

**KANANOOK CREEK ASSOCIATION INC  
PRIORITY DEVELOPMENT PANEL - PROPOSED FRANKSTON BOAT HARBOUR  
WRITTEN SUBMISSION**

**KCA BACKGROUND**

**1. STRATEGIC JUSTIFICATION**

**1.1 A STRATEGIC BLUNDER-OLIVERS HILL IS AN INFERIOR CHOICE OF LOCATION FOR A MEGA MARINA**

**While on the map of the Commander in Chief up in Spring Street, Oliver's Hill might look like a good place for a marina, but it is as much a potential strategic blunder as the choice of the landing sites on the Gallipoli Peninsula on a map in Whitehall was in the first world war.**

Local knowledge is critically important, but who is listening? If a marina at Oliver's Hill is such a good proposal why has it not already been constructed?

**Since first formally mooted in 1982, two marina proposals at the site have been rejected following detailed investigation, as unsuitable and too dangerous.**

A compelling case has never emerged and proposals have since become too big, too expensive, and too risky to improved beaches and lack widespread public support.

**This is not just a proposal for a small, unobtrusive boat harbour, at 35 hectares this would be, not only be one of the biggest marinas in the state –but a mega marina in Australian terms!**

**The mega proposal fundamentally changes the natural character of Frankston foreshore.**

This proposal, with its **massive increased scale**, does nothing to deal with the issues identified nor improve Oliver's Hill marina's chance of success under future rigorous scrutiny.

The new proposal is for a mega marina directly beside one of the most desirable and unique residential areas in the state.

**Oliver's Hill is natural amphitheatre**-noise amplification is already a problem with jet skis and power boat engine flushing. Add a restaurant, a marine workshop and 300 clanging wires on masts and you have a major noise pollution problem.

**The cliff is highly unstable** and the Selwyn fault is nearby.

There is no natural land form protection to the north and west.

Due to a northerly face to marina entrance, a dangerous broadside turn to the prevailing weather is required.

It is not a safe being the longest fetch of bay. State government's own Victorian-Boating Safety brochure identifies the coast here as **one of the most dangerous places on the bay**

Nearby rocks and reefs present boating hazards in bad weather.

Visual impact of an industrial site on one of the most inspiring natural vistas around the bay.

The intersection of Nepean highway with Liddesdale Avenue at the base of Oliver's Hill is a **notorious accident black spot** and one of most dangerous places on busy Nepean Highway

**1.2 THE STRUCTURE PLAN HAS IDENTIFIED KANANOOK CREEK-AS A PRIORITY-A GOOD STRATEGIC PLAN PROVIDES COMPREHENSIVE RATHER THAN PARTIAL SOLUTIONS!**

**Kananook Creek and Oliver's Hill are strategically interdependent from a small boating perspective.**

**We need a strategically consistent and coordinated boating plan for Frankston –surely it is bad planning to decide on Oliver's Hill in isolation- we still have to restore boating facilities in our neglected creek.**

The Frankston Structure Plan has identified that Kananook Creek is an urgent urban renewal priority .Frankston is disconnected from its waterfront and the solution and first priority is the Kananook Creek Boulevard Project

**The update of the Kananook Creek Corridor Management Plan has been in progress since 2004 hence the recreational boating strategy for Kananook Creek remains in progress.**

Council has not given this Plan the priority it deserves; State Government has commenced the Kananook Creek Boulevard Project while Council dithers over its own contribution to urban renewal.

Because of the strategic interdependence, the Management Plan must be completed as a priority to enable a comprehensive strategy. KCA notes that the current draft offers no small boating solution complementing the Boulevard Project.

While the focus over the last 26 years has been on various alternative marina sites on the foreshore there has been a progressive deterioration in condition and neglect of boating facilities in Kananook Creek due to lack of action by council and other responsible authorities.

The priority in the Frankston Structure Plan is urban renewal of the Kananook Creek waterfront. State Government has allocated \$8million of Transit City money for the Kananook Creek Boulevard Project which is nearing completion of the design concept phase.

However the community has seen no plans by either Frankston Council or the responsible authority to restore boating facilities and clean up the mess in the waterway. Unless this is done the eyesore will damage the urban renewal priority investment and present a major potential embarrassment to the State Government.

### **1.3. STRUCTURAL DISCONNECTS**

What good planning logic is behind the proposal to create a separate industrial and commercial zone right in front of one of the best residential areas in Australia - Oliver's Hill- is it the "bugger thy neighbour" planning principle?

