

Draft Economic Development Strategy

Response to Submissions received on the Draft Strategy via online survey

Submission 1	
Question 1: Submitter Name:	
Question 2: In your opinion, do the guiding principles of the draft Economic Development Strategy as outlined on page 5 ensure sustainable, positive outcomes for the whole community, including business and residents?	Submitter Response Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Somewhat Agree Agree
Submitter Comment Agree, but in respect to the whole report, it is unclear why the focus of the strategy specifically notes it is applicable to current boundary, but often reference data applicable to COGG side of Fellows Road (North West of Fellows Road) - Report does not address climate change which have critical impact on this area - Suggest diagram 2.3.3 show percentage of citizen NOT working to highlight whole status - How has the report determined high levels of entrepreneur and leadership? -Suggest engagement with Central Coastal Board and understanding of proposed Visitation Framework would be worthwhile prior to committing to proposed strategy. - especially note 2.5.4 has to be done EXTREMELY sensitively, - Suggest 3225 community does include those on COGG side of boundary and boundary needs to be addressed environmentally, socially and economically as the occupants will contribute to the future change. -The report seems heavily focussed on assets etc. of Queenscliff with little reference to Point Lonsdale and its asset (better natural environment, access to surf than Queenscliff) -The report seems to leave property prices out of research and analysis, creating a major gap in understanding the causes of population and demographic. (PS focusing on baby boomers now is at odds with 2025 ambition given a lot will not be here anymore) What of future property prices? Table 4.5 seems like a good few mother statements without clarity as to what 'skills' may be focussed on.	Officer Response Feedback noted. The EDS has a 10 year horizon while climate change is not predicted to impact on the Borough in this timeframe. That said, Council is preparing an adaptation plan in relation to climate change and sea level rise as reflected in the Council Plan 2017-21. The publication of demographic data for the Borough of Queenscliff occasionally does present challenges. For the most part data is available for, and presented in the draft EDS in terms of the Queenscliff municipality. Given the broader community of interest and the shifting trends in population, some data is presented for the 3225 postcode. At other times the limited size of the Borough require regional data to be presented and where possible applied with caveats. The question of the 3225 postcode and any future change to the municipal boundary is outside the scope of this tender. That said, Council is continuing to examine this matter.

<p>Question 3: In your opinion, do the strategies outlined under Pillar 1 "Increase sustainable yield in the visitor economy"?</p>	<p>Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Somewhat Agree Agree</p>
<p>Question 4: In your opinion, do the strategies under Pillar 2 work to "Connect and partner"?</p>	<p>Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Somewhat Agree Agree</p>
<p>Submitter Comment None of pillars comment to transport - so if sharing and connecting across Point Lonsdale to Queenscliff - what of ideas for bike share, bike hire? Initiating shuttle bus between as per Barwon Heads/Ocean Grove? Concerned about private partnerships on Crown Land - needs very careful testing and review that protects environment and acknowledges climate change, Government tends to sell too much ill informed of real values. Also Federal Government has no government architect to protect process.</p>	<p>Officer Response Feedback on transport opportunities is noted. Any changes to Crown land management arrangements would be subject to community consultation via the Council's annual Implementation Plan or specific consultation activities.</p>
<p>Question 5: In your opinion, do the strategies under Pillar 3 work to achieve "Experiential excellence"?</p>	<p>Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Somewhat Agree Agree</p>
<p>Submitter Comment Agree with some, not others. Fort Queenscliff yes, but foreshores be careful. Concerned about the push generally for 'Eco Cabins'. These have proven to not be as successful as envisaged, especially when left to private sector. (anyone can label project 'Eco' without true regard) Also note earlier point regarding climate change and sea level rise especially along foreshores as noted. Optimizing rail line is good, and perhaps could be part of Pillar 2, seen as a potential transport network as much as tourist facility.</p>	<p>Officer Response Support and comments for Fort Queenscliff and Bellarine noted. Council's offering of cabin accommodation attracts a high demand particularly in the summer season. The EDS has a 10 year horizon and climate change was not identified as an issue in this timeframe. That said, Council is preparing an adaptation plan in relation to climate change and sea level rise as reflected in the Council Plan 2017-21.</p>
<p>Question 6: In your opinion, do the strategies under Pillar 4 allow for "Sustainable diversification"?</p>	<p>Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Somewhat Agree Agree</p>

<p>Submitter Comment</p> <p>Feel sceptical about 'knowledge' given this is a Victorian and Australian economic driver so ALL areas committing to this with more infrastructure available to facilitate. Lead point should be something that is point of difference. Suggest answer for investment may not just be 'rezoning' but a structure/urban design framework plan that unlocks opportunities. Rezoning is two dimensional and does not adequately address overall qualities to be retained. Agree if majority of business are small operators, then mixed use may assist. However, critical issue is that property prices are high. Increasing opportunities for sensitive housing densification and diversity, adaptive reuse of existing buildings would assist in housing affordability and contribute to future demographic change and economic contribution.</p>	<p>Officer Response</p> <p>Feedback noted.</p> <p>Agree, knowledge economy is a Victorian and Australian economic driver. This strategy is about positioning BoQ to take advantage of the opportunities that will arise in the future.</p> <p>Re-zoning is just one strategy under Pillar 4 – Sustainable Diversification. It is not the only answer for investment but re-zoning to mixed use land provides flexibility to capitalise on the potential uses of the land.</p>
<p>Question 7:</p> <p>In your opinion, do the strategies outlined under Pillar 5 address the "Boom with the boomers"?</p>	<p>Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Somewhat Agree Agree</p>
<p>Submitter Comment</p> <p>I don't believe this is a long term strategy - What happens when they die, and even if land left to families, the families can't afford to keep it on amongst multiple children. Item b. sounds like a motherhood statement without content. What does it mean? Agree opportunities for aged care facilities, but also other models for earlier age that allow independent ownership within common development. Similar to cohousing Baugruppen model (see me for clarification).</p>	<p>Officer Response</p> <p>Feedback noted.</p> <p>Strategy recognises the opportunities that can stem from the emerging demographic trends in the Borough of Queenscliffe and its attraction as a retirement setting for 'baby boomers'.</p>
<p>Question 8:</p> <p>Are there any other comments or suggestions you would like to make in regards to the draft Economic Development Strategy?</p>	
<p>Submitter Comment</p> <p>Council as enabler good and needs to be encouraged. Engage with younger population (even if small) to garner ideas, i.e. how could Borough encourage they stay or return to area? Good to have case studies, but feel there could have been more, for example from interstate and OS Europe etc. Report REALLY hasn't considered issues of climate change, coastal sea rise and erosion (and inundation). Agree opportunities should be focus, but risks must be acknowledged - that way report appears to be comprehensive. Encourage more dialogue with ALL business owners including Point Lonsdale - not just 'squeaky wheels'.</p>	<p>Officer Response</p> <p>Feedback noted.</p>

Submission 2	
Question 1: Submitter Name:	
Question 2: In your opinion, do the guiding principles of the draft Economic Development Strategy as outlined on page 5 ensure sustainable, positive outcomes for the whole community, including business and residents?	Submitter Response
	Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Somewhat Agree Agree
Submitter Comment No Comment.	Officer Response
Question 3: In your opinion, do the strategies outlined under Pillar 1 "Increase sustainable yield in the visitor economy"?	Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Somewhat Agree Agree
Submitter Comment No comment.	Officer Response
Question 4: In your opinion, do the strategies under Pillar 2 work to "Connect and partner"?	Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Somewhat Agree Agree
Submitter Comment No comment.	Officer Response
Question 5: In your opinion, do the strategies under Pillar 3 work to achieve "Experiential excellence"?	Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Somewhat Agree Agree
Submitter Comment No comment.	Officer Response

<p>Question 6: In your opinion, do the strategies under Pillar 4 allow for "Sustainable diversification"?</p>	<p>Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Somewhat Agree Agree</p>
<p>Submitter Comment No comment.</p>	<p>Officer Response</p>
<p>Question 7: In your opinion, do the strategies outlined under Pillar 5 address the "Boom with the boomers"?</p>	<p>Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Somewhat Agree Agree</p>
<p>Submitter Comment No comment.</p>	<p>Officer Response</p>
<p>Question 8: Are there any other comments or suggestions you would like to make in regards to the draft Economic Development Strategy?</p>	
<p>Submitter Comment The document sets out clear and concise goals in what its trying to achieve. My only concern is that this document doesn't have measured targets and timeframes set out against these goals and I don't want to see this document become a non-working document that's left on the shelf.</p>	<p>Officer Response</p>

Submission 3	
Question 1: Submitter Name:	
Question 2: In your opinion, do the guiding principles of the draft Economic Development Strategy as outlined on page 5 ensure sustainable, positive outcomes for the whole community, including business and residents?	Submitter Response Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Somewhat Agree Agree
Submitter Comment No Comment.	Officer Response
Question 3: In your opinion, do the strategies outlined under Pillar 1 "Increase sustainable yield in the visitor economy"?	Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Somewhat Agree Agree
Submitter Comment No comment.	Officer Response
Question 4: In your opinion, do the strategies under Pillar 2 work to "Connect and partner"?	Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Somewhat Agree Agree
Submitter Comment No comment.	Officer Response
Question 5: In your opinion, do the strategies under Pillar 3 work to achieve "Experiential excellence"?	Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Somewhat Agree Agree
Submitter Comment No comment.	Officer Response

<p>Question 6: In your opinion, do the strategies under Pillar 4 allow for "Sustainable diversification"?</p>	<p>Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Somewhat Agree Agree</p>
<p>Submitter Comment No comment.</p>	<p>Officer Response</p>
<p>Question 7: In your opinion, do the strategies outlined under Pillar 5 address the "Boom with the boomers"?</p>	<p>Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Somewhat Agree Agree</p>
<p>Submitter Comment No comment.</p>	<p>Officer Response</p>
<p>Question 8: Are there any other comments or suggestions you would like to make in regards to the draft Economic Development Strategy?</p>	
<p>Submitter Comment I question as to where the current Wellness & Spa industry is included in the economy structure and future planning as there is current significant growth being undertaken in the region in this area. From our experience, mid-week visitor to the region want to spend within the region, but become frustrated with unreliable opening hours and lack of amenities to access, therefore are forced to head into Geelong or cut their stay short. Local media has a real obligation and opportunity here to inform local residents/businesses of current & new businesses in the region that they can potentially visitor partner/package with. In the past, some local businesses have had their 'heads in the sand' in regards to what exists in their own backyards! This limits opportunities for local referrals. All businesses and local residents should be ambassadors for all quality businesses within their own region</p>	<p>Officer Response Feedback noted. Increasing mid-week offering from businesses and packaging experiences, have been identified as priorities in the draft EDS.</p>

Submission 4	
Question 1: Submitter Name:	
Question 2: In your opinion, do the guiding principles of the draft Economic Development Strategy as outlined on page 5 ensure sustainable, positive outcomes for the whole community, including business and residents?	Submitter Response
	Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Somewhat Agree Agree
Submitter Comment Not completely happy about all the council's planning. Don't completely agree with this point: Must optimise a connected approach that leverages existing Borough of Queenscliffe council plans and strategies, as well as the plans of the broader Bellarine, Barwon, Greater Geelong region and the Mornington Peninsula region. This includes embracing greater connections within the region and recognising opportunities in neighbouring LGAs.	Officer Response Feedback noted regarding ways to improve planning. In regards to embracing greater connection, the draft EDS identifies Pillar 2– 'Connect and Partner' where the strategy is based on having a planned, coordinated and collaborative approach with the Bellarine and Mornington Peninsulas to maximise visitor experiences and stays.
Question 3: In your opinion, do the strategies outlined under Pillar 1 "Increase sustainable yield in the visitor economy"?	Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Somewhat Agree Agree
Submitter Comment Suggestion based on my opinion but could 'Must reinforce how unique we are' change to 'Must reinforce what makes us unique'. There can't be 'many unique' places. To own a 'unique' quality almost suggests we only need a little enhancement but to understand the offering is highly comparable to other beautiful parts of Vic/Aust and that we need to make the offering unique is a clearer message. Branding is a key and core component of a place. It's very important anyone in the position to direct this process within council has experience in the field.	Officer Response Feedback noted. TGGB has allocated funds that may be able to be used to achieve this outcome.
Question 4: In your opinion, do the strategies under Pillar 2 work to "Connect and partner"?	Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Somewhat Agree Agree

