detract from the park 	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “The proposed sealed road: if storm water drains are not upgraded as well then the sealing of this road could mean that further erosion of the tiered sites will occur.” • Good sealed roads at the entrance to the park would be good but a large roundabout and sealed roads at this end of the park will detract from the bush character of the park • ““Another consideration - this ‘Cottage’ could be located as close as possible to the proposed ‘improved presentation of the Queen's Park entrance’ either Armytage or Hird Streets and, as such could be utilised as a residence and office to further assist those casual campers, many of whom have difficulty finding their allocated site on arrival.” • “Agree. The Armitage St entrance requires updating with a safer and more reliable, more secure entrance.” • “Agree. Upgrading the entrance section of road would be beneficial.”
15. View that occupancy	Some respondents expressed the	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Although there are many notable and necessary improvements in the

<p>and revenue will not increase or targets won't be reached</p>	<p>belief that the proposed plans would not result in high occupancy rates beyond current levels and may not drive much of a revenue increase. A range of reasons were given for this including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That the plan proposes an overinvestment/overdevelopment • That the location and terrain of the park is not compatible with high interest/use • That the reduction in sites will result in revenue loss and remove a regular income stream • That the group accommodation proposed is inappropriate and will not be well used (see also section summarising comments on the group accommodation element) 		<p>proposed plan, I believe that in many respects the plan proposes an over development of the site and would require an investment of unreasonable proportions that will not be recouped.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “We also acknowledge Queens Park doesn’t suit everyone for a variety of reasons and regardless of these proposed changes, QP may still not necessarily attract the numbers required to justify the significant expenditure being proposed. QP is located ‘out of town’, some distance from the various Lorne beaches, shopping and hospitality facilities. While this may suit some, many families these days, with younger children, find this a ‘negative’ as most don’t wish to use their vehicles and prefer short walking access, away from busy roads, to the above during their beach holiday and/or overnight stay.” • “GORCC needs to be very mindful that a ‘capital works’ program at this iconic QP facility may not attract an increase in campers and/or caravanners during the high/shoulder seasons as, most years, the entire facility appears to be booked out, regardless during this period. Add to this the proposed reduction in marketable sites from 73 to 32.” • “Has a needs and cost analysis been done? The cost of this accommodation and the loss of existing sites seems to be an over development. My experience with school groups (35 years a teacher) is that current trends are to remove students from their comfort zones and into tents and campfire cooking which is not allowed in the park.” • “Rather than generating revenue, halving the number of sites will reduce revenue.” • “I don't know the exact numbers but there must be about 60 powered sites that are fully booked for at least four weeks in summer. Deposits are paid a year in advance and full payment is happily paid in September by hundreds of families. Surely removing sites that guarantee income year after year will result in a huge loss of revenue. The proposed dormitory accommodation may not attract the income to replace it especially considering the cost of the re development.”
<p>16. Call for the natural environment to be protected or natural character of the park</p>	<p>Respondents indicated that retaining the natural character of Queens Park should be paramount and that</p>	<p>5</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “The bush character of the caravan park is a vital factor to its present popularity. With its unique location the general ‘feel’ of the park is coastal, natural and friendly. Maintaining this character should be an important objective of GORCC.”