Frankston is desperately trying to solve one structural disconnect –why create another one? Why create an exposed industrial and commercial zone disconnected to the CBD 2km away.

### **1.3 THE KEY STRATEGIC RISK -MARINAS DESTROY BEACHES!**

**Council's position is "no damage to our beaches.**

**Coastal marinas always destroy nearby beaches –this 35 hectare proposal is a mega marina and mega marina's cause mega destruction to beaches!**

**We are not talking about destroying just any old beach - Frankston is Victoria's cleanest and safest beach.**

How can the panel proceed if this is a strategic showstopper?

How can the panel have any credibility with the community if it ignores the real examples of the destruction of beaches by groynes and marina's?

**In face of such overwhelming evidence, to knowingly destroy Victorias best beach is criminal denial!**

The widening of Nepean highway in the 60's resulted in total destruction of the original Sweetwater Creek Beach at Oliver's Hill (photo)

**The PDP must do a field inspection of Hampton Beach and assess the impacts-this beautiful swimming beach which been totally destroyed by the Sandringham Marina (witness, photo)**

Groynes have caused severe damage to Middle Brighton Beach etc (letter)

**Siltation at the Glenelg Sth Australia Marina has resulted in unforeseen and sustained dredging costs of \$2million a year to the ratepayer community (photo).** The developer did not pay for the damage caused.

What about future generations?

What about the destruction to underwater marine world in and around the 35 hectare site (photo)

### **1.4 GOOD STRATEGIC BALANCE-THE TRIPLE BOTTOM LINE?**

**Strategic balance -this revised proposal is just all about economics!**

Over the last 26 years millions have been spent by various state governments and council on promoting and developing the Marina but not a cent spent to ensure independent physical and numerical modelling has been done.

In 2006 the council began a market sounding exercise which was all about reshaping the design to make the marina more attractive to a commercial developer.

**However no work has been done on reshaping the design to reduce the key risk –the damage to nearby beaches.**

As the council is the proponent and that the damage to the nearby beaches is a potential marina show stopper, **the community has asked that the independent physical testing and numerical modelling be completed on behalf of the community up front.**

How can the community be confident that their interests will be protected if the testing contract is effectively organised by the preferred developer?

**Why has there has been absolutely no work to establish the criteria against which the tests and modelling results are to be measured as either acceptable or unacceptable?**

Defining how acceptable beach impact is to be measured should be completed by council on behalf of the community as a matter of urgency.

Is the developer going to decide this?

### **1.5 GOOD STRATEGIC DECISION MAKING-LOOK AT THE DIFFERENT NEEDS**

**We don't need a mega marina if we separate the needs of small and large boats!**

**We support initiatives to improve facilities for small boat launching and retrieval at both Oliver's Hill and Kananook Creek in Frankston.**

However adequate facilities for keel boats already exist at Patterson Lakes, Mornington, Hastings, Somerville and Safety Beach. We also note proposals to expand facilities at Mornington.

But we don't have to destroy our beaches and we can achieve a win-win because Kananook Creek has since first European settlement been the safe harbour for small boats and still has great potential for small boating.

**Just compare the flourishing of boating facilities in Mordialloc Creek which continues to make an important contribution to the local economy and the near destruction of boating facilities in Kananook Creek.**

Mordialloc Creek is a thriving destination for professional fishing, recreational boating boat building, supplies and tourism.

Meanwhile Kananook Creek, with hundreds of tonnes of silt deposited in the creek annually from the vast network of storm drains, is now barely navigable. Melbourne Water has not performed silt removal at drain outlets in central Frankston since taking over this responsibility from the DVA in 1991.

This proposal is not about helping small boat owners (better launching facilities could have been built 26 years ago. How serious is council about the needs of small boats? The sandcastle exhibition adjacent to the launching ramp has occupied Mc Comb Park (which is the boat trailer park overflow) all summer and the launching ramps were closed for the entire Sea Festival weekend in January.

### **1.6 STRATEGIC TIMING**

**Strategies hatched in 1982 do not reflect 2008 realities and priorities.**

Since 1982 many things have changed and so should the strategies.

The first marina proposal was hatched during economic hard times in the 1980's to provide tourist based economic salvation for our beleaguered retailers.

Times have changed.