<p>Submitter Comment I do think this is a great idea but is it possible to connect this way given the division of the councils and the various vested interests? The messages to the consumer can become confusing, again breaking that united message we need so much.</p>	<p>Officer Response Feedback noted.</p>
<p>Question 5: In your opinion, do the strategies under Pillar 3 work to achieve "Experiential excellence"?</p>	<p>Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Somewhat Agree Agree</p>
<p>Submitter Comment It's too difficult to say without knowing who we are and who we want to be. There are endless possibilities to suggest for 'experiential excellence' but identity has to come first. I wouldn't suggest we spend any money on developing the Fort from our current 'blind' identity status especially. How can anything be suggested if there isn't a clear agenda guiding the process? Who are you, what do you want to be?</p>	<p>Officer Response Feedback noted regarding the having an 'identity'. The draft EDS identifies a priority action to develop an all-encompassing visitor narrative involving both business and the community to address this issue.</p>
<p>Question 6: In your opinion, do the strategies under Pillar 4 allow for "Sustainable diversification"?</p>	<p>Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Somewhat Agree Agree</p>
<p>Submitter Comment The Borough has so much to offer all year round. We just need to brainstorm it with a calendar. I believe all businesses will slot in somewhere and we'll all get a go! Agree with small-scale trials of emerging technology but in my mind 'brand Borough' is one of intelligence and this really works. I see the Fort as a university campus but again, we need to know who we are and who we want to be before spending more. Dissecting one idea at a time does not work. The zoning of the land is a little mind boggling to me. But my guess is the land was zoned and then the councils were divided... Not a very well thought out process. I'm speechless over this one</p>	<p>Officer Response Feedback noted. The Borough does have so much to offer all year round. The draft EDS includes a range of strategies under the 'Connect and Partner' pillar. In regards to the use of the Fort decision on the future of the Fort ultimately rests with the Department of Defence however the Fort Queenscliff Tourism Master Plan has identified four principles that must underpin any future proposal. These principles are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remembering and respecting our history • Opening up the Fort to the community • Preserving the Fort's significant assets • Building a vibrant and diverse local economy

<p>Question 7: In your opinion, do the strategies outlined under Pillar 5 address the "Boom with the boomers"?</p>	<p>Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Somewhat Agree Agree</p>
<p>Submitter Comment Of course this is great and we regularly have friends and visitors to the gallery talking about plans to move locally. I fear focusing too much here and we'll forever be God's waiting room and the slow retirement town. I believe we need to entice the QMF visitors to come back and even stay as they are truly the big demographic missing here. A little of every age makes a great and very happy place. Large amounts of common groups are never a good idea for communities. It's just not healthy - not real!</p>	<p>Officer Response Feedback noted. It is not the only demographic that the Strategy suggests BoQ targets, it is just one of the five pillars in the EDS. However this pillar does focus on the opportunities that can stem from the emerging demographic trends in the Borough of Queenscliffe and its attraction as a retirement setting for 'baby boomers'.</p>
<p>Question 8: Are there any other comments or suggestions you would like to make in regards to the draft Economic Development Strategy?</p>	
<p>Submitter Comment Can we just stop all the strategy and planning and focus on a branding exercise first? It's all blind work otherwise. I really feel my tax dollars and the daily efforts to establish a business are not being used to full potential. With some of the Council's recent moves, I've found myself researching the viability of functioning as our own Borough. I love the idea but it calls for extreme competence, experience from all members of Council and given our population not much room for financial and planning errors.</p>	<p>Officer Response Feedback noted. As indicated the draft EDS includes a priority to develop an all encompassing visitor narrative involving both business and the wider community.</p>

Submission 5	
Question 1: Submitter Name:	
Question 2: In your opinion, do the guiding principles of the draft Economic Development Strategy as outlined on page 5 ensure sustainable, positive outcomes for the whole community, including business and residents?	Submitter Response
	Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Somewhat Agree Agree
Submitter Comment Not keen on optimising all exiting council plans and strategies - but great to connect to surrounding regions.	Officer Response Feedback noted.
Question 3: In your opinion, do the strategies outlined under Pillar 1 "Increase sustainable yield in the visitor economy"?	Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Somewhat Agree Agree
Submitter Comment On Pt Lonsdale not being able to handle more visitors during summer, what will happen when all the new development is complete, full of residents and all their family and friends come to visit? a) attracting more people to the beaches means you need more places for these people to eat and drink. b) unique? maybe.. as every child in a room is unique in their parents' eyes we may feel that Queenscliff is unique. But as every child in that room is different - they are not unique and so, Queenscliff is different to other locations, but not unique. c) Ferry visitations: just checking on this but I noticed a billboard driving towards Geelong promoting ferry goes to jump across to Sorrento for a latte. Is there a billboard on the other side with the opposite message..? e) midweek spending can only occur if businesses are open midweek.	Officer Response Feedback noted. The draft EDS responds to many of the matters raised, including the need to increase the mid-week offering from businesses.
Question 4: In your opinion, do the strategies under Pillar 2 work to "Connect and partner"?	Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Somewhat Agree Agree
Submitter Comment Yes, agree with partnering in business to expand the offering to the visitor coming	Officer Response Feedback noted.

<p>to the Bellarine. Sports: not sure how this benefits the community as a whole - more so only a few key stakeholders.</p>	
<p>Question 5: In your opinion, do the strategies under Pillar 3 work to achieve "Experiential excellence"?</p>	<p>Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Somewhat Agree Agree</p>
<p>Submitter Comment Who are we and what are we offering? We cannot be everything to everyone. To use the commonly referred to example Daylesford: Daylesford is a destination point. It offers natural beauty, food and coffee, accommodation and cultural experience (in that order). I feel we need better/more accommodation and food. Need to be careful not to create too much that is new (e.g. the fort) as people will have nowhere to stay or eat. Before most people jump in their car for a 1.5hr drive they search where they will be eating</p>	<p>Officer Response Feedback noted. The draft EDS responds to the need for an all encompassing visitor narrative that identifies the unique experience of the Borough.</p>
<p>Question 6: In your opinion, do the strategies under Pillar 4 allow for "Sustainable diversification"?</p>	<p>Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Somewhat Agree Agree</p>
<p>Submitter Comment No comment.</p>	<p>Officer Response</p>
<p>Question 7: In your opinion, do the strategies outlined under Pillar 5 address the "Boom with the boomers"?</p>	<p>Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Somewhat Agree Agree</p>
<p>Submitter Comment Is focusing on the Baby Boomers really a long term plan? Aren't we just going to create a community of old people in 10 years' time? I am more happy with the fact that the primary school intake has increased threefold</p>	<p>Officer Response Feedback noted. It is not the only demographic that the Strategy suggests BoQ targets, it is just one of the five pillars in the EDS. However this pillar does focus on the opportunities that can stem from the emerging demographic trends in the Borough of Queenscliffe and its attraction as a retirement setting for 'baby boomers'.</p>

Question 8:

Are there any other comments or suggestions you would like to make in regards to the draft Economic Development Strategy?

Submitter Comment

Before trying to work out who we want to be we need to work out who we are. For example, if you know you are a strong student in mathematics and the sciences, you can consider pursuing a course in engineering. Who is the Borough of Queenscliffe? Before trying to work out who we will become we need to understand what we are capable of.

Officer Response

Feedback noted.
The draft EDS responds to the need for an all encompassing visitor narrative that identifies the unique experience of the Borough.

Submission 6	
Question 1: Submitter Name:	
Question 2: In your opinion, do the guiding principles of the draft Economic Development Strategy as outlined on page 5 ensure sustainable, positive outcomes for the whole community, including business and residents?	Submitter Response Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Somewhat Agree Agree
Submitter Comment No Comment.	Officer Response
Question 3: In your opinion, do the strategies outlined under Pillar 1 "Increase sustainable yield in the visitor economy"?	Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Somewhat Agree Agree
Submitter Comment No comment.	Officer Response
Question 4: In your opinion, do the strategies under Pillar 2 work to "Connect and partner"?	Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Somewhat Agree Agree
Submitter Comment No comment.	Officer Response
Question 5: In your opinion, do the strategies under Pillar 3 work to achieve "Experiential excellence"?	Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Somewhat Agree Agree
Submitter Comment No comment.	Officer Response

<p>Question 6: In your opinion, do the strategies under Pillar 4 allow for "Sustainable diversification"?</p>	<p>Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Somewhat Agree Agree</p>
<p>Submitter Comment No comment.</p>	<p>Officer Response</p>
<p>Question 7: In your opinion, do the strategies outlined under Pillar 5 address the "Boom with the boomers"?</p>	<p>Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Somewhat Agree Agree</p>
<p>Submitter Comment No comment.</p>	<p>Officer Response</p>
<p>Question 8: Are there any other comments or suggestions you would like to make in regards to the draft Economic Development Strategy?</p>	
<p>Submitter Comment Although I sat in on 2 feedback forums for this strategy, and was enthusiastic about my input, I find the final draft beyond my intellectual capabilities; too 'wordy', and too complicated for most people to understand. It lost me completely! Genuine language used for feedback results would have made for better communication, and thus, knowledge of the overall process.</p>	<p>Officer Response Feedback noted. The final EDS will include an Executive Summary that provides a more accessible concise overview of the Strategy.</p>

Submission 7	
Question 1: Submitter Name:	
Question 2: In your opinion, do the guiding principles of the draft Economic Development Strategy as outlined on page 5 ensure sustainable, positive outcomes for the whole community, including business and residents?	Submitter Response Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Somewhat Agree Agree
Submitter Comment No Comment.	Officer Response
Question 3: In your opinion, do the strategies outlined under Pillar 1 "Increase sustainable yield in the visitor economy"?	Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Somewhat Agree Agree
Submitter Comment No comment.	Officer Response
Question 4: In your opinion, do the strategies under Pillar 2 work to "Connect and partner"?	Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Somewhat Agree Agree
Submitter Comment No comment.	Officer Response
Question 5: In your opinion, do the strategies under Pillar 3 work to achieve "Experiential excellence"?	Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Somewhat Agree Agree
Submitter Comment No comment.	Officer Response

<p>Question 6: In your opinion, do the strategies under Pillar 4 allow for "Sustainable diversification"?</p>	<p>Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Somewhat Agree Agree</p>
<p>Submitter Comment This is the key to diversification of our growth economically, employment and growth in real estate in Queenscliff and Point Lonsdale would make this the place to live knowing the next step is a village and care that we can stay together as a couple with a two stage process.</p>	<p>Officer Response Feedback noted.</p>
<p>Question 7: In your opinion, do the strategies outlined under Pillar 5 address the "Boom with the boomers"?</p>	<p>Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Somewhat Agree Agree</p>
<p>Submitter Comment They are our future sustainability. Have a reason why people want to live and retire here. Make it worth their while.</p>	<p>Officer Response Feedback noted.</p>
<p>Question 8: Are there any other comments or suggestions you would like to make in regards to the draft Economic Development Strategy?</p>	
<p>Submitter Comment Make Murray road site happen it is a must and a no brainer, we need another diverse growth area to add to the success of tourism. Both create sustainability and employment the two keys to a successful economy.</p>	<p>Officer Response Feedback noted.</p>

Submission 8	
Question 1: Submitter Name:	
Question 2: In your opinion, do the guiding principles of the draft Economic Development Strategy as outlined on page 5 ensure sustainable, positive outcomes for the whole community, including business and residents?	Submitter Response Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Somewhat Agree Agree
Submitter Comment The local businesses suffer madly from misinformation and have had a wedge driven into their livelihoods by the councils inactivity and poor implementation. The local residents are guided by this misinformation and do not understand because of the lack of transparency.	Officer Response
Question 3: In your opinion, do the strategies outlined under Pillar 1 "Increase sustainable yield in the visitor economy"?	Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Somewhat Agree Agree
Submitter Comment No comment.	Officer Response
Question 4: In your opinion, do the strategies under Pillar 2 work to "Connect and partner"?	Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Somewhat Agree Agree
Submitter Comment No comment.	Officer Response
Question 5: In your opinion, do the strategies under Pillar 3 work to achieve "Experiential excellence"?	Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Somewhat Agree Agree
Submitter Comment It's far from the councils control to provide visitors with the experience. This falls	Officer Response Feedback noted.