<p>maintained through sensitive planning/development</p>	<p>development must be very sensitive to this.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “It MUST be appreciated and acknowledged that any further works within this precinct should be approved with a higher degree of sensitivity to the environs whilst providing some modern-day overnight camping facilities, such as on-site, self-contained cabins etc.” • “Queens Park already provides a nature based experience which is why so many regular campers book year after year. Whilst we are happy to share this secret with others so they can access this all year I feel that the current changes will strip the park of its natural appeal.” • “I do not believe that the key objectives have been met. Rather than protecting and enhancing the parks existing values and natural values, the plan will erode those values. The plan will reduce the nature based experience.”
<p>17. View that the proposed camp kitchen will become an eyesore (due to lack of cleanliness/maintenance) and/or is not required at all.</p>	<p>Some respondents opposed the creation of a new camp kitchen for a number of reasons including that it would become dirty and would not be well maintained.</p>	<p>4</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “A facility of this nature is completely out of step with the environs of Queen’s Park. Further, from our experience, who is going to maintain this facility? I have never seen a ‘public/communal’ facility of this nature remain ‘presentable’ for any length of time. A ‘communal’ kitchen will not work and requires high maintenance. Will GORCC have the capacity to manage a facility of this nature? “ • “A camp kitchen is not required in a bush camping setting. It would be under-utilized for the amount of cleaning and maintenance that would be required.” • “This ‘Camp Kitchen’, like the current amenities block, will prove to be one of the main drivers to keeping potential customers away! I repeat Queen’s Park does not need to be turned into ‘Camp America’” • ““The camp kitchen at area 12. I question the need for this development too. Have existing campers been surveyed to ask what percentage of them would use a camp kitchen? While many short term residents (tourists etc.) use the existing shared BBQ area, longer term campers cook and eat in family/friend groups. Save some more money by just updating the existing BBQ facilities (add a sink!)””
<p>18. View that the proposed camp kitchen is not in an ideal location (not close enough to those</p>	<p>These individuals had a slightly different response to those described above. They didn’t necessarily disagree with the inclusion of a camp kitchen but</p>	<p>4</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Looking at the plan of Queens Park- the camp kitchen, amenities and outdoor dining area is too far away from most of the camp sites to be readily usable by the campers, it needs to be in a more central position in the park as the cabins will all have their own cooking facilities.”

<p>who would use it)</p>	<p>felt its location was inappropriate, mainly due to accessibility for campers.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Whilst I support the idea of a camp kitchen to create cooking facilities as this will improve the park's facilities ...the location of this facility however, seems more relevant to capturing the view rather than to suit its purpose. A camp kitchen should ideally be closer to the campers. This location is a walk from all sites. • “The concept of un-powered camp-sites (item 7 on the plan) is a good idea and fits in well with the nature-park concept, but has some major drawbacks ...most of these campers will need to utilize the campers kitchen which is not close to this location.” • “I agree that a camp kitchen is a valuable addition. However, the location of this facility is inappropriate as it not in close enough proximity to the campers / people who would use it. It should be in a central location otherwise it will not be used and will not provide a community meeting point.”
<p>19. Support for protection and enhancement of the Spotters Hut</p>	<p>Respondents indicated that the Spotters Hut had special historical significance and that they supported the protection of it as well as the opportunity to see it better utilised. Concerns were expressed, however, that BBQs near to the building would take away from its beauty.</p>	<p>4</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Fully support the on-going maintenance and refurbishment of this historic landmark. The full story needs to be told about the wonderful work our forefathers and WW1 returned solders called Queen’s Park ‘home’ for many years from 1918 on as they went to work on the construction of the Great Ocean Road. The Spotter’s hut played an intricate role during this period.” • “I think the Spotters Hut is an underutilised resource in a beautiful location. Restoring the existing building and allowing use as a gathering space is a great way to improve the Park’s, amenities, recreational values and overall visitor experience.
<p>20. Access (emergency, disabled and other)</p>	<p>Various comments were made regarding access tracks and emergency access.</p>	<p>4</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • My only concern is the design of the single entry / exit access. Shouldn’t the Hird St pedestrian access be designed to take vehicles in case of a bush fire emergency? • “It should be noted this access is also used extensively to walk up to Teddy’s Lookout, not item #20 as shown.” • “18. Emergency Access – We acknowledge this access already exists. Can we assume the current roadway/walkway would be a walking access only?” • “Access Track to Hird Street – Refer to my comments in Item #01 with respect to our suggestion that this street access could be used more safely as a one-way thoroughfare access to the entire Queen’s Park facility”

