

**DRAFT  
KANANOOK CREEK CORRIDOR MANAGEMENT PLAN-DRAFT ISSUES AND ACTIONS  
PAPER-FEBRUARY 2008**

**KCA COMMITTEE ADVICE TO DRAFT PLAN FEBRUARY 2008**

KCA has been asked to provide its advice on the draft document provided to the KCLC on 12<sup>th</sup> February 2008. The KCA committee has considered this Draft Plan and has authorised the advice provided. This was a difficult task given the size and structure of the Draft Plan and the commitment of volunteers to other conflicting urgent priorities at this time. Importantly due to illness of our Reserves Coordinator Allan Sisson our advice, at this time, does not have his valuable input. We have read the whole document but ran out of time in collating the many points on the detailed sections –this will follow.

**Motion** The KCLC formally records that the KCA Committee has tabled this advice and recommends its consideration.

**KCA METHOD AND APPROACH TO THE REVIEW OF UPDATE TO MANAGEMENT PLAN**

The management plan **update** should deliver the following:

Confirm shared **vision** for the creek corridor

Confirm **purpose** and objective of the plan

**Perform a situation analysis**

-Identify key issues and “lessons learned” arising out of implementation of the existing plan- what worked /did not work and why?

-identify key internal and external obstacles and opportunities to implementation (SWOT)

Confirm that key **management strategies and objectives** deal with the identified issues and opportunities and objectives are complete, consistent and adequate to achieve the shared vision

Confirm that **detailed management actions supporting these objectives:**

- Will adequately deliver all objectives
- Are consistent with objectives and vision
- Are specific and clear
- Are realistic and measurable
- Are costed with clear timeframes

Ensure program **management processes** and oversight will faithfully ensure implementation of the plan

**ASSUMPTIONS**

- **Project Stage.** the KCLC on 15<sup>th</sup> February KCA received the Kananook Creek Corridor management Plan Draft issues and actions paper dated February 2008-we are not sure if this document is the output from Phase 2 Issues Identification Phase or Phase 3 Draft Management Plan as referred to in 1.4 Project Methodology on page 9? We assume we are at Phase 3 Draft Management Plan phase prior to release for community consultation.
- **Role of the KCLC in the update of the Plan has been confirmed.** We are waiting to confirm the minutes of the last meeting.(Refer attachment 1 for Charter approved by KCLC 17 /5/05)

**RECOMMENDATIONS ON EASE OF USE**

At 90 pages plus attachments the document is not designed for ease of use by the general community.

Further, the 2008 update has been fundamentally re-structured from the existing 1992 Plan so it is hard for community users to map the changes.

For effective community consultation process we recommend production of an **Information Bulletin** (similar to what is done for the Marina) that highlights the **key points** and **key changes**.

To assist all users, the 2008 Plan should have an **executive summary**.

This **Executive summary would refer to the issues and lessons learned from implementation of the 1992 plan**, how they have been dealt with, what's changed from the 1992 Plan and the justification.

Need to look at the **structure of the Management plan**. Who is the plan aimed at? Currently this is not community user friendly. In addition to no executive summary of key management proposals, issues and actions applicable to all reaches first appear **on page 35** of the report. Project brief, detailed background history etc could be attachments.

## KCLC REVIEW OF THE UPDATE APPROACH ITSELF

The KCLC should review the efficiency and effectiveness of the update program it commissioned. This update was specifically **commissioned by the KCLC in 2004** with an original completion date of **October 2004**—the introduction does not reflect this. It should be noted that KCA's advice on the brief of 16/11/05 (refer attachment 2) was not accepted. Also the **approach was changed** from a trilateral approach in 2004 to a bilateral approach in 2005. What lessons have we learned, what costs, benefits and improvements are recommended? Rather than a 15 year lifetime, there needs to be some mechanism for **dynamic and annual updating** of the management plan actions and annual review of budgets