<p>on the shoulders of the businesses and operators. The council's only contribution to the "experience" is to provide public services (toilet blocks, car parking, access) and sadly the council fails badly in all three. The council does have solid town planning that is largely ignored or not enacted that could address most economical issues.</p>	<p>Refer to the Future Role of Council in section 7.1 to understand how council can enact the Strategy.</p>
<p>Question 6: In your opinion, do the strategies under Pillar 4 allow for "Sustainable diversification"?</p>	<p>Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Somewhat Agree Agree</p>
<p>Submitter Comment Large emphasis has been placed on the emerging Asian market - I do agree to a point. A bigger market for Queenscliff is the traditional market where we had weddings every weekend, we had a larger and better demographic living in our locale and we had a directive council. The local council is too hung up on blaming someone for the mistakes that have been made instead of been proactive and maintaining the assets we the ratepayers own. Unfortunately greed and narcissism has infected the offices.</p>	<p>Officer Response Feedback noted. The draft EDS places a priority on realising the potential to increase the length of visitation (and yield) from the existing visitor economy while also identifying opportunities to enhance the unique experience of the Borough.</p>
<p>Question 7: In your opinion, do the strategies outlined under Pillar 5 address the "Boom with the boomers"?</p>	<p>Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Somewhat Agree Agree</p>
<p>Submitter Comment As stated earlier in response, transparency by the council would alleviate a lot of problems. I can reach 5000 people (more than the constituents) on Facebook for \$30 why can the council be connecting with all constituents at least weekly - I can see what my son does everyday he is at school on a blog.</p>	<p>Officer Response Feedback noted.</p>
<p>Question 8: Are there any other comments or suggestions you would like to make in regards to the draft Economic Development Strategy?</p>	
<p>Submitter Comment No comment.</p>	<p>Officer Response</p>

Submission 9	
Question 1: Submitter Name:	
Question 2: In your opinion, do the guiding principles of the draft Economic Development Strategy as outlined on page 5 ensure sustainable, positive outcomes for the whole community, including business and residents?	Submitter Response
	Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Somewhat Agree Agree
Submitter Comment No comment.	Officer Response
Question 3: In your opinion, do the strategies outlined under Pillar 1 "Increase sustainable yield in the visitor economy"?	Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Somewhat Agree Agree
Submitter Comment No comment.	Officer Response
Question 4: In your opinion, do the strategies under Pillar 2 work to "Connect and partner"?	Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Somewhat Agree Agree
Submitter Comment No comment.	Officer Response
Question 5: In your opinion, do the strategies under Pillar 3 work to achieve "Experiential excellence"?	Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Somewhat Agree Agree
Submitter Comment No comment.	Officer Response

<p>Question 6: In your opinion, do the strategies under Pillar 4 allow for "Sustainable diversification"?</p>	<p>Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Somewhat Agree Agree</p>
<p>Submitter Comment No comment.</p>	<p>Officer Response</p>
<p>Question 7: In your opinion, do the strategies outlined under Pillar 5 address the "Boom with the boomers"?</p>	<p>Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Somewhat Agree Agree</p>
<p>Submitter Comment No comment.</p>	<p>Officer Response</p>
<p>Question 8: Are there any other comments or suggestions you would like to make in regards to the draft Economic Development Strategy?</p>	
<p>Submitter Comment It needs an extension or extra chapter, "implementation". It outlines the players that need to make this happen but need a good implementation plan as well. How do we do this? One project at a time will not get us there and 5 years is a short time. Great work so far.</p>	<p>Officer Response Feedback noted. Council will include all priority actions stemming from the Economic Development Strategy in Council's Annual Implementation Plan and Budget that will be the subject of community consultation in accordance with the requirements of the Local Government Act.</p>

Draft Economic Development Strategy

Response to Submissions received on the Draft Strategy in writing

Submission 1	Officer Comment
<p>The present Draft Strategy does not meet or address what we the submitter seek of a Draft Economic Development Strategy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • an explanation model of basic understanding to our present structure and linkages that are presently servicing our community. Especially the linkages, commercial, social and regulatory, by which our community presently interrelates. • Within the Strategy, we would expect the identification of present Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and timelines of where we currently stand today, a baseline. • The members of our community in these sectors, such as The Harbour, The Ferry Corporation, Bellarine Community Health, the Schools, Council and other major participants, etc., be invited to talk to community to about their future expectations, their aspirations, and allow us in the community to share their contribution and understand the interrelationship. • The BoQ (the ratepayers of the community) as a major employer, however more importantly a major participant in Tourist Accommodation economy, outline their business model. • We would expect the community to be consulted as to the future • Where and what are the community expectations 	<p>All feedback noted.</p> <p>BoQ Council has approved a 'Project Brief' that was the subject of a publicly advertised tender awarded to Deloitte. Many of the requests in this part of the submission are outside the scope of the tender.</p> <p>Section 2.4 of the draft EDS deals directly with an analysis of the Borough's strengths, weaknesses, etc.</p> <p>Suggestion regarding inviting key organisations to speak is noted. Council is aware that this is occasionally happening through The Rip Chamber, Borough After Five and through community organisations like the PLCA.</p> <p>Tourist accommodation business model was not in the scope of the tender.</p>
<p>The " Back to Basics " of a Strategy must outline specific actions underpinning future strategies by the Manager (BoQ) of the two primary commercial districts (Hesse Street, Pt Lonsdale Strip).The past & current lack of action and the no involvement/ intervention approach, are failing. This failure is both to the commercial sector but of equal importance, to the community as a whole. By all comparisons, shopping centre managers play an active role i.e. in Car Parking, defined uses, interactive business actions, up-to-date clear signage, landscaping, and more. In our present local approach over the summer, pressure of access to our centres is unplanned and acute; the whole commercial environment is accidental. There is no strategic plan at play</p>	<p>Feedback noted.</p> <p>Council completed a plan for the Point Lonsdale shopping village and foreshore area in 2002 with little or no action taken in the ensuing years. Council 'resurrected' this plan in 2009 and many of the priority actions related to the design and activation of the shopping village and foreshore have been implemented over the past 6 years.</p> <p>There have been several attempts to undertake a similar plan for Hesse Street with Council encountering conflicting views within the community about the best way forward.</p> <p>In 2017/18 Council has allocated funds to examine the matter of the Queenscliff commercial district.</p>
<p>The submitter seeks an explanation as to who is actually paying for the Economic Development Strategy, its implementation, oversight, and motivation and future gains. The present differential BoQ rate structure of Residential and Commercial rates raises funds where commercial applications of dedicated BoQ employees, the Information Centre, business group support, membership fees to Tourism and G21, all extract Council budget funds. These funds are servicing the current economic model and effort. The submitter would suggest</p>	<p>Feedback noted.</p> <p>The question of who is paying for the EDS implementation will differ depending on the strategy to be progressed and potential funds from external sources. Council will review the Strategy from year to year to determine priority</p>

<p>that in the future; Council evaluate the financial burden to the general ratepayer and redirect that burden so that the future application of any Economic Development Strategy would be costed through Council enacting a Special Rate "Economic Development "on any beneficiary. As with all suggestions, community consultation across all sectors is a must</p>	<p>actions within available budget parameters. Council does apply a differential rate to businesses (30%) and tourist accommodation (10%). And these funds are directed to economic development related activities.</p>
<p>P3. This starts the doubt as to the structure involved in the preparation and submission to council of this "Strategy" document. We consider that TEDAC may only comment on the content and provide a separate review of the Deloitte draft. The draft is the paper produced by Deloitte as referred to in their terms of reference this issue is further complicated by the P59."Limitation of our (Deloitte) work" statement, Quote: " You should not refer to or use our name or the advice for any other purpose" (sic...than an internal discussion draft).This implies that any change to this draft requires the final report to be named as the "EDS" excluding and not qualified by the "Deloitte" Brand, and cannot be quoted as such. It therefore becomes the TEDAC/BoQ EDS given that the as yet unpublished Executive Summary is to be prepared post TEDAC commentary. This is an important issue as BOQ will rely on this document as an authority to justify their implementing program in future years, and it must not attain the authority of a "Deloitte" document.</p>	<p>Feedback noted. Draft document is a Deloitte document and so must include Deloitte disclaimers and terms & conditions.</p> <p>Once the document has been approved and adopted by BoQ council, it will no longer be a Deloitte document and ownership of the document will be with BoQ council. All Deloitte logos, disclaimers and terms & conditions will be removed.</p>
<p>The previous submission to the working paper, as attached, sets out observations on the terms of reference for the Deloitte involvement, which appears to be confirmed in the current draft. The current terms of reference for TEDAC do not permit them to be involved with other than TOURISM issues.</p>	<p>Feedback noted. Council formally appointed TEDAC to provide strategic advice to Council on tourism and economic development related issues. In addition Council appointed TEDAC as the reference group for this project, noting that there were a range of opportunities for residents, community organisations, businesses, etc. to provide input and feedback to inform the production of the EDS.</p>
<p>The current study was to include a separate component relating to a Tourism Strategy however, this element has been included in general comment. The draft should identify this change to the brief and preferably provide the separation of Economic and Tourism issues and identify the interaction. There appears to be no definition of these terms in the draft provided</p>	<p>Feedback noted. Tourism strategy incorporated into economic development strategy as agreed by Project Steering Group. The draft economic development strategy sufficiently delivered on both tourism and economic strategy.</p>
<p>P4 Introduction "Deloitte has been guided by..... ". the submitter has previously objected to the use of TEDAC as a community reference group. TEDAC is a Council /CEO selected internal advisory committee, which has no community involvement.</p>	<p>Feedback noted. Council has appointed the members of TEDAC following a publicly advertised Expression of Interest process. Applicants needed to meet certain criteria including one or more of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a resident in the Borough of Queenscliffe, • ratepayer in the Borough of Queenscliffe, • business owner in the Borough of Queenscliffe, or • business operator in the Borough of Queenscliffe

<p>Phase OneEstablish the Project Reference Group. There has been no community involvement or input to this process.</p> <p>Phase Three....Council priority alignment with State and Fed Govt priorities. We note no further reference to this issue in the current draft document</p> <p>Phase Four.....prepare a draft and a final report with recommendations for implementation. As we are now at the draft stage there needs to be more clarity on the steps to a report that may be submitted for a council vote</p>	<p>Feedback noted.</p> <p>No specific reference required throughout the strategy. Rather recommendations and strategy priorities have been considered to ensure, where possible, they align with state and federal government priorities. This should maximise the likelihood of success with support, funding and implementation.</p> <p>Council has formally appointed TEDAC to provide strategic advice to Council on tourism and economic development related issues. In addition Council appointed TEDAC as the reference group for this project, noting that there were a range of opportunities for residents, community organisations, businesses, etc. to provide input and feedback to inform the production of the EDS). The next steps in the production of the EDS include presenting the final draft to Council for consideration at the 23rd November Ordinary meeting of Council and preparation of an Investment Prospectus.</p>
<p>The consultants overwhelmingly spoke of the 3225 community as the council see this as its 'community of interest ' This is a previously unstated position for the council who have previously disassociated their involvement to any issue outside the current borough boundary.</p> <p>This statement therefore needs definition as to the community of interest and the relationship to the borough and a possible alternative community included in the 3225 postcode. We have advocated council consideration of a ONE3225 approach to the long term stability of the area. To date BOQ have made no public indication of their consideration of the ONE3225 possibility and many think that they have put this option in the "too hard" basket.</p> <p>The ONE3225 option should form a key consideration in this study although not included in the brief as changes to all elements of the strategy are dependent on this issue. This includes population, resident and non-residential ratios, demographics, land availability, light industry possibilities, retail accessibility ... in fact the basis of economic change! The ONE3225 issue does not appear to be considered in this draft report. If the ONE3225 position was achieved the current draft, report would be irrelevant</p>	<p>Feedback noted.</p> <p>Council and the broader community have reinforced the need to fully consider the interests of those residents who live outside the Borough municipality in the 3225 postcode. This is reflected in Council's Community Engagement Policy. The question of the 3225 postcode and any future change to the municipal boundary is outside the scope of this tender. That said, Council is continuing to examine this matter.</p>
<p>Interestingly this starts by describing 3225, and apart from some changes in non BOQ figures the borough has a slight reduction in permanent residents and the growth is in COGG areas of 3225. There is a tremendous lift in population in the Point Lonsdale area and will place great stress on the amenity. The many flaws this one of working solely with LGA data. There appears to be a mix of data in this section of the report that makes</p>	<p>Feedback noted.</p> <p>The publication of demographic data for the Borough of Queenscliffe occasionally does present challenges. For the most part data is available for, and presented in the draft</p>

<p>objective evaluation difficult. This is demonstrated in the P8 Borough age profile 2016 Census that then shows 3225 data. The employment issue is also complicated by where people work and opportunity for work on a borough, 3225, and regional basis. This analysis does not appear to be covered in the draft document.</p>	<p>EDS in terms of the Queenscliffe municipality. Given the broader community of interest and the shifting trends in population, some data is presented for the 3225 postcode. At other times the limited size of the Borough require regional data to be presented and where possible applied with caveats.</p>
<p>It is reasonably well understood by anybody that lives permanently in the BOQ that activity is seasonal an effects community from retail through to trying to organise local activities. This is further exacerbated by the proportion of permanent residents that travel away from the area during the winter period. Alternatively the summer season late December to February each year is crowded and any additional tourist activity will require a major change to local conditions. There is also the possibility as in other locations (Lorne) that this would change the local environment ...it may never be the same again</p>	<p>Feedback noted on the fluctuating population.</p>
<p>The "narrative" of the area needs definition as the immediate village of Point Lonsdale is unlikely to change with more adjacent development. However the "development " of Queenscliff or a wider 3225 Queenscliff area could impact on what is considered by locals to be the charm of the area in which we live especially the "Heritage" nature of the Queenscliff township that is the major attraction for visitors and residents alike. The statement P10..Seasonal population poses a challenge for local business</p>	<p>Feedback noted</p>
<p>2.2.3 A Safe Community ...We consider that crime is not a major issue in this community</p>	<p>Support noted</p>
<p>2.3.1 The Borough Economy.....Yes, small, visitor driven, highly seasonal, local economy</p>	<p>Support noted</p>
<p>2.4 Strengths The high social capital is a strength not acknowledged by the BOQ in its dealings with community as strength. Weaknesses 1 Human resources ...acknowledge different skill sets in occupational employment 2 Local amenities.... Due to the size of the borough amenities must consider the adjacent areas 3 Material Standards.....this may be a matter of assessing retirees as compared to employees and how they rate use of income</p>	<p>Feedback noted. The Council Plan and Community Engagement Policy clearly reinforce the capacity and value of the local community in shaping the Borough and contributing in a range of productive ways across the economic, social, environmental and cultural spheres.</p>
<p>2.5 The Borough natural and built assets and attractions. This possibly requires the formulation of a statement (or narrative) of local resident and non-resident property owners, and visitor expectations and the values placed on local access (beach, walks, low traffic, seascapes, rock pools, views, weather, heritage, light houses and shipping, calmness and wellbeing). The entities listed are physical entities that interact with the activities that most visitors relate to when visiting this area.</p>	<p>Feedback noted</p>
<p>2.5.1 The Fort this unique place must remain a heritage icon. Any move to create a theme park activity will be strenuously challenged by local and national community activity. It appears that this EDS has adopted the council "there must be some money for us" attitude that pervades all current council projects. The alternative should be how to preserve Heritage locations in a way that opens the learning opportunity and retains the fabric of heritage places. We would refer to Canada as a</p>	<p>Feedback noted. The Fort Queenscliff Tourism Master Plan was endorsed by Council at its 24 June 2015 Ordinary Meeting of Council and endorsed the four principles that must underpin any future proposal. These principles are:</p>

