

CORRECTED VERSION

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT, INFRASTRUCTURE AND OUTER SUBURBAN/INTERFACE SERVICES COMMITTEE

Inquiry into Marine Rescue Services in Victoria

Frankston — 17 March 2014

Members

Mr N. Burgess

Mr K. Eideh

Mr F. McGuire

Mrs I. Peulich

Mr A. Ronalds

Mr G. Shaw

Chair: Mr N. Burgess

Deputy Chair: Mr F. McGuire

Staff

Executive Officer: Mr N. Bunt

Research Officer: Mr M. Newington

Witnesses

Frankston City Council

Councillor Darrel Taylor, Mayor

Mr Dennis Hovenden, Chief Executive Officer

Frankston Volunteer Coast Guard

Commander Anthony Mayall, Flotilla Services

The CHAIR — Good afternoon everybody. Welcome to all the guests and people in the gallery and thank you to Hansard for being here. Welcome to the hearing of the Economic Development, Infrastructure and Outer Suburban/Interface Services Committee into marine rescue services in Victoria. This committee is an all-party parliamentary committee, and all evidence taken at this hearing is protected by parliamentary privilege; however, comments made outside the hearing are not afforded that privilege. Could you state your full name and address.

Cr TAYLOR — Darrel Gregory Taylor, [REDACTED].

The CHAIR — Darrel, are you appearing on behalf of an organisation?

Cr TAYLOR — In conjunction with Frankston volunteer Coast Guard and Frankston City Council.

The CHAIR — Do you hold a position?

Cr TAYLOR — I am the mayor of Frankston City Council.

Mr HOVENDEN — Good afternoon, Chair. Dennis Andrew Hovenden, [REDACTED].

The CHAIR — And your position?

Mr HOVENDEN — I am the chief executive officer of Frankston City Council.

The CHAIR — Are you appearing on behalf of that organisation?

Mr HOVENDEN — I appear both for Frankston City Council and Frankston volunteer Coast Guard.

The CHAIR — I now ask you to make a public address, but you will also be asked questions at the end. Anything you say will become part of the public record. You will receive a copy of the transcript in a couple of weeks and you should feel free to make any typographical changes wherever you think errors may have been made but nothing to the substance of the document.

Cr TAYLOR — Thank you, Chair. Today we propose to provide a presentation on the situation currently with boating, Frankston Volunteer Coast Guard, their situation with regards to their building, and the impact the current situation with marine rescue services is having within Frankston and the south-east.

Overheads shown.

Cr TAYLOR — I refer you to the slides that we are about to put up on the screen. If we go to the first slide, Frankston's Australian Volunteer Coast Guard is home to Australia's first Coast Guard. Not many people realise that, but it became the first Coast Guard when, I believe, VF1 and VF3 joined their two services and became the first Coast Guard in Australia. It is a registered training organisation, so it is able to do certified marine safety training up to certificate II level, and it is registered with training.com.au as an RTO. It does certificate II in marine operations.

Frankston volunteer Coast Guard conducts over 50 rescues per year. They are on the water for approximately 80 to 100 days per year, and they cover a coastal area of around 400 square kilometres. Frankston Coast Guard has done great work over the years and provided an essential service for this part of the Mornington Peninsula region, but there have been a number of issues that have impacted upon their ability to maintain their services and provide the level of service required going forward.

From memory, the current Coast Guard building was built back in 1970 and was only supposed to have a life of 20 years, but that has been extended somewhat. Relocation of that facility was delayed by another 10 years when this council some 10 years ago attempted to have a marina built at the base of Olivers Hill. It was envisaged then that the yacht club and Coast Guard would both go down there, because the council foresaw an opportunity to have someone else build their infrastructure. But that did not come to fruition, so the main building was at risk and very close to being demolished last year; it had a building order placed on it. Some of the windows were at risk of collapse, and one of the walls was at risk of collapse, but the Coast Guard undertook remediation works around some of the windows to correct that and to buy a little bit of time. That

cost \$40 000 and they used most of their operational funds to do so, but luckily the justice minister came to the rescue and gave them some money to assist with those works. We thank him for that.