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> “The plan shows no consideration for use of the facilities by disabled persons. While not exhaustive the following statements illustrate the problem: The car parking spaces are essentially separated from the cabins on the upper levels. There is no clarity of intent to create truly fully self-contained cabin accommodation for disabled persons..”
21. Support for protection and enhancement of the Spotters Hut	Respondents indicated that the Spotters Hut had special historical significance and that they supported the protection of it as well as the opportunity to see it better utilised. Concerns were expressed, however, that BBQs near to the building would take away from its beauty.	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> “Fully support the on-going maintenance and refurbishment of this historic landmark. The full story needs to be told about the wonderful work our forefathers and WW1 returned solders called Queen’s Park ‘home’ for many years from 1918 on as they went to work on the construction of the Great Ocean Road. The Spotter’s hut played an intricate role during this period.” “I think the Spotters Hut is an underutilised resource in a beautiful location. Restoring the existing building and allowing use as a gathering space is a great way to improve the Park’s, amenities, recreational values and overall visitor experience.
22. View that the Amenities block should be renovated rather than demolished	Two respondents felt that the current amenities block did not need replacing and could instead be upgraded to save on costs.	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> “But, why would one demolish the current amenities block IF this building can be gutted and ‘modernised’ to an acceptable standard? GORCC will gain just one more camp site by demolishing and moving this building 20 metres along the middle terrace” “The existing amenities block is large and solid. Demolishing and re building is again a waste of funds especially as you are reducing the number of campers by half. The existing building requires upgrading but refurbishment is all that is needed.”
23. Concern that campers are not being or will not be properly heard by GORCC or the Committee	Two respondents expressed that they felt GORCC and/or the Committee had not and would not listen to their concerns properly.	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> “As a long term camper and as a Victorian tax payer, I hope GORCC and the GORCC committee actually read this, and stop wasting money on plans without any logic. That said, I suspect this document will never be seen by the GORCC committee.” “I offered in my last submission to take any or all of GORCC, their employees, the GORCC committee or indeed anyone else who cared around the park, and suggested they even come and experience the park – spend a few nights, and get to know the park! Not treat it as an abstract concept. We want to help you. Work with us! No-one accepted. I guess that means no-one really cares, despite all the rhetoric in the latest document.”
24. View that while the new revised draft was	These respondents indicated that the plan had improved since it	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> “Firstly, this draft is leaps ahead of the initial master plan, but still has some major issues.”

a better plan, more work was still required	was in its preliminary draft stage but that more improvements were required.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> “Overall, this design is a lot more practical than the last, however I feel improvements can still be made.”
25. Positive feedback (general)	Two respondents expressed support for the plan overall.	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> “I congratulate GORCC on the concept of the nature based accommodation layout planned for Queens Park. The key objectives, if achievable are credible as is the accommodation mix.” “I am in support of the proposal to upgrade the facilities of Queens Park Caravan Park.”
26. Concerns regarding safety	One respondent voiced concerns regarding the lack of safety fence along the eastern side of the park.	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> “GORCC has clearly stated that they have no intention of providing a safety fence to prevent campers and visitors from falling over the Armytage St cutting that forms the eastern boundary of the site as it is on Shire road reserve. We regard this failure to consider park user safety as outrageous as it is only a matter of time before someone is seriously or fatally injured when scrambling down this cutting.”