<p>successful conservationist of heritage "places"</p> <p>The "Fort Queenscliff Tourism Master Plan 2014" was rejected as a realistic assessment of possible uses for this site. Any works that were funded by grant funding were external of the Fort walled area and have never been defined in detail or a detailed costing tabled.</p> <p>The suggestion for the use of the site for educational purposes is a realistic option as it provides opportunities for residential and visitor numbers in the off-season. No plan has been suggested for exploration of this option that is a fit for the seasonal population of this holiday area</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remembering and respecting our history • Opening up the Fort to the community • Preserving the Fort's significant assets • Building a vibrant and diverse local economy <p>The decision on the future of the Fort ultimately rests with the Department of Defence.</p>
2.5.2 Foreshore. Noted	Feedback noted
2.5.3 Bellarine Railway. Great story. More needed	Support noted.
2.5.4 Vantage Points and Viewscapes...needs master planning rather than individual project approach	Feedback noted.
2.5.6 Festivals. Normal council activity needs greater effort	Feedback noted.
2.5.7 Port Phillip. All enterprise noted should receive local government support this is the primary area of business growth with the option to impact on the local economy. We note other semi government groups support application for government grant funding in their regions, which would be of significant support to local	Feedback noted.
2.5.8 Queenscliff Harbour. This is not the port of the Searoad Ferry, which operates from its own facilities adjacent to the harbour. The harbour is a business that offers berths and maintenance as well as retail spaces for other independent retail business. These entities are listed as QHPL.	Feedback noted.
Contextual Elements: Challenges and Opportunity. We are in general agreement with the issues raised. 1,2	Support noted.
Contextual Elements: Challenges and Opportunity 3 - There is no comment on small vs seasonal vs retirement vs property values etc. that would allow assessment of possible comparisons	Feedback noted
Contextual Elements: Challenges and Opportunity 4 - The ONE 3225 vs BoQ and postcode 3225 issues not addressed. 5 - As above this is a part of a region that in most other situations would be one town and needs to be assessed as such 6, 7	Feedback noted. The question of the 3225 postcode and any future change to the municipal boundary is outside the scope of this tender. That said, Council is continuing to examine this matter.
Contextual Elements: Challenges and Opportunity 8. This is a major issue (fractured retail and hospitality landscape) not addressed when the QH was developed and still need attention however; no comment is made in this strategy document	Feedback noted. The draft Strategy acknowledges the challenge associated with having three retail localities.
9. A major issue for community and heritage asset utilisation the present proposal for seeking International tenders to "develop" the heritage site is unacceptable to a large portion of the community	Feedback noted. The Fort Queenscliff Tourism Master Plan was endorsed by Council at its 24 June 2015 Ordinary Meeting of Council and endorsed the four principles that must underpin any

	<p>future proposal. These principles are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remembering and respecting our history • Opening up the Fort to the community • Preserving the Fort’s significant assets • Building a vibrant and diverse local economy <p>The decision on the future of the Fort ultimately rests with the Department of Defence.</p>
10. Grand Hotel experience needs fostering and should attract council support.	<p>Feedback noted.</p> <p>Council’s role in relation to future investment in and management of Queenscliff’s grand hotels is limited to its statutory planning function. This role rests with the private sector.</p>
<p>5.1 Increase visitor yield Queenscliff foreshore master plan Visitor narrative Capture ferry visitation Increase visitor spend Mid week offerings. Conference facility. Possibly big hotel option</p>	<p>Range of feedback noted.</p>
<p>5.2 Connect and Partner (e) Facilitate opportunity for private partnership on Crown Land. This opens a range of options that are not explored in this draft and need to be a clear statement that identifies a more definitive approach to crown land utilisation. (f)Engagement with Deakin on the facility (previously known as Marine discovery centre. Possibly promote Deakin entry into Queenscliff in other activities. (the Fort)</p>	<p>Feedback noted.</p> <p>Any changes to Crown land management arrangements would be subject to community consultation via the Council’s annual Implementation Plan or specific consultation activities.</p>
<p>5.3 (a) Unlock the Fort. This strategy has become focussed with the future development of the fort and in the present form provides the council with a mandate for the international tendering of the fort over which they have no authority at this time. The alternative is that there is behind the scenes negotiation on this issue that needs to be addressed in the public arena.</p>	<p>Feedback noted.</p> <p>The Fort Queenscliff Tourism Master Plan was endorsed by Council at its 24 June 2015 Ordinary Meeting of Council and endorsed the four principles that must underpin any future proposal. These principles are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remembering and respecting our history • Opening up the Fort to the community • Preserving the Fort’s significant assets • Building a vibrant and diverse local economy <p>The decision on the future of the Fort ultimately rests with the Department of Defence.</p>

<p>5.4. Sustainable diversity (b) Another issue that sets the hackles. Which land? This strategy will empower the BoQ to "follow the recommendation" and possibly it was part of the person to person discussion of acceptable outcomes! We can only think of Murray Road, Golightly Park, and Queenscliff beach area (suggested previously as a site for unit development) etc.but where? If council had a strategy for ONE3225 this suggestion would be significant however we cannot locate any comment on ONE3225 in this draft. This issue needs clarification. (d) As previous comment (e) Similarly. Both of these issues need greater description and strategic consideration. The current text leaves the question open to interpretation in a way that will worry many.</p>	<p>Feedback noted. Council yet to determine any specific land sales.</p>
<p>5.5. Another reference to "broader" 3225 without a definition as to BoQ, a postal region with BoQ as a social centre, or a BoQ ONE3225. The strategy needs to address this "up front" otherwise the EDS is a waste of time, effort and money. The listed strategies are dependent on this</p>	<p>The question of the 3225 postcode and any future change to the municipal boundary is outside the scope of this tender. That said, Council is continuing to examine this matter.</p>
<p>6. Success. Again based on Tourism, and Fort development as the first item, reinforcing a BoQ council preferred position. Expressed differently they may be the future</p>	<p>Feedback noted.</p>
<p>7. Enabling the Strategy, needs definitive explanation of the terms Facilitator and Enabler.</p>	<p>Feedback noted. Definition of facilitator provided in 7.1.3 and definition of enabler provided in 7.1.4 of Strategy</p>
<p>7.3 possibly the more worrying statement of a strategy document as the role of TEDAC must be removed as they are not an ongoing part of local government and cannot be the formal advisors to a Borough Council for the term of application of this strategy .This issue must be addressed</p>	<p>Feedback noted. Council formally appointed TEDAC to provide strategic advice to Council on tourism and economic development related issues. In addition Council appointed TEDAC as the reference group for this project, noting that there were a range of opportunities for residents, community organisations, businesses, etc. to provide input and feedback to inform the production of the EDS.</p>
<p>Appendix A - We would expect some more appropriate comparison such as Port Fairy and similar, or alternatively some "what if's". Even a MONA experience</p>	<p>Feedback noted.</p>
<p>Appendix B. C1. Pages 46 and 47 as read, 48 do not really know what it relates to but could be analysis of a survey, we do note the final line on the P48 schedule pertaining to Uncertainty in BoQ Future and this again addresses the Borough boundary issue of ONE3225 C2. We note that there were several different versions of the discussion paper feedback questions and P50 may reflect a summary of issues. From review of C1&2 it would appear that community feed back does not play a significant part in the establishment of an EDS and in general it follows council's preconceived model,</p>	<p>Feedback noted. The question of the 3225 postcode and any future change to the municipal boundary is outside the scope of this tender. That said, Council is continuing to examine this matter. Consultations undertaken are detailed in Appendix H.</p>

<p>"The Vision," as noted in the Fort commercialisation tender brief. No reference is made to written submissions, and no review of such with interested parties has occurred</p>	
<p>Appendix H no public meetings noted as initial council policy was for business involvement only We do note the TEDAC draft review and request for comment and relevant dates as noted in the RIP column</p>	<p>Feedback noted. The wider community including businesses and individuals who had an interest in the drafting of the strategy were encouraged to get in touch with Council and register for project updates via email. A dedicated project page was added to the Council website calling on the community to get involved. Consultations undertaken detailed in Appendix H.</p>

Submission 2	Officer Comment
<p>No Executive Summary – An Executive Summary needs to be completed by the authors i.e. Deloitte’s and not vetted or amended by TEDAC. A major concern is that the Deloitte’s report is being given to a non-representative council advisory body- TEDAC. In terms of process why have a draft strategy circulated and then a separate discussion/conversation with TEDAC over contents of the executive summary who then have the option of altering the report. Without an Executive Summary we are limited to addressing all the issues and to determine for ourselves where Deloitte's emphasis lies.</p>	<p>Feedback noted. The Executive Summary (as the title implies is a summary of the EDS) will be included prior to formal consideration by Council. Council formally appointed TEDAC to provide strategic advice to Council on tourism and economic development related issues. In addition Council appointed TEDAC as the reference group for this project, noting that there were a range of opportunities for residents, community organisations, businesses, etc. to provide input and feedback to inform the production of the EDS. (A small section of the QCA comment has been removed) Executive summary to be completed after initial feedback as agreed. Executive summary will be a summary of the Strategy itself.</p>
<p>There is little in this “Queenscliff centric” strategy that quantifies the actual benefits to an aging resident and ratepayer population or many businesses in the major retail centres. Many of the recommended Strategies, which include numerous references to “activations” “experiential” “diversifications” and “destinations”, focus mainly on initiatives outside the central activity areas e.g. Queenscliff foreshore, ferry and rail operations, The Fort, crown and Council lands, caravan parks, rezoning of residential land and the Primary Industries operation in The Narrows.</p>	<p>Feedback noted. These conclusions do not reflect the content of the draft EDS.</p>
<p>The Strategy appears to focus mainly on one aspect of the local economy (tourism and visitation) rather than other key components that are readily evident and more dominant. We ask why a tiny Borough with less than 3,000 residents, with an aging population, actually needs an Economic Development Strategy. This point has been already canvassed once before. It appears the focus of the report changed from diversifying the economy to a concentration on ramping up the Visitor and tourist economy. The strategy has moved a long way from the initial discussion paper that spoke of diversification of the economy to one of expanding the visitor experience</p>	<p>Feedback noted. The production of an Economic Development Strategy has been identified and endorsed as a priority by the previous (2013-2017) and current Councils. This has been actively promoted through the current and previous Council Plans and through many annual Implementation Plans and Budgets over recent years following community consultation. It has taken Council several years to secure funding from the State Government to progress this work. The draft EDS includes a range of strategies spanning various industry sectors.</p>
<p>The employment data contained on page 13 also shows that 36% of those employed in the BOQ actually live here whilst only 55% of business owners live in the BOQ. One could question why we are spending so much time and resources on this segment? It is worth noting we have a higher residency occupation than Lorne</p>	<p>Feedback noted. Under the Local Government Act, all Councils are required to promote the social, economic and environmental</p>

	<p>viability and sustainability of the municipality and to promote appropriate business and employment opportunities.</p> <p>Section 2.3.3 employment overview provides a summary of why this data is important and its relation to the BoQ economy.</p>
<p>The advice from TEDAC as a group and then as separate individual members of TEDAC is given too greater weight in the report. To suggest TEDAC be the formal channel to execute the recommendations/strategies in our view compromises the independence of the report. The limited number of businesses that responded and provided input also limits the value of the overall findings.</p>	<p>Feedback noted.</p> <p>Council formally appointed TEDAC to provide strategic advice to Council on tourism and economic development related issues. In addition Council appointed TEDAC as the reference group for this project, noting that there were a range of opportunities for residents, community organisations, businesses, etc. to provide input and feedback to inform the production of the EDS.</p>
<p>The Strategy seems to reflect many of the projects previously mentioned or endorsed by the Council/Rip Chamber/TEDAC. For example, Foreshore (clearing of coastal vegetation), Destination Queenscliff, eco cabins, developing crown land and redevelopment of the Fort. Some of these ideas have little community support.</p>	<p>Feedback noted.</p> <p>It is appropriate for the draft EDS to include some of the priorities currently incorporated into the Council Plan and 2017/18 Implementation Plan and Budget.</p>
<p>There is no mention of Climate Change issues (changing weather patterns and rising sea levels) and the significant impact this might have on the Borough given we are surrounded on 3 sides by waterways. This may affect economic viability and competitive advantage/disadvantage.</p>	<p>Feedback noted.</p> <p>The EDS has a 10 year horizon and climate change was not identified as an issue in this timeframe.</p> <p>That said, Council is preparing an adaptation plan in relation to climate change and sea level rise as reflected in the Council Plan 2017-21.</p>
<p>There is no analysis of the interrelationship of the planning scheme and the MSS on key strategies or Council's rating strategy as a potential influence of business activity.</p>	<p>Feedback noted. The draft EDS identifies a set of strategies framed around five key pillars. Implementation of any strategies by Council will be in accordance with existing planning scheme and the MSS.</p>
<p>The Borough's Vision is not reflected in many of the strategies and proposals put forward in the Deloitte Strategy.</p>	<p>Feedback noted.</p>
<p>There is limited discussion of capital works and plans already in the pipeline including the rebuild of Fisherman's Wharf (\$2 million), Ferry terminal upgrade (\$17 million), Destination Queenscliff/Eco Cabins/Recreation Reserve (over \$10 million), sale and sub-division of Murray Road land (\$5+million), new Surf Life Saving Club (estimated at \$4 million), Point Lonsdale Lighthouse Reserve redevelopment (\$1.2 million), heritage listings for both lighthouse reserves, new rail/train initiatives, plans for heritage hotel</p>	<p>Feedback noted.</p> <p>The project brief requests an EDS with a 10 year horizon. The draft EDS identifies a set of strategies framed around five key pillars. A number of the elements identified in this feedback do form part of the draft EDS.</p>