## SUMMARY OF KCA RESPONSE

### Positives

- **At last** the KCLC have a draft updated management plan. The process of socialising this with the community has begun.
- The Plan is a **comprehensive reference** on the creek corridor, particularly river health.
- **Strategic context**-this plan has identified many of the key strategies which have been prepared.
- **Breakthrough change**. State Government has commenced the **Kananook Creek Boulevard Project**. Council has approved the design contract and completion is expected in four years
- **Flushing pumps** Melbourne Water has continued, although qualified, its commitment to the pumps at Patterson Lakes,
- **Removal of silt** There has been commencement of removal of silt at the northern drains-4 drains was cleared.
- **Retaining walls**. The replacement of the dilapidated retaining walls in the CBD is recommended-The western side of the creek will revert to natural profile below Wells St
- The benefits of positive surveillance of the reserves through boundary fences is identified

## CRITICAL RECOMMENDATIONS

- **Action timeframes for critical restoration priorities need to be aligned to the completion of Kananook Boulevard Project** The community, organised through the KCA, has worked for Kananook Creek Restoration since 1970. There is buzz within the community that the 38 year long battle is nearing completion. A sense of urgency surrounds Frankston's urban renewal priority at Kananook Creek. The breakthrough has been the State Government funding of the Kananook Creek Boulevard Project over the **next four years**. The Boulevard Project is intended as a catalyst for further urban renewal activity. The Boulevard project supports a commitment to **restore life in the creek (similar to Mordialloc Creek)**. This would involve a commitment to navigability and to maintain small boat moorings. Completion of the Boulevard in 2012 will be a major celebration for the city and confidence that we can measure up as the Regional Capital. This sense of excitement is absent from the Draft. The highest priority in the draft is one to five years-surely we need to complete critical restoration priorities in the next four years in time for the celebration.
- The Restoration of Kananook Creek provides a unique opportunity to build a stronger community. **Both the KCLC role in coordination, and KCA'S role in building community consensus is important**. The plan does not identify the comprehensive contribution of volunteers to the Reserves nor the systems and processes built up since the 1988 fire by the KCA Reserves Group under Allan Sisson. Absent also is the annual planning process for the reserves and the quarterly coordination meetings. After the fire in the reserves north of Station St, the walking tracks were cut and reserves restored by KCA. There needs to be adequate description and recognition of work done by community volunteers since the 1992 Plan and the 2008 Plan should articulate a clear role for **KCA community volunteer work** in future. This program needs to be fully consistent with the major themes of the collective **vision for Frankston community 2025**. In the **1992 Plan** key management proposal #8 was "the vital role of the public

and community groups in maintaining and improving the Creek should be recognised". What's changed?