Some individual comments were made regarding elements of the plan that did not fit relate to the above themes. These comments included, but are not limited to, the following:

AREA	EXAMPLE OF COMMENT RECIEVED
Litter	“More work needs to be done to reduce the volume of litter that emanates from the camping area. This is a particular problem when groups gather for long weekends.”
Powerlines	“I think the Great Ocean Road Committee 2015 and council has another opportunity here to meet these objectives and that is to underground the Armytage st power lines and poles, especially from Smith St to the caravan park. They are old infrastructure and unsightly (as well as a potential fire risk)... I have been in discussions in mid-2014 with Powercor who owns and manages the power lines and they are supportive of the proposal to retire several poles and underground. There is local home owner support for this and the potential for some financial contributions to meet this end.”
Noise	“While GORCC may have the best of intentions, Local Residents, from time to time, have to endure parking problems and also considerable late night noise, particularly when the Spotter’s hut is rented out for celebrations. The worst experience in recent years had very loud noise continue unabated until 6.30 am when the ranger finally shut off the power.”
Poisoning of vegetation	“And you have still done nothing to recover the lost ground cover and stop erosion on the banks of the terraces - caused by your employees poisoning all the previous flora.”
Limits to site permits/stays	“Remove the artificial 2 weeks per year limit, and you could probably fill those sites at least 5 months of the year. And I know a number of people who would be more than happy to stay all year round, if allowed.
Business plan	“I understand a full copy of Revised QP Draft Master Plan #3 and the associated Business Plan is not being made available. This is

	disappointing as it's difficult to offer a full and constructive view without some knowledge of the total overall expenditure being proposed for the 'upgrades'.
Water tank	"Water Tank – There's no mention of the current Water Tank in this revised proposal. Is this an oversight or has my previous suggestions been taken into account? While this tank is an essential piece and a necessary part of water conservation, it's an 'eye sore' in it's present location taking up valuable space and relocating this water tank should be carried out. The area behind the current amenities block may be more appropriate. We suggest some of the various oval-shaped PVC tanks currently available could be positioned on the current pathway seldom used to access the laundry and current community kitchen cleaning room."
Sales/marketing	"In light of the proposed expenditure to be undertaken in Queen's Park as outlined here in Master Plan #3, in our view a fundamental strategic sales and marketing plan will be vital if this project is going to be successful. This is to ensure a higher, year-around occupancy rate can be achieved and thus ensure the financial success of this project."
Signage	Increased signage guiding Great Ocean Road travellers to Queen's Park would also be a good and economic start along with some much targeted promotion on the various camping websites and the CMCA magazine for example.
Upgrades to the toilets to improve safety and hygiene for children	Suggestions included in this response were lowered hand basins, preschool-size toilets, baby holders in women's toilet, nappy change tables, family change rooms with showers etc., and addressing security issues regarding doors being jammed open so campers can more easily access amenities.

Some questions were also raised by respondents. It is expected that all questions will be responded to directly in (or will be answered indirectly via changes to) the final plan.

- The recommendations appear to be logical upgrades of the present powered sites. Will car spaces incorporate hard-standing?, i.e. concrete platforms or similar?
- Emergency Access – We acknowledge this access already exists. Can we assume the current roadway/walkway would be a walking access only? Is there a plan to upgrade this upper tier level for vehicular access in case of an emergency?
- The sites are going to be in line with the industry standard medium site area suitable for 'medium caravans'. Will the sites be large enough to accommodate the large caravans that many retirees are travelling with?
- Why are the sites that are powered on our level being turned into unpowered sites, this will force all those families on our level to seek alternative sites via a ballot for a powered site?
- If the proposed development goes ahead as an effected camper will I be given an opportunity to book the cabins?
- How will the deeply sloping embankment between the extended van sites and Armytage St be retained and landscaped?
- What provisions will be made to ensure storm water collection and distribution from the site will not impact on Armytage St?
- Will there be a community bus service to and from the beach and town?

- What will the operating times be? Operating times: Yearly/Monthly/Casual/Permanent ?
- Will there be noise abatement screening to Armytage St?

5. Next Steps

All submissions received on the revised draft master plan will now be considered in the development of a final plan. Based on the feedback received, the GORC Committee will consider revisions to the plan before approving a final version. Once the Committee has approved a final version of the plan, it will then be submitted to the the Department of Environment, Land, Water and Planning for Coastal Management Act consent, prior to its public release.