<p>upgrades (Queenscliff, Brew House and Vue Grand hotels). Also properties continue to be sold at high process and the level of construction in the Borough is high.</p>	
<p>There doesn't appear to be any in-depth analyses of the problems, issues or even opportunities that businesses in the Borough are experiencing at present, such as the impact of 'Airbnb' properties and Council's planned eco-cabins on accommodation providers, the fractured retail precincts, the high retail rentals in Queenscliff, the loss of quality shops and dining experiences, the rise of second hand shops and struggling hotels and eateries.</p>	<p>Feedback noted. The project brief requests an EDS with a 10 year horizon. The draft EDS identifies a set of strategies framed around five key pillars. A number of the elements included in this feedback do form part of the draft EDS.</p>
<p>There is no discussion of the recent phenomenon where owner/developers obtain Council and VCAT planning permits for large developments and then on-sell once they have approvals rather than invest in the local economy. This has been witnessed quite a few times over the past decade e.g. Vue Grand, former nursing home (Anchorage site) and Lathamstowe.</p>	<p>Feedback noted. The dynamics of State and Local Planning Policy and to property sales and investment decisions are outside the scope of the tender for the production of the EDS.</p>
<p>There is no analysis of economic detriment and impacts of potential Conflicts of Interest of council or community managed facilities on private businesses. Council is participant AND a Competitor. As a participant it can be an unfair competitor. The same may be true of sporting clubs competing in the same market as private business. This issue and Conflicts of interest have not been assessed as potential weaknesses in the tourism offering and ones affecting economic viability. No market analyses have been provided in the report and yet are crucial information data and prelude to Strategy deliberations.</p>	<p>Feedback noted. Many Councils are appointed by the State Government as the Committee of Management for Crown land that may include responsibility for the operation of caravan parks. The draft EDS identifies the four roles that Councils often play in economic development. The role of council and conflict of roles have addressed as part of 7.1 future role and contribution of Council.</p>
<p>Other concerns include proposed re-zonings, vague foreshore infrastructure proposals and unspecified plans for the Fort, the recommendations to offer crown and Council owned land parcels for 'development'. This is not elaborated upon.</p>	<p>Feedback noted. Council will include all priority actions stemming from the Economic Development Strategy in Council's Annual Implementation Plan and Budget that will be the subject of community consultation in accordance with the requirements of the Local Government Act. Any land rezoning would require Council to undertake community consultation activities consistent with the requirements of the Local Government Act.</p>
<p>There is little analysis on a key strength -that we are a niche market providing a diverse heritage seaside location with a unique blend of offerings that sets this area apart from others. This is a major strength to exploit. Inappropriate development and large- scale infrastructure impositions can be detrimental to the scale and charm of Queenscliffe. 'Done properly' is a subjective phrase mentioned often in the report but who determines that very question? We would suggest it is the community rather than council who have expertise in his matter.</p>	<p>Feedback noted. Section 2.4 of the draft EDS deals directly with an analysis of the Borough's strengths and weaknesses. As indicated, Council will include all priority actions stemming from the Economic Development Strategy in Council's Annual Implementation Plan and Budget that will be the subject of community consultation in accordance</p>

	with the requirements of the Local Government Act.
Concern also that Council will resolve to adopt many of these vague or non specific recommendations and possibly the entire Strategy regardless of public comments (as witnessed with the recent Draft Council Plan, Implementation Plan and Budget public feedback process that ignored community feedback). Recent experience shows such documents are further developed by Council or private operators into detailed projects, backed by government grants, that do not reflect community wishes (recent examples are Destination Queenscliff and tourist housing on Shortland Bluff, stingray feeding stadium in the Harbour and the spa and accommodation proposal for Point Lonsdale Lighthouse Reserve). To action any proposals there needs to be a real conversation with the community on any strategy proposed. The vagueness of strategies in the Study without necessary detail is an area of concern.	Feedback noted. As indicated, Council will include all priority actions stemming from the Economic Development Strategy in Council's Annual Implementation Plan and Budget that will be the subject of community consultation in accordance with the requirements of the Local Government Act. All projects identified in the submitters feedback were the subject of extensive community consultation that was considered by Council in resolving the relevant direction and priorities.
We believe the prescriptive brief has limited the potential of the study and the over emphasis on tourism limits a full understanding of the economic health of the Borough. It is worth noting we have low unemployment. It is quite apparent a number of businesses have been in operation for a number of years. Others come and go quite quickly. In our opinion, as a methodological issue an examination of diverse case studies would have yielded some important conclusions. A number of businesses have been resilient to a range of economic conditions. We could suggest either by innovative entrepreneurial ship, marketing, family business links, monopoly or oligopoly power, government grant funding, council support, financing or strong capital flows and/or a range of other factors may have contributed to longevity and resilience	Feedback noted. The draft EDS has fully considered an extensive range of demographic, economic, social and environmental data sets from various sources.
We have concern over the Brief that requests the Study provide 'An Investment Prospectus that profiles the most significant private sector investment opportunities (up to eight in total), consistent with the Borough's key economic strengths and competitive advantages, that are most likely to deliver local economic, investment and employment outcomes in the next decade.' Many of the cited opportunities have limited community support. Again without a detailed strategy any success of gaining community support will be questionable.	Feedback noted. As indicated, Council will include all priority actions stemming from the Economic Development Strategy in Council's Annual Implementation Plan and Budget that will be the subject of community consultation in accordance with the requirements of the Local Government Act.
Part of the Brief was to deliver 'drivers of visitation'. There has been little data collated in the report to provide any trend analysis or what visitation the key drivers provide. No tourism data is provided for the Music Festival, the Blues Train, the Hot Rod weekend, Melbourne Cup weekend, Good Friday Appeal etc. Surely if the Study has morphed into an analysis of the visitor economy this data would be an essential component of any strategy.	Feedback noted. The draft EDS has fully considered an extensive range of demographic, economic, social and environmental data sets from various sources. Accurate data at such a granular level is not collected or available; therefore an analysis is not possible.
Some 'driver's have been identified however the Study has not given sufficient weight or fails to mention to the following strengths or drivers that add to the excellent visitor experience the Borough offers - <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The health and well being potential - our location and ambience as a respite centre and a place to relax and escape city pressure. It's quality as an oasis and 'step back in time' heritage health offering. Its 'safe' 	Feedback noted. The project brief requests an EDS with a 10 year horizon. The draft EDS identifies a set of strategies framed around five key pillars. Section 3 of the draft EDS deals directly with an analysis of the Borough's challenges and

<p>and welcoming potential appears not to have been promoted.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • World heritage value and National Heritage Values (no reference to steps being taken) and its potential or any assessment of potential to attract visitors (e.g. international and national visitation). • The arts and culture market. • The grand hotel experience and heritage precincts (many examples of great restorations being undertaken). • The maritime experience (fishing, ship viewing, boating, lighthouse visits, fresh fish sales, historic Fishermans Flat and the harbour) • Museums' experience - Queenscliff is a museums town (historic society museum, maritime museum, Fort's military museum) • Excellent safe beaches at Queenscliff (Ocean View, Maytone, Rec Reserve/campers beach, Santa Casa, YMCA and Lonsdale Bay) and extensive parklands for passive recreation (Citizens, Princess and lower Princess Parks). • Regular markets in Queenscliff and Point Lonsdale. The study ignores the day trip market. • No analysis of Hesse Street retail (we agree it has been fragmented but no strategies are given ensure that this remains the dominant retail sector) No analysis of traffic flows or parking opportunities. No strategies are put forward of how Council is to manage 4 commercial/retail precincts and potential need to specialize. • There is an overweight discussion of diversification as per the project brief given by Council when a micro economy may need to specialize and promote specific strengths or natural advantage rather than a watered down the mix that becomes a 'Pizza with the lot.' • We agree about the notion of Sustainability and accept its use i.e. maintain a certain consistency or level successfully, consistent level of production, distribution, trade, consumption as this implies a minimum growth or stable or controlled growth pattern and potentially a smarter or more efficient use of resources. • We note there has been little analysis of whether Council tourism resources make a value add or measurable economic return to the tourism market. There is no analysis of the costs of staffing and net economic benefit from any examination the council Budget. With expenditures in the realm of \$13 million p.a. there is no discussion of this expenditure on the local economy. An analysis from an independent source of the VIC visitor numbers would have been beneficial. The question arises with growing online servicing and marketing whether Council services have maintained or enhanced online and social media presence. Council VIC data collected for a least a decade would have provided insights on the tourism market and accommodation mix. We ask was this collated and examined? • No analysis of traffic flows or Vic Roads traffic data. Again this data would have provided quite useful independent data on transport patterns and vehicle numbers in the Borough. It may have provided insights on access to and from e.g. Harbour/ferry and retail area. 	<p>opportunities.</p> <p>A number of the drivers identified in this feedback do form part of the draft EDS.</p>
--	---

<p>Does the report analyse the 'accommodation offer' as per the brief? The report does not offer any perspective or analysis of any need to expand the cabin market e.g. We would contend that council driven priorities distort the gaining of independent advice.</p>	
<p>Important for Council and the report to delete any references to eco-cabins on Shortland Bluff given they are now proposed going elsewhere in the Borough.</p>	<p>Feedback noted. Draft EDS makes no reference to eco-cabins on Shortland's Bluff.</p>
<p>There is concern and a real lack of information about proposals in particular those around the opening up access to Queenscliff Foreshore including references to "additional complementary infrastructure and recreational potential" in the commentary and Strategies. Such proposals may undermine the special and unique environmental strengths of the Borough.</p>	<p>Feedback noted. Council will include all priority actions stemming from the Economic Development Strategy in Council's Annual Implementation Plan and Budget that will be the subject of community consultation in accordance with the requirements of the Local Government Act. Council's 2017/18 Implementation Plan includes funds for a Foreshore Plan to improve the amenity and use of the Borough's foreshore.</p>
<p>No annual data or analysis of the biggest ferry service in Australia and the largest feeder of visitors into the township/borough being company supplied ferry numbers (850,000 people and 200,000 cars being transported between Sorrento and Queenscliff according to Searoad ferries). Absolutely no figures on how many visitors actually stop in Queenscliff are presented. This is critical information needed by Council for any surgical and comprehensive examination of the local economy. Again as a 'driver' this would be critical information and crucial tourism data for Council.</p>	<p>Feedback noted. The draft EDS has fully considered an extensive range of demographic, economic, social and environmental data sets from various sources as well as data provided from regional and local organisations and business, including Searoad Ferries.</p>
<p>There appears underlying contentions or philosophies that the tourism market will grow and everyone benefits. It is our contention in a micro economy the pie is either just further divided creating viability issues or that increases in the market size benefits monopoly power. There is little micro-economic analysis provided on the potential winners and losers. There is little analysis of competition and economies of scale. While better collaboration is offered as a strategy often the nature of small business revolves around competitive advantage. The recent sale of the supermarket underlines the economy of scale issues. As a micro-economy it is subject to the macro- economy influences and very much subject to near neighbouring economies</p>	<p>Feedback noted. The draft EDS places emphasis and priority on increasing the visitor spend (or yield) generated from the current visitor economy.</p>
<p>No strategy is offered how this ferry market /users could be captured to spend time in Queenscliffe. We contend there is little incentive if customers are wined and dined at the 2 booking centres when loading on/off and also on-board. Proposals to expand the infrastructure could potentially lead to further capturing of this market to the detriment of other businesses that rely on passing trade. Will Council consider economic detriment in the planning process? The report ignores the monopoly power of the business and its impacts on the other food providers. There is no analysis of an expanded café / restaurant at the ferry.</p>	<p>Feedback noted. The draft EDS includes a strategy to attract people travelling on the ferry service to stay longer in the Borough, therefore increasing local economic activity (or yield) generated from the current visitor economy.</p>