- There is **no provision for a liaison and advisory process** going forward .The Plan should acknowledge KCLC's role in the commissioning and ownership of the plan The Plan should also acknowledge KCLC'S working group .which is reviewing **the KCLC Charter**. The **1992 Plan** key management proposal #9 was" the Kananook Creek Advisory Committee should be given the task of monitoring the progress of the Kananook Creek Management Plan, to be implemented jointly by Melbourne Water and the City of Frankston".
- We don't support any change of status of Nature Reserves (Public conservation and Resource -PCRZ) to open Space (Public Park and recreation -zone PPRZ) and changing the Nature Trail to Kananook Creek Trail The 1992 Plan recommended that, from Station Street to Eel Race Road, "Public Open Space reserves on east bank to be developed as a **nature reserve** by FCC and Melbourne Water)"and "KCA and FCC to construct **nature trail** and observation hides, from Armstrong's Road to Eel Race Road".
- **Status as a Recreational waterway** .This is one of the community critical objectives to change the status of the Creek and manage the creek as a recreational waterway rather than as an arterial drain.
- **Navigability** of the creek for small power boats as a beneficial use along its length from the mouth to Eel Race should be a **critical management priority** .Dredging and removing silt deposits and removing fallen trees and other navigation hazards. North of the launching ramp at the mouth are essential. **Landowner Support**. Draft Objectives (1.3) page 8 .The landowner community will be alienated if boating navigability is not restored. To encourage landowners better communication and cooperation is required
- **We have created a very effective silt collection system-what are we doing about removal of the massive silt deposits at drain outlets in the PAC?** No silt removal has been done here since Melbourne water took charge in 1991.Each year the problem gets worse. The timetable for removing silt deposits at drain outlets in the most visible parts of the creek is now 16 years overdue. Where is the plan solution? We need measurable actions, costings, funding, clear responsibility and authority.
- **Why is the Bicycle track back in Kananook Creek Reserve?** This is a highly contentious issue and council has not resolved this. How is this insensitive and arbitrary inclusion in the Draft Plan consistent with the major themes of the collective vision for Frankston community 2025? The Bicycle strategy (Oct1997) is being reviewed and a new strategy is being prepared. Refer Council minutes of 4 August 2003 which originally considered this strategy (Attachment 3).The conclusion in 2003 was about community preference, minimal environment impact and to create an **improved landscape** along the railway line. Allan Sisson's contribution was critical, he produced an EES response. **The Community Consultation data** (page 29) does not provide support **for a bike path**. The plan refers to the Community Survey sent to 3560 people within a radius of .5km of the Corridor and the Reponses from 282 and statistically dismisses this on grounds of age(without survey area age data to support) and response rate. Surely this is an arbitrary and discriminatory act. The Reference Group Community stakeholders meeting is then summarised (page31).Both the survey and stakeholder meeting are later incorrectly used as a basis supporting a bike path
- **Aesthetics** .There needs to be a critical objective in the Plan to improve the aesthetics of the creek in the **1992 Plan** key management proposal #7 was "the aesthetic quality of the Creek be enhanced by regular clearing of litter, removal of dilapidated boat houses and jetties, and enforcement of suitable edge treatment designs". The support and role of landowners in this objective is vital.
- **Wild West Working Group**. This has as much to do with **reducing bureaucracy** and **more effective reinforcement** than introducing **more rules**. Although this issue is a KCLC high priority there is no acknowledgement of the work of KCLC'S **Wild West** Working Group, including draft guidelines for jetties, edge treatments etc and the need to have Local Laws support existing regulations. The new approach has been to involve the community in the process (similar to the Beach Box process).A committed community of landowners is the Creeks best ally.

- Creekside property owners are potentially the key champions of the Creek Restoration – they are not the enemy. We are concerned about the proposed introduction of **planning scheme provisions to cover the riparian zone and associated terrestrial vegetation**. We would be concerned if Creek **landowners lost their right to a jetty and boating access**. Is this overkill? Is such proposal consistently applied for all of Melbourne's Recreational Waterways? The "Wild West" working Group has already highlighted the need to reduce bureaucracy, to provide more guidance and focus and more effective reinforcement of existing provisions
- **Balance**. Because of the disconnect of the project aims with the KCLC vision, the plan has a bias towards **improving stream health**. A healthy drain does not necessarily define success. The plan needs further identification of **economic, social and public health** management objectives for the corridor. There should be clear objectives for economic development including boat hire arrangements and mooring fees. The commercial opportunities in the creek are significant –refer attachment 4 for a business valuation of a boat hire business in Mordialloc Creek. The new **Canoe club** and **Kananook Creek walking group** are not mentioned.
- **Program management** We started in 1970, why has the restoration of Kananook Creek taken so long-the Yarra transformation started later and has been completed 15 years ago? We have a constant stream of new people and we have suffered a lack of continuity. We have experience with implementation of the 1992 plan for 16 years. What have we learnt? The management plan must identify and deal with these. Who is the Program Manager, who is coordinating? The plan does not deal with the lack of integrated program management and there is no proposed program management structure for the creek restoration.