By 2005 the Frankston Structure Plan identifies that Frankston will consolidate its position as the Regional Capital ,especially for advanced business services ,higher order retail, institutional and cultural functions. Frankston has developed into a sophisticated service economy, a new port is considered nearby at Hastings, it is to become the Regional Capital serving over 310,000 people.

**Tourism is no longer the strategic economic driver here and so the need to trade our most iconic natural asset for tourist driven economic growth has passed.**

In 1982 Frankston had a badly polluted beach .in 2008 **Frankston is Victoria's cleanest and safest beach.**

Spare capacity exists in facilities for keel boats at Patterson Lakes, Mornington, Hastings, Somerville and Safety Beach.

Small boat owners have been the loser with massive Siltation and neglect of Kananook Creek. Long neglected, Kananook Creek has finally been recognised under the Transit City initiative as the priority for investment in urban renewal in Frankston is the Kananook Creek Boulevard Project reconnecting the city to the waterfront.

## **2. APPROPRIATENESS OF PROPOSED CHANGES**

### **What are the planning principles involved?**

KCA is unsure as to what planning principles the panel will apply in assessing this expanded marina submission from Council and how this panel will reconcile with the clear concerns and deliberations of the previous panel.

How the community is assured that the panel process is based on real principle and good balance or is it just an arbitrary process.

How do ignoring previous clear rulings, concerns and sensitivities make this Council submission any more credible or acceptable?

How is the Frankston Community given any real protection when Council is acting as both the proponent and planning authority and has lacked transparency?

Is the community –“the enemy”?

### **The proposed changes are inappropriate!**

This proposal is a monstrous one –adding hotel accommodation, increasing commercial facilities from 500sqm to 6650 sqm i.e. 1300% times the original building footprint (including, new dry storage of 4400sqm) and doubling height limits.

If the last panel was clearly uncomfortable with the impacts then this panel should feel very uncomfortable with a vastly expanded proposal.

Is planning principle just all about economics?

### **3. SITING AND DESIGN GUIDELINES**

#### **How fair and credible is the planning process when the public has seen no site plan and there has been no public consultation on this revised proposal?**

In face of previous panel concerns, council should have got the message and looked at reducing the footprint and trimming the financial cost and impact. Why in five years has nothing been done on measuring environmental impacts, in particular impacts on adjacent beaches?

Why are we all here looking at this obscene and desperate proposal?

#### **The Frankston community is not “wet behind the ears”?**

Commercial and residential components would be the “the thin end of the wedge”

This looks like it’s the start of a real estate play.

Are we reclaiming the beach to create a Brighton UK style property development?

#### **Height limits**

We do not support a hotel and note that no height limits are specified for the 60 units

We do not support any dry storage and disagree with the proposal to double the height of dry storage from 6m to 12.5m

### **4. APPROPRIATE STATUTORY PROCESSES**

**This mega proposal fundamentally changes the natural character of Frankston foreshore and accordingly should receive proper statutory due process and rigorous, detailed scrutiny.**

### **NO MANDATE FOR A MEGA MARINA! LACK OF RESPECT FOR DEMOCRATIC PROCESSES**

Community respects democratic decision making process but no public mandate for the mega marina has been sought or obtained.

Community calls for a referendum were rejected

The community petition was ignored

Local government Act has been quietly amended to exclude provisions for a referendum

### **SOCIAL AND COMMUNITY**

Frankston has serious social problems. What social justice is there in alienating 35 hectares of public open space with a security fence for a real estate development for the benefit one of the richest companies in Australia? This results in destruction of free beach amenity. This is contrary to our new Community Vision which is about building rather than dividing communities.

What is the true level of economic subsidy? What would 35 hectares of prime beach front fetch as residential development –about \$300 million? Will the commercial lease reflect this value?

What social justice is there in giving economic subsidies to the Fat Cats?

### **FINANCIAL VIABILITY**

The Glenelg South Australia marina has resulted in massive unforeseen and ongoing dredging costs to the community. Because we have no realistic exit strategy we have to be **certain** about the marina’s sustainability .What protection to the community if the marina damages the beaches or it goes broke? It would become a 35 hectare white elephant –we cannot realistically

remove a \$150 million breakwater and the cost of a bank guarantee or performance bond would be prohibitive?

We note that the community ended up with removal costs of the failed hydrofoil pad on Frankston Beach.

Robert Thurley Hon President 6<sup>th</sup> March 2008