<p>A key piece of information the Caravan Park study as yet unreleased remains a critical part of any analysis of the 'visitor economy'. How can this 'driver' not be included in the Study? A strategy on p28 points to "Increase spend from visitors holiday parks" - it mentions private parks but none of the council owned facilities. It is as though there had been no discussion on these parks. It is troublesome that Council has invested very little in caravan parks over the past 30 years, conducted at least 4 caravan park studies in past 20 years, had the previous study torpedoed and then in glossy ratepayer documents tells ratepayers how important this income is to the viability of the Borough. No concrete evidence or surgical examination of the caravan parks has been provided in the report. It could be said that Council did not explain the nature of Crown Land revenues effectively. No documented analysis has been provided on revenues and expenses for individual caravan parks.</p>	<p>Feedback noted. Council is currently undertaking a Master Plan and Business Plan for Council managed Caravan Parks. Given the proportion of people staying in caravan parks in and near the Borough, the draft EDS places emphasis and priority on increasing the visitor spend (or yield) generated from this part of the current visitor economy.</p>
<p>There appears little reference to the 2007 economic study conducted by council and the achievement (if any) of strategies relating to that study. No desktop analysis of that previous report has been provided.</p>	<p>Feedback noted.</p>
<p>We do a lot of things right. To embark on re-inventing the wheel is a recipe for disaster. We contend minor adjustments rather than a full- scale overhaul is required. Our market is one that sees Queenscliffe as a unique seaside village as Deloitte's have pointed out. To invent projects such as Destination Queenscliff and Unlocking The Fort run the risk of failing to target what people come to Queenscliff and Point Lonsdale for.</p>	<p>Feedback noted. The Council endorsed 'Destination Queenscliff' project has secured Federal and State funding to enable improvements to the sporting facilities at the Queenscliff Recreation Reserve, Victoria Park, the ocean view car park and kiosk, as well as improved tourism accommodation. The Fort Queenscliff Tourism Master Plan was endorsed by Council at its 24 June 2015 Ordinary Meeting of Council and included four principles that must underpin any future proposal. These principles are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remembering and respecting our history • Opening up the Fort to the community • Preserving the Fort's significant assets • Building a vibrant and diverse local economy <p>The decision on the future of the Fort ultimately rests with the Department of Defence.</p>
<p>The report does not include data on property values, rate impositions ((certainly a commercial cost and viability issue), lease data, commercial occupancy rates, accommodation occupancy rates, turnover periods for leases. Much of this data could have been obtained from the 3 or 4 real estate agents and council itself. In effect there is little data represented about the commercial or retail sector of any use. A useful strategy for council would be to implement a feedback sheet for exiting businesses. The lack of survey returns from the business sector indicates either apathy, perhaps too busy or a range of other reasons.</p>	<p>Feedback noted. The draft EDS has fully considered an extensive range of demographic, economic, social and environmental data sets from various sources. Many of the requests in this part of the submission are outside the scope of the tender. Survey response was voluntary so cannot be controlled by Deloitte. Additionally, a number of real estate agents were</p>

	approached but did not return Deloitte’s approach.
The 3225 issue and population increase appears to have been neglected. The impact on amenity and using council services and community assets has minimal reference.	Feedback noted. The question of the 3225 postcode and any future change to the municipal boundary is outside the scope of this tender. That said, Council is continuing to examine this matter.
There has been little recognition of the volunteer contribution to the local economy. We believe this would be a significant ‘driver’ in our community. The museums and op shops e.g. are prime examples of how important ‘free labour’ is in the local economy. No economic data has been provided on the size of this workforce or the economic contribution made. Given the recognition of volunteering it should have formed a key strategy in the report. Many tourism offerings depend on volunteers. The role of community groups can also not be disregarded as important contributors and providers of expert knowledge. This cultural knowledge source has not been referenced or valued in the report but we would contend is an important economic contributor. We acknowledge the report is to be equally owned by the community.	Feedback noted. The draft EDS has fully considered an extensive range of demographic, economic, social and environmental data sets from various sources.
We believe a variety of information and data sources exist apart from the census and ABN numbers. We acknowledge that Deloitte had a tough task to examine a mini/micro economy that hardly warranted such a study. However, we have identified a series of pertinent and relevant economic data and material that could have strengthened the report and provided a more comprehensive set of findings.	Feedback noted. The publication of demographic data for the Borough of Queenscliffe occasionally does present challenges. For the most part data is available for, and presented in the draft EDS in terms of the Queenscliffe municipality. Given the broader community of interest and the shifting trends in population, some data is presented for the 3225 postcode. At other times the limited size of the Borough require regional data to be presented and where possible applied with caveats.
Section 5 Strategy The submitter notes paragraph 1 <i>“the strategy needs to be equally owned, driven and monitored by business, community and Council, not the later alone.”</i> Five interlinked pillars – Note each pillar constitutes a series of initiatives that will help the Borough to develop a more vibrant, sustainable and/or year-round local economy. With reference to- <i>“The implementation plan for each of these pillars and the strategy as a whole will be developed subsequent to Council’s consultation and adoption of the strategy, along with business attraction package.”</i> This is a concern as residents need to understand exactly what is being proposed for the Implementation Plan phase i.e. more detail is needed before accepting the strategies – it’s a case of the devil is in the detail. This remains a fundamental process issue with council Plans and implementation of strategy. It is an unresolved process issue.	Feedback noted. Council will include all priority actions stemming from the Economic Development Strategy in Council’s Annual Implementation Plan and Budget that will be the subject of community consultation in accordance with the requirements of the Local Government Act.
5.1 Pillar 1: Increase sustainable yield in the visitor economy	Feedback noted including points of agreement.

Agree with a focus on a higher yield rather than simply more volume through increasing the opportunities of overall visitor experiences expenditure. Also Paragraph 4 we agree that there is limited annual data or analysis of the largest feeder of visitors into the township/borough being ferry numbers (850,000 people and 200,000 cars being transported between Sorrento and Queenscliff). As mentioned in our reply there remains no figures on how many actually stop in Queenscliff. This is critical information for a surgical examination of the local economic strategy. Parks Victoria did provide some information re an 11 minute stay and \$1 spend. If this is the case the supposed economic flow on benefits from the Ferry service are limited.

There has been no assessment of capacity limits for roadways etc. and access and exit points.

It is presented that no reliable data can be produced for such a small economy. This means every Economic analysis presented on Visitor numbers can be seriously questioned. There is no validation on how many tourists come to/or stay in Queenscliff. The tourism business data on p11 where COGG data is combined with BOQ presents issues. No doubt this is due to a lack of data in BOQ or the numbers are so insignificant they detract from the argument for infrastructure.

We note e.g. the Harbour, Ferry, Fort proposals, Destination Queenscliff expected visitor numbers are then seriously in doubt. There appears NO reliable data source that can be presented to back up economic analysis re visitor numbers and visitor expenditure.

We note the comment to us by a TEDAC member that this likened to a 'Black box or voodoo or quasi- science' how such compilations and projections are created. Verification becomes a vexed issue and should not be used to action development plans based on imprecise projections.

Tourism visitation Figures as presented in economic studies for the Point Lonsdale Structure Plan and The Harbour were presented in our submissions. These appear not to have raised comment in the report. We contend that since council vigorously entered the tourism space with additional resources it has detracted from tourism visitation. We also contend that some major infrastructure has been detrimental to tourism visitation.

These would be contentious issues for Council to face but without negating evidence this, on face value appears to be the reality.

The Deloitte suggestion that perhaps Council needs to be a facilitator rather than a participant perhaps indicates its concern in this area. It could be suggested that Council facilitating tourism or 'picking winners' in the tourism space has failed to meet real targets and value add

The draft EDS has fully considered an extensive range of demographic, economic, social and environmental data sets from various sources.

The publication of demographic data for the Borough of Queenscliff occasionally does present challenges. For the most part data is available for, and presented in the draft EDS in terms of the Queenscliff municipality. Given the broader community of interest and the shifting trends in population, some data is presented for the 3225 postcode. At other times the limited size of the Borough require regional data to be presented and where possible applied with caveats.

(a) Activate and Master Plan the Queenscliff Foreshore

Whilst the removal of the unwanted coastal vegetation is welcome much of the foreshore is already fully accessible by the public. One of the problems with the strategy of opening up the Queenscliff front beach/foreshore is that it is really only attractive to visitors during good weather (no one wants to be there during cold weather in winter and spring). Also Queenscliff's front beach shoreline is very dynamic since the ferry terminal was built (this acts like a large groyne which has led to sand build up and the shallowing out of the water back to the Pilot Pier and Shortland Bluff) and it has virtually non-stop seaweed washing ashore.

Feedback noted.

Over several years Council has received a significant level of community support for increasing the amenity and use of the Queenscliff Front Beach foreshore.

<p>Queenscliff’s back beaches are far more attractive to locals and visitors because they are safe, clean and virtually weed free – indeed they are some of the best beaches on the Bellarine Peninsula. We question the value of timber paths on the foreshore.</p> <p>The community would want to see the master planning details of the proposed sea baths and or “<i>other experiential enabling infrastructure</i>”</p>	
<p>Develop an all –encompassing visitor narrative.</p> <p>Community would be keen to see the all-encompassing narrative for the Borough that Tourism Greater Geelong and Bellarine arrives at. The submitter has concerns given previous planning experience with the Geelong based tourism group and their views on heritage. There is concern that Council funding of G&B T also creates a conflict of interest. We contend a series of support letters from GBT are not community- supported projects</p>	<p>Feedback noted.</p> <p>The draft EDS highlights the opportunity to utilise resources from the regional tourism authority to progress this strategy. It is difficult to understand the contention that Council has a conflict of interest with the regional tourism authority.</p>
<p>Capture more business from ferry visitations</p> <p>See comments above about determining how many people/cars actually stop in Queenscliff. The submitter has identified this potential (e.g. 10% of additional passengers stopping in town would be a value add to the local economy. As mentioned there is an existing disincentive or a pre- met need that has been satisfied with food/ coffee etc. We would argue that the bulk of passing trade would be interested in food/drink impulse needs rather than specific ‘Destination Queenscliff’ requirements.</p> <p>Advertising of events, places to see and stay on –board would be a useful local community and economic service.</p>	<p>Feedback noted.</p> <p>The draft EDS identifies a priority to realise the potential to increase the length of visitation (and yield) from this component of the existing visitor economy.</p>
<p>Increase spend from visitors holiday parks</p> <p>Traditionally caravanning and camping is not a high-end market and unlikely to encourage high yield spending in the Borough. Without access to the Caravan Park study this detracts from any useful analysis. The submitter has previously enquired but been refused to have individual caravan park revenues provided. However the loss of 60-80 regular park users at the Rec Reserve and 50% drop in Golightly Park would have impacts on hotels, supermarkets, cafes etc. None of this has been quantified. We would argue this has significant effect on council revenues and foregone revenues. We contend the loss of such sites if not filled with casual users would be in the order of \$500,000. The loss of this expenditure around town has not been quantified. It should be noted that leakages from the local economy occur when itinerant traders are allowed to supply milk, bread and vegetables to the parks</p>	<p>Feedback noted.</p> <p>Council is currently undertaking a Master Plan and Business Plan for Council managed Caravan Parks. Given the proportion of people staying in caravan parks in and near the Borough, the draft EDS places emphasis and priority on increasing the visitor spend (or yield) generated from this part of the current visitor economy.</p>
<p>Increase the mid-week offering from businesses.</p> <p>Agree with Strategy</p> <p>We would note that logistical problems of owners need for a ‘weekend’ and associated costs impacts on offerings. Opportunities for better co- ordination of a closed business calendar may be beneficial. We would suggest lights on at night in winter would assist promoting the township and provide an ‘open for business vibe’</p>	<p>Feedback and support noted.</p>

<p>Pillar 2: Connect and partner Agree that connecting and partnering by local businesses can be productive and leveraging off neighbouring economies and using the Ferry and Bellarine Railway as connecting infrastructure is worthwhile pillar and potential value add. The limitation with the railway is that it only goes to Drysdale and isn't Victorian gauge. Indeed going forward one of the limitations of the Bellarine is that it has no connecting railway, although the reservation still exists to South Geelong. We would suggest this is an area Council could lobby G21 for. Interestingly there is no mention in the Strategy of the plan to extend the Geelong Ring Road to Bellarine Highway (and eventually Portarlington Road). No analysis of the Portarlington Ferry service for the Borough has been addressed.</p> <p>Partnering and leveraging off neighbouring economies to enhance the year round visitor offerings sounds worthwhile. The synergies of the Mornington Peninsula region and Portarlington ferry service are areas to investigate. Closer relationships of VIC both sides of the Bay would be beneficial.</p> <p>Agree some benefits cycling/wineries as per the Riesling trail in Clare for eg. Clare Valley offers real potential. We would ask to investigate better promotion of this potential.</p>	<p>Feedback and support noted, particularly for the strategy related to the future of the Bellarine Historic Railway.</p>
<p>Facilitate opportunities for government or private partnerships on Crown land This is rather vague and the community would need to understand exactly what is being proposed here given that Crown Land in Queenscliffe is traditionally used to benefit all Victorians and should not be privatised to benefit a few. For a community that has displayed a willingness to fight for non-commercialization and privatization of Crown Land this should be a strategy to avoid. Crown land is viewed as high value by the community.</p>	<p>Feedback noted. Any changes to Crown land management arrangements would be subject to community consultation via the Council's annual Implementation Plan or specific consultation activities.</p>
<p>Pillar 3: Achieve "experiential excellence" Visitor economy is looking for authentic cultural, historic, natural and culinary experiences and the submitter agrees that the Borough has a valuable set of existing events, assets (built and natural) and infrastructure that form the foundation of the type of experiences that domestic and international visitors are increasingly demanding. This has been recognized by GBT and our current accommodation mix appears to satisfy demand. The submitter believes World Heritage Value and National Heritage Values and its potential to attract visitors should be promoted as part of the authentic experience for visitors. The Borough has a very rich heritage (maritime and military history) and environmental (marine parks and RAMSAR listed sites) story to tell. The value of this potential has not been addressed in the Report.</p>	<p>Feedback and support noted.</p>
<p>Determine the future of Fort Queenscliff (unlock the Fort) It is difficult to understand the strategy of opening up the Fort given its current use a working Commonwealth facility (army archive centre). Unless Council (and Deloitte) has information local citizens do not have about the Commonwealth intentions to discontinue its presence at the Fort.</p> <p>Also no detail is provided about of what is currently being proposed in terms of "well considered investment". The submitter believes the Fort is integral to the future of Queenscliffe and would resist attempts to turn it into a "retail Disneyland" and 'beer hall'. Ideally, if the Fort was vacated it should be turned into an</p>	<p>Feedback noted. The Fort Queenscliff Tourism Master Plan was endorsed by Council at its 24 June 2015 Ordinary Meeting of Council and endorsed the four principles that must underpin any future proposal. These principles are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remembering and respecting our history • Opening up the Fort to the community