## MAJOR RECOMMENDATIONS

- There should be some identification of future and potential "corridors of green" connection of the Kananook Creek Corridor with the **Boggy Creek Corridor**.
- Project methodology page 9 1.4 -the only communication with the community was the Reference Group meeting in 2006. A more timely consultation process needs to be established and clear.
- **Regional River Health Strategy 2006**-The river health strategy ranks Kananook creek as significant so why the target condition is only to halt further decline-should be to improve...
- As there is no identification of agreed **beneficial uses** the identified "issues and actions" are not complete
- **We need signs** re boating speed limits and banning jet skis
- Need real recognition of the central role of the creek and our **maritime heritage** in the historical, cultural and economic development of Frankston. .
- The plan generally lacks **specific agreed real actions, timeframes, costing**- lots of 'to investigate' As a plan it needs clear **means of accountability and measurement of performance**.
- Surely FCC and MW see the benefit of community "ownership" of the plan. The draft plan suffers from lack of input from **key community stakeholders**. Why has the consultant sought **no input from any KCA people** (like Allan Sisson, Alison Kuitert, Olwen Bawden, Minio Rossetto) since being appointed?
- **Priority ranking** should be aligned to critical path for program objectives If the objective is to complete the restoration program in four years –a critical path needs to be worked through accordingly. Currently the actions have a **priority ranking** based on indicative timeframes ( high 1-5 years-page 36) .There is no ranking for ease of implementation (effort and funding).More specific timeframes are needed for critical path actions
- **Marketing, promotion and education**. There should be clear commitment to the annual **Celebration Day** and education, promotion responsibilities.
- **A plan for 15 years?** Firstly Restoration program objectives should have a four year horizon. There needs to be some mechanism for **dynamic and annual updating** of the management plan actions and annual review of budgets

## SPECIFIC ISSUES

## Section 1-Introduction

Currently this is a terms of reference for the consultant (this should be an attachment)

The 2008 Plan should have a 2 page executive **summary of major management issues**.

There is **no summary of the issues and lessons learned from the 1992 plan**, how they have been dealt with, what's changed and what justification.

The update was **commissioned by the KCLC in 2004** with an original completion date of **October 2004**—the introduction does not reflect this. Also the **approach was changed** from a trilateral approach in 2004 to a bilateral approach in 2005.

There is no identification of and commitment to agreed **beneficial uses** Therefore. the identified issues will not be complete .For example; where is the community justification for **conversion of walking paths to bicycle roads** through natural reserves?

**Also there is no commitment to navigability** for canoes and small boats above launching ramp at mouth- maintain black hole! Accordingly:

There is no commitment to silt removal in the PAC.

There is no commitment to fallen remove trees and navigational hazards

There is no commitment to resolving the Wild West-no commitment to local laws and effective regulation

### 1.2 project aim

Why are we changing the vision? The **vision of the KCLC (2005) is not consistent with the Project Aim**.

The project aim surely is simply to produce an integrated and coordinated plan to deliver this vision. We need to have a clear and compelling "**shared vision**" for the creek corridor.

The current vision of the KCLC is "**to maintain and enhance the environmental, social and economic values of Kananook Creek consistent with the needs and expectations of the community, stakeholders and agencies**".

(1.2) Page 8. The "**aim of the Plan** is to focus attention on the actions required to manage, remediate and **improve stream health** including improved community use with retention and renewal of as much naturalness as possible

The project aim has a bias towards **improve stream health** rather than balancing compatible beneficial uses

What does success look like? When do we complete the Kananook Creek Restoration Program phase and move to the ongoing care and maintenance phase?

There should be identification of future and potential "corridors of green" connection of the Kananook Creek Corridor with the Boggy Creek

### 1.3Draft Objectives

#### 1.5.1 Relevant local strategies and policies (page9)

The many **strategies** listed are still not complete **and are not coordinated and consistent with each other**

The Creek should be managed as a single environmental and recreational link.

Should include management plans for Wetlands, Seaford and Frankston Beaches

Seaford Lifesaving Precinct Master Plan

Kananook Creek Boulevard approved design.