<p>educational facility to once again make education an industry in Queenscliffe (complement the existing kindergarten and 3 primary schools). It's worth noting the last community consultation process undertaken by Council consultants was very unsatisfactory – they took virtually no notice of what the local community indicated during the “consultation” process. The follow up ‘Blue Skies’ process with a limited number of participants ignored widespread community concerns.</p> <p>One huge draw back is the potential and real costs of maintenance and repair. The Fort is not a commercially viable project. In present state would not meet health and safety and public risk criteria. The potential of the Museum is underrated. Government could have better used ‘Destination Queenscliff’ grant to enable better and more reliable opening times and structural improvements to tourist offering. Shutting Fort doors at various times of the year affects tourism potential.</p> <p>Concern also the same Deloitte consultancy has now been given a very large fee (\$230,000) to undertake a follow up Fort Business Case study.</p> <p>Concern that this Brief, unlike the Economic Development Study was not publically presented to Council and that the CEO awarded contract under delegation. The serious question of how a tender four times the amount the initial tender for the Economic Study is not addressed and presented at a public council meeting.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preserving the Fort’s significant assets • Building a vibrant and diverse local economy <p>The Fort Master Plan endorsed by Council included a recommendation requesting officers to seek State or Federal Government funding to prepare a Business Plan to provide a pathway for achieving the vision and core principles, noting that the decision on the future of the Fort ultimately rests with the Department of Defence. Council was able to secure this funding and following a publicly advertised tender, appointed Deloitte to prepare this Business Plan.</p>
<p>Allow visitors to experience the viewscape and the history</p> <p>Building an “experiential” pathway across the Borough from the Ferry, between the lighthouses and linking to Swan Bay and the Bellarine Trail needs more detail so that residents can understand what this really looks like</p>	<p>Feedback noted.</p> <p>Council will include all priority actions stemming from the Economic Development Strategy in Council’s Annual Implementation Plan and Budget that will be the subject of community consultation in accordance with the requirements of the Local Government Act.</p>
<p>Pillar 4: Sustainable diversification</p> <p>Attract appropriate investment through zoning of Council land</p> <p>The submitter is concerned with the strategy that states, <i>“Re-zoning targeted parcels of vacant Council land (if required), and/or seeking expressions of interest on vacant land could lead to new investment opportunities. This land is currently zoned for residential use – rezoning parts of it for “mixed use”, would provide for a range for a range of residential, commercial, industrial and other uses. Done properly, this strategy would:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Complement the mixed-use function of the locality;</i> • <i>Provide for housing at higher densities; and</i> • <i>Encourage development that responds to the existing or preferred neighbourhood character of the area”</i> <p>There is no indication what parcel(s) are being targeted here, presumably Council’s Murray Road site or perhaps one of Council’s other freehold sites including Golightly Caravan Park, YMCA site or Ganes Reserve. This proposed re-zoning has real danger signs associated with it, particularly rezoning from “residential” to “mixed use” that can alter the amenity for surrounding residential neighbourhoods and lead to un wanted commercial uses being created. Note the residential precincts of Queenscliff are the highest order residential</p>	<p>Feedback noted.</p> <p>Council will include all priority actions stemming from the Economic Development Strategy in Council’s Annual Implementation Plan and Budget that will be the subject of community consultation in accordance with the requirements of the Local Government Act.</p> <p>In addition, any rezoning of Council land would require Council to undertake community consultation consistent with the requirements of the Local Government Act.</p>

<p>use under the Neighbourhood Zone – it would be very unfair to suddenly reclassify as these areas as Mixed Use. We would argue there is a need to increase PCRZones as a contrary policy.</p> <p>Note also there has never been a housing needs study completed for Queenscliffe that demonstrates the need for higher density housing - indeed in the 1990's when a Council commissioned consultant advocated the construction of medium density housing on the former High school site it received a negative community response and the proposal was quickly dropped. The recent BCH Board proposal to construct a large 2 storey block of private aged care facilities (independent living units) deemed “property development” on their crown land site along Point Lonsdale Road met with very stiff local opposition – this plan was also recently dropped. The new focus is now, where it should be, on refurbishing the Eric Tolliday units for low-income occupants.</p>	
<p>Explore opportunities to add-value to the local agribusiness industries.</p> <p>The submitter suggest this could be extended to other value-add ventures such as a return to the weddings industry (weddings/receptions) that was such a feature of Queenscliff some years ago. It utilized the churches and old heritage hotels (other locations such as 360 Degrees and parklands/beaches in Queenscliff) and was a perfect fit for the township. Conferences were also a feature of value add offering in the township</p>	Feedback noted.
<p>Pillar 5: Boom with the Boomers</p> <p>Attract investment in aged care facilities and/or independent living units</p> <p>See caution above re the BCH Board’s recent independent living unit proposal</p>	Feedback noted.
<p>Success looks like</p> <p>“A must visit destination for international visitors who spend in the Borough” – while this is a very worthwhile objective we need to be careful what we wish for – The last thing genteel Queenscliff would want is to be another Apollo Bay with endless stream of quick stop tourist buses on the coastal loop. Analysis of the Great Ocean Road tourist expenditure already reveals little yield and mass tourism that detracts from tourist and environmental offering. Mass tourism and little yield is counter- productive to the ambience and charm of Queenscliffe. A cost –benefit analysis should be provided</p>	<p>Feedback noted.</p> <p>Feedback noted.</p> <p>The draft EDS places emphasis and priority on increasing the visitor spend (or yield) generated from the current visitor economy.</p>
<p>Enabling the Strategy</p> <p>Actions for the Council to Consider, item 5 (and 6) - reference to specialist management of the caravan park asset over a long term (20 year period). Not in favour of this given 2 of Council's 4 caravan operations are actually in located in Public Parks with seasonal caravanning and camping permitted (supposed to be December to April) including our Botanic Park (Victoria Park) located in Queenscliff's Botanic Gardens Precinct. Privatising the operation would almost certainly mean these public parks, including Royal Park near Bunny Wood in Point Lonsdale, would become permanent trailer parks with year round camping. Also likely to be closed off to the public with boom gates etc. - visually these would look awful on the approaches to historic Queenscliff and Point Lonsdale and we would lose these coastal parklands.</p>	<p>Feedback noted.</p> <p>Council is currently undertaking a Master Plan and Business Plan for Council managed Caravan Parks. This will be the subject of a community consultation process consistent with Council’s Community Engagement Policy.</p>
<p>Finally there is much to commend having reliable data and independent analysis in order to shape policy and strategies. Our concerns relate to issues that this Study is too closely aligned with a non- representative Council advisory body and on a pre- determined policy outcome that supports a contentious and value laden</p>	<p>Feedback noted.</p> <p>Council formally appointed TEDAC to provide strategic advice to Council on tourism and economic development</p>

economic driver. Council's apparent non- acceptance of the two community Associations suggestions with the Council and Implementation Plan do not provide confidence that such feedback will inform final reports

related issues. In addition Council appointed TEDAC as the reference group for this project, noting that there were a range of opportunities for residents, community organisations, businesses, etc. to provide input and feedback to inform the production of the EDS.

Council appointed the members of TEDAC following a publicly advertised Expression of Interest process.

Applicants needed to meet certain criteria including one or more of the following:

- resident in the Borough of Queenscliffe,
- ratepayer in the Borough of Queenscliffe,
- business owner in the Borough of Queenscliffe, or
- business operator in the Borough of Queenscliffe.

Further, as a community input to Council, TEDAC is transparent to the community in terms of membership, meetings and activity.

Submission 3	Officer Comment
<p>A major deficiency is that the thinking is focussed on the 3225 postal district and not on the Borough. Much of the 3225 district is beyond the control of the Borough and while the ramifications of the nexus between the Borough and the postal district are of great significance, the strategy is or should be first and foremost concerned with the area under the control of the Borough with an additional separate consideration being given to the peripheral influences and threats such as the effects of polices and actions taken by the City greater Geelong. The threat of being absorbed into the COGG or a newly created Bellarine Shire is real, and this would remove a major employer from the Borough, that the Borough administration and of course its consultants.</p>	<p>Feedback noted. Council and the broader community however have reinforced the need to consider the interests of those residents who live outside the Borough municipality in the 3225 postcode. This is reflected in Council’s Community Engagement Policy. The residents of the 3225 community also make a contribution to the economy of the Borough so must be considered in that regard. The question of the 3225 postcode and any future change to the municipal boundary is outside the scope of this tender. That said, Council is continuing to examine this matter</p>
<p>A second major deficiency is the importance given in the planning to the assumption that the Army will relinquish the Fort. There is very little evidence that the Army is going to leave the Fort at any time in the medium-term future.</p>	<p>Feedback noted. The Borough of Queenscliffe Fort Queenscliff Tourism Master Plan was endorsed by Council at its 24 June 2015 Ordinary Meeting of Council and endorsed the vision and four principles that must underpin any future proposal. The decision on the future of the Fort ultimately rests with the Department of Defence.</p>
<p>A weakness in the analysis is the failure to adequately analyse population trends and projections. The paper talks about “the present and emerging age groups” but fails to offer any forecasts of the future population. There seems to be an underlying assumption that the present ‘aged’ population will be replaced by a younger cohort with substantially different expectations, but there is no analysis of the present and future patterns of ownership. There are implied assumptions in the discussion of future strategies. Casual observation suggests that the current buyers are people looking to have the Borough as a holiday resort pending retirement some years in the future, much as had been happening for a good many years, but no indicative analysis is offered in the paper. Nowhere is it shown that the members of the Probus or Golf or Bowls or Elderly Citizens Clubs were consulted. The study might have given more emphasis to this. If the opportunity for work in the Borough continues to decline then this pre-retirement activity is likely to continue to be the practice.</p>	<p>Feedback noted. The wider community including businesses and individuals who had an interest in the drafting of the strategy were encouraged to get in touch with Council and register for project updates via email.</p>
<p>A significant change could be brought about by the increasing opportunities to work from home made possible by the growth in the service industries and computerisation. This is barely considered and would call for excellent..... (end of sentence).</p>	<p>Comments noted, noting too that Pillar 4 ‘Sustainable diversification’ includes a strategy about the becoming a knowledge economy, to position the Borough as a place for telecommuting (working from home).</p>
<p>Another major gap in the analysis is the total failure to consider the fishing industry. What of the growing fish and shell fish farming and the possibilities of added value processing? What are the future opportunities and</p>	<p>Pillar 4 in the draft strategy includes a strategy to ‘explore opportunities to add value to the local agribusiness</p>

threats to the Fishery research establishment?	industries' and identifies 'fishing and aquaculture' enterprises as an opportunity for further exploration.
Yet another gap in the analysis is the inadequate weight given to 'Natural and built aspects and Street scapes'. What needs to be done to maintain the competitive advantage our heritage buildings and foreshore give the Borough in attracting tourists? A masterplan is overdue.	Feedback noted. Council has included a review of the heritage provisions in the Queenscliffe Planning Scheme as part of its 2017/18 Implementation Plan.
What is meant by reclaiming our foreshore? Does it mean, as seems implied, opening it up for private exploitation?	Council's 2017/18 Implementation Plan and Budget includes the production of a Foreshore Plan and beach Cleaning at the Queenscliff Front Beach in key holiday periods
There is no reference to the Visitor Information Centre, either as a desirable activity or as a source of input to the forecasting of accommodation and other needs.	Feedback noted. Visitor information centre mentioned under 7.1.4
Why is there no mention of the Queenscliffe Historical Museum and its activities and the other two museums are mentioned?	Feedback noted. Fort Queenscliff and Maritime Museum were the case studies chosen.
Having said these few things, I welcome the fact that the never-the-less many of the recommendations under the various strategies recognise some of these issues.	Feedback and support noted.