Relevant Acts

1.5.2.14 – The Bicycle strategy (oct1997) is not current Council Policy. The strategy is outdated and has been superseded. Update of bicycle plan is due in December 2008 and may have an impact.

.

## Section 2 -Background Information

There is little recognition of Frankston's rich fishing heritage and the cultural importance of early European settlement

2.2 No mention of Land for Wildlife status or connection to wetlands or beach via Three Waters Walk. No mention of use of reserve for educational purposes  
2.3 small motor boats do use the creek (last paragraph)  
Page 22 Open Space and Recreation. Final paragraph. Need to add that the 'recently formed Kananook Creek Canoe Club use the open space monthly for Club trips as well as ad hoc training times'.  
2.6 No mention of Waterwatch  
2.7 Nothing about revegetation projects and species planted  
2.7.2 No mention of foxes, cats or rats.  
No mention of Fungi survey anywhere  
2.9.2 Need to beef up the value of that little bit of heath land along the railway line in Reach 2

2.10.1 May not be diminishing value of survey because ages were higher than average... central section most of us came here with babes in arms and have stayed, testament to how much we love the area.

2.11 Should Parks Vic be included here as creek runs into bay?

Should there be mention of Coast Management Act and the Flora & Fauna Guarantee Act  
Who looks after the bridges?

Under Rail Authority, perhaps put in 'liaise with Council re slashing of grasslands'

### **Section 3- Issues and actions applicable to all reaches of Kananook Creek**

3.2.2 No mention of crown land that has inadvertently been fenced or any crown land being occupied, like the van park at McCulloch... in fact there has been no mention of that at all. I know it's in there somewhere, but need to mention properties whose title goes to middle of creek.

3.2.3 Nothing about derelict boat sheds

Nothing about uniform bank treatment (summary of key outcomes)

LU1/0 put in tree protection

LU4/0 (Action) or plant screening trees along fences

3.3 D2/0 put in a generator

Look at "A" grade treated water from ETP

Note: maybe we should wait till Climate Change Documents are available

D4/0 Salination of groundwater – control over bores

3.4 No mention of sewage overflows or illegal plumbing in area

(Summary of key issues) add deliberate dumping into drains

No mention of more litter traps

Who cleans out the street drains and there is nothing about people sweeping grass clippings and leaves into gutter which goes straight into creek.

3.5 Issues need to add something about pest birds taking over nesting holes, predation of local species or cross breeding of black ducks with pet ducks

No fungi list here

No mention of need for aquatic plant and animal surveys. I recall sea grass being mentioned around Fiocchi, but there are good patches all the way up the creek.

3.6 Issues – climate change

No mention of heath land on Rail Reserve

V6/0 removing *Carpobrotus glaucescens* might create more erosion than benefit – feel there are more important problems

### **Section 4 -Reach Description, Issues and Actions**

#### **4.1.-Reach 1 Mornington Freeway to Eel Race Road**

#### **4.2 -Reach 2 Eel Race Road to Armstrong's Road**

#### **4.3 -Reach 3 Armstrong's road To Seaford Road**

Page 67 Under 4.3.7 Recreation and Community Use need to add  
That the 'recently formed Kananook Creek Canoe Club use the open space  
monthly for Club trips as well as ad hoc training times'.

The issue of where to locate a suitable venue for the Canoe Club needs to be  
addressed. However, considering that we don't know where it will be, it  
makes this difficult. However the Planning committee needs to be aware of our intentions to  
include a club along Kananook Creek somewhere

#### **4.4 -Reach 4 Seaford Road to Mile Bridge**

#### **4.5 -Reach 5 Mile Bridge to Wells St**

#### **4.6 -Reach 6 Wells St to Port Phillip Bay**

**Table of contents**

**List of Plans**

**List of Figures**

**Appendices**

**A KCC management Plan Waterway Geomorphology**

**B. Overview of Vegetation condition**

**C List of Bird Species**

**Acknowledgements**

**Glossary**

**Robert Thurley**

**Hon President Kananook Creek Association Inc 11 March 2008**