Submission 4	Officer Comment
<p>From my perspective there are some good aspects, which are very thought provoking, and some worrying aspects to the study. Perhaps the most worrying aspect is there is little detail around many of the recommended strategies, so in effect we don't know what the likely outcomes will be for those of us who enjoy living here. It seems to me that many of the development schemes put forward to enhance the tourist offering have been floated before by Council and others just re-presented in a different format. In particular schemes around using vacant public and crown land and the Commonwealth owned Fort spring to mind. I am not sure how the need for an Economic Development Strategy actually came about – I don't recall the community requesting this.</p> <p>My biggest fear is that if the community accept the draft strategy Council will trot it out when they want to justify some as yet undefined project further down the track. In other words if we don't say something now it's assumed that we are fine with the consultant's proposals (strategies) as presented. The statement below regarding future implementation plans suggests to me there is more to come that the community needs to see and be part of.</p> <p><i>"The implementation plan for each of these pillars and the strategy as a whole will be developed subsequent to Council's consultation and adoption of the strategy, along with business attraction package."</i></p> <p>Note. The last economic study I can recall in the Borough was the Essential Economics Study completed for the Harbour redevelopment – it would be interesting to revisit that and compare what was being projected to what has actually happened.</p>	<p>Comments on good aspects and 'worrying' aspects noted. Economic Development Strategy has been identified and endorsed as a Strategy by the previous and current Councils. This has been actively promoted through the current and previous Council Plans and through many annual Implementation Plans and Budgets. It has taken several years to secure funding from the State Government.</p> <p>Council will include all priority actions stemming from the Economic Development Strategy in Council's Annual Implementation Plan and Budget that will be the subject of community consultation in accordance with the requirements of the Local Government Act.</p>
<p>5.1 Pillar 1: Increase sustainable yield in the visitor economy – Page 27</p> <p>Agree with a focus on a higher yield rather than simply more volume through increasing the heritage, cultural and environmental offerings that will improve the overall visitor experiences expenditure.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>
<p>(a) Activate and Master Plan the Queenscliff Foreshore</p> <p>Somehow I doubt whether clearing the foreshore at Queenscliff and building unspecified infrastructure would greatly enhance the tourist offering. Perhaps a new hot sea baths facility, if it blended in might be considered, but the community would want to be part of the master planning details of the proposed sea baths. God only knows what the <i>other experiential enabling infrastructure</i> refers to.</p>	<p>Council's 2017/18 Implementation Plan and Budget includes the production of a Foreshore Plan and beach Cleaning at the Queenscliff Front Beach in key holiday periods</p>
<p>(b) Develop an all –encompassing visitor narrative.</p> <p>Not sure what the all-encompassing narrative for the Borough will look like but I think the local community needs to be involved in any story that Tourism Greater Geelong and Bellarine arrives at.</p>	<p>Feedback noted. Local community would be invited to be part of this process.</p>
<p>(c) Capture more business from ferry visitations</p> <p>Seems this would be a worthwhile pursuit for local businesses given many cars/people simply use Queenscliff as a transshipment point rather than a destination, which was always the fear, especially when the ferry went to hourly services.</p>	<p>Support noted</p>
<p>(d) Increase spend from visitors holiday parks</p> <p>Would not like to see our public parks, particularly our botanic garden precinct, used for more camping and</p>	<p>Feedback noted. This strategy focusses around increasing spend from visitors at current public and private</p>

caravanning, which seems to me not to be the value add spend Queenscliffe should be trying to target.	holiday/caravan parks.
(e) Increase the mid-week offering from businesses. Agree with this thought – seems to me we want to try and get our heritage hotels, museums, galleries, heritage walks, eateries all up and working to enhance the mid week visitor experience. Different mid week packages with plenty of advertising, similar to what happens on the Mornington Peninsula, might be worth investigating. Like the idea of using what assets (heritage and environmental) we have.	Support noted
5.2 Pillar 2: Connect and partner – Page 28 Agree that connecting and partnering by local businesses can be productive and leveraging off neighbouring economies to round out the visitor offering also sounds good. Also using the Ferry and Bellarine Railway as connecting infrastructure is worthwhile.	Support noted
(e) Facilitate opportunities for government or private partnerships on Crown land Not sure what all this is really about but would be against using valuable crown land for private ventures.	Feedback noted
5.3 Pillar 3: Achieve “experiential excellence” – Page 29 Would like to see much more detail around building an “experiential” pathway across the Borough from the Ferry, between the lighthouses and linking to Swan Bay and the Bellarine Trail so that I can understand what this proposal would look like before making any commitment. Tragically the Swan Bay natural and cultural experience has been greatly lessened by the loss of all our black swans over the past 2 years. Hundreds of swans that traditionally congregated along the Queenscliff shoreline, including early morning clusters behind the kindergarten where they had access to fresh water, have disappeared. We need to find out what’s happened to this very important wildlife feature. World Heritage Values and National Heritage Values incorporating the marine national parks and RAMSAR waterways has great potential which should be promoted as part of the authentic experience for visitors. A fairly recent trip to the Isle of Mull in western Scotland highlighted to me the many benefits of a natural experience.	The concept of an ‘experiential pathway’ from the Ferry to the Lighthouses will require such actions as improvements to walking/cycling paths and interpretive signage, etc. Destination Queenscliff stage 2 includes an allocation for interpretative signage and story telling that can be activated by mobile phones.
(a) Determine the future of Fort Queenscliff (unlock the Fort) Page 30. I have always believed that Queenscliff Fort is a key heritage asset that is so important to the town. It needs to some sort of education or knowledge based facility going forward.	Feedback noted
(c) Allow visitors to experience the viewscape and the history Agree with this	Support noted
5.4 Pillar 4: Sustainable diversification Pages 30 & 31 (b) Attract appropriate investment through zoning of Council land Generally don’t support this. Would need much more information about what Council lands would be rezoned and for what reason. Also, with a reducing population, I don’t think we need higher density living.	Feedback noted. Any rezoning would require Council to undertake consultation consistent with the requirements of the Local Government Act.
(c) Explore opportunities to add-value to the local agribusiness industries. This sounds okay but suggest we need to broaden this to include other value-add opportunities.	Support and comments noted
5.5 Pillar 5: Boom with the Boomers Pages 31 and 32	Feedback noted

<p>Many recently retired “boomers” live in the coastal villages of Queenscliff and Point Lonsdale because we like the ambience and don’t really want it diminished.</p>	
<p>(e) Attract investment in aged care facilities and/or independent living units Would need to reverse the current trend where some 3 public aged care facilities closed because they were deemed unviable. Also see the recent “Age” series about the “nightmare stories” of large aged care providers.</p>	<p>Feedback noted</p>
<p>6. Success looks like - Page 33 <i>“A must visit destination for international visitors who spend in the Borough”</i> To achieve this we need to keep the ambience and charm of Queenscliff and Point Lonsdale.</p>	<p>Feedback noted</p>
<p>7. Enabling the Strategy - Page 34 Page 35 Actions for the Council to Consider, item 5 (and 6)- I am not in favour of any long or short term privatisation of any of Council’s park operations especially Victoria Park. I believe we should keep our historic parklands for all Victorians and also consider rezoning them from PPRZ to PCRZ to highlight their conservation significance.</p>	<p>Feedback noted regarding opposition to privatisation of any Council parks.</p>

Submission 5	Officer Comment
<p>I share concerns about notional strategies that are to be vetted by council's Tourism & Economic Development Advisory Committee. Independence of the study and authorship is paramount. I note that it is a document to be equally shared with the community</p>	<p>Feedback noted. Council formally appointed TEDAC to provide strategic advice to Council on tourism and economic development related issues. In addition Council appointed TEDAC as the reference group for this project, noting that there were a range of opportunities for residents, community organisations, businesses, etc. to provide input and feedback to inform the production of the EDS.</p>
<p>The lack of specifics and detail creates a degree of community concern. Having been through an earlier process with an Economic Study around 2007 some lessons do need to be reinforced about consistent and ongoing engagement with the community in order to ensure success.</p>	<p>Council will include all priority actions stemming from the Economic Development Strategy in Council's Annual Implementation Plan and Budget that will be the subject of community consultation in accordance with the requirements of the Local Government Act.</p>
<p>My belief is that good policy requires good data, market analysis and full understandings of the intricacies of the local economy. It has been pointed out in the above submissions of some failings to deliver the required data to fully understand the local economy.</p>	<p>The draft EDS has fully considered an extensive range of demographic, economic, social and environmental data sets from various sources. The publication of demographic data for the Borough of Queenscliffe occasionally does present challenges. For the most part data is available for, and presented in the draft EDS in terms of the Queenscliffe municipality. Given the broader community of interest and the shifting trends in population, some data is presented for the 3225 postcode. At other times the limited size of the Borough require regional data to be presented and where possible applied with caveats.</p>
<p>Like many local economies 'shared values' is a common theme. Heritage and environmental values appear to be the 'shared values' of the community and underpin the Deloitte Report. In my opinion extracting value from these assets are strategies that are not detrimental to these core strengths. As a community member with a tourism business any negation of these twin pillars would be counter productive. In essence a minimal change, non or cautious development model is more appropriate. Utilization and maintenance of existing assets should underpin future directions. This is a strength of National Heritage listing and indeed our planning policy.</p>	<p>Feedback noted. Draft EDS principles reinforce these values.</p>
<p>Studies can be value laden. This has been evident in the Brief. I share concern that Council as client can impact on future strategies. I too share concern with the non publicity surrounding the Fort Business Plan. The council process with this tendering is of concern.</p>	<p>Feedback noted. The Fort Queenscliff Tourism Master Plan was endorsed by Council at its 24 June 2015 Ordinary Meeting of Council</p>

	<p>and endorsed the four principles that must underpin any future proposal. These principles are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remembering and respecting our history • Opening up the Fort to the community • Preserving the Fort’s significant assets • Building a vibrant and diverse local economy <p>The Fort Master Plan endorsed by Council included a recommendation requesting officers to seek State or Federal Government funding to prepare a Business Plan to provide a pathway for achieving the vision and the four core principles, noting that the decision on the future of the Fort ultimately rests with the Department of Defence. Council was able to secure this funding and following a publicly advertised tender, appointed Deloitte to prepare this Business Plan.</p>
<p>There is much to build on with the Economic Development Study. If it becomes simply a rubber stamp for TEDAC projects that would be a major concern. The majority of ratepayers and indeed visitors who enjoy the amenity of this unique Borough need to have these interests protected. Crown Land is an asset for all to enjoy.</p>	<p>Feedback noted. Council will include all priority actions stemming from the Economic Development Strategy in Council’s Annual Implementation Plan and Budget that will be the subject of community consultation in accordance with the requirements of the Local Government Act. Any rezoning of Crown land would require Council to undertake consultation consistent with the requirements of the Local Government Act.</p>
<p>Council needs to seriously consider matters such as Conflicts of Interest, sectional economic interests and economic detriment via full cost /benefit analyses</p>	<p>Feedback noted. Council is fully aware of its legislative responsibilities and obligations.</p>

Submission 6	Officer Comment
Pg 29, Section 5.2 (f) – we note that the cross reference to Section 5.4 (b) is incorrect and should read 5.4 (e).	Noted and amended.
The opportunity for collaboration between Deakin and the Borough could extend well beyond the teaching and research scope conducted or proposed at the Queenscliff marine research facility, notwithstanding that this facility could provide a useful starting point	Deakin proposal to be incorporated into Pillar 4 Strategy e.
<p>Some examples of collaborative opportunities that relate specifically to the marine research facility include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Working in partnership with the Marine and Freshwater Discovery Centre (MDC) [mentioned on page 19] to enrich the experience for visitors to the Centre. We are already in talks with the MDC about this. • Increasing the resident population of Deakin staff and students who are based at the Marine station and attracting national and international research visitors, which will provide economic benefit to the Borough. • Community engagement and outreach in the broad field of marine science, and possibly with special focus on Port Phillip Bay. This would be separate to the Discovery Centre that is currently focused at sub-teenage children. • Undertaking research in marine science that is focused on local community issues/problems with the marine estate 	Deakin proposal to be incorporated into Pillar 4 Strategy e.
One possible model for interaction includes our operating approach with the Surf Coast Shire, which includes an MOU and a joint Steering Committee to drive mutually beneficial collaborations	Deakin proposal to be incorporated into Pillar 4 Strategy e.
Deakin has a recent track record of working with the City of Greater Geelong to drive economic development initiatives through the ‘Geelong Economic Futures’ project, which was aimed at driving significant (i.e. <\$100m) investment opportunities into the region. This approach is applicable to other regions.	Deakin proposal to be incorporated into Pillar 4 Strategy e.
<p>Deakin has broad and deep technical knowledge of relevance to the Borough, which span all Pillars identified in the Draft report. The following provides a limited snapshot of some of these areas, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information technology, data analytics, Internet of Things, sensor networks, artificial intelligence. • Marine science, environmental science, aquaculture and the blue economy. • Energy management, renewable energy, integration of energy options, microgrids. • Urban planning, design, social sciences, population studies. • Health and community health outcomes. • Tourism and modern approaches to tourism management, including virtual and augmented reality. • Arts, culture and humanities 	Deakin proposal to be incorporated into Pillar 4 Strategy e.
Deakin also notes the significant opportunities for our student population to become engaged with industry and the community through activities such as internships, work integrated learning, industry supported PhD programs and citizen science initiatives	Deakin proposal to be incorporated into Pillar 4 Strategy e.