However, that does not do much going forward. There is probably five or six years left in that building before it has to be seriously looked at for demolition, which puts at risk their ability to provide the services required. Currently, to provide the service, they have one small boat there in the shed and they have their larger boat at Carrum Downs, which is 9.5 kilometres away at Patterson Lakes. When they get a call, their fastest response time when there is no traffic — and they have a clear run and can get out of Patterson Lakes — is a minimum of 35 minutes. At best it is 45 minutes and up to an hour. Unfortunately, Anthony is not here, but he had a couple of examples to give you. Just last week he had a callout, and between the time he got the call and when he got to Patterson Lakes the police had come from Williamstown and effected the rescue — after an hour or so — and so that rescue occurred.

The other issue is that currently we have swimmers contesting the water with motorcraft and windcraft at Kananook Creek, as boats are launched out at Kananook Creek with the yacht club. The council is going to go ahead with a \$12 million redevelopment of the foreshore and yacht club this year. We foresee a growth in yachting, so at that Kananook Creek mouth where there are motorised craft exiting and entering the bay, there will be windcraft as well, and there are a lot of swimmers in that area. You have this contest around that area for windcraft, swimmers and motor craft. There are no all-weather launching facilities located within the southern region of Port Phillip at all at the moment.

Chair, the commander of Frankston Coast Guard has arrived. Is it all right if he joins the committee hearing?

The CHAIR — Sure.

The CHAIR — Good afternoon. Could you please introduce yourself: give your full name, title and whether you are appearing on behalf of an organisation.

Cmdr MAYALL — My name is Anthony Mayall. I am commander of Frankston Coast Guard, although I have been requested to appear here today in conjunction with Frankston Council. I am speaking on local matters only and not as a representative of the Coast Guard as a whole.

The CHAIR — Thank you, I have informed everybody else that evidence taken today will become a public document. It is also covered by privilege; however, any comments you make outside this meeting will not be covered by that privilege.

Cr TAYLOR — Thank you, Chair. Anthony, we have just been covering the Coast Guard — your organisation — what you do and how your current situation is impacting on the way you deliver your services. Before I go on, is there anything you would like to add in regards to your organisation and the current situation as it stands?

Cmdr MAYALL — Frankston Coast Guard was the very first Coast Guard in Australia. We have been located here in Frankston for 50 years now. Because of the lack of facilities here at Frankston we now have our main rescue boat in a wet berth up at Carrum. It is as ready as it can be. Should an incident occur off Frankston, we have to drive our personal vehicles up to Carrum, get in the vehicle there and then bring it back down to this area. There are also rescue groups at Carrum already. There is a Coast Guard unit there and also another one down at Mornington. Essentially, if there are any incidents off the Frankston area, we are talking about probably 45 minutes before we are able to respond just to get off the beach, let alone get to the actual location of the incident.

The CHAIR — Was that 45 minutes?

Cmdr MAYALL — Approximately 45 minutes. That could be reduced through sheer luck, but generally we are talking about 45 minutes. If there were a facility here at Frankston — and there is quite a lot of water activity going on from the Frankston area, which is mainly smaller vessels — then that response time would be cut down by approximately half.

Also, because our group has our main rescue vessel at Carrum and we have all our facilities here at Frankston, we are somewhat fragmented. If you look at Safety Beach, for example, they have their rescue boat about 2 minutes' walk away from their base, so on a weekend when they are providing safety patrols they are either out on the vessel or at the base, where they are at instant ready.

What Frankston Council is proposing, as far as the regional boating facility is concerned, would turn this area into a model for all rescue organisations or any rescue unit throughout the state and probably even Australia. We would have a purpose-built facility sitting right on the water's edge. On weekends we run a duty roster, so during peak times, when there are the most people out on the water, we would have staff at the building ready to go and able to respond very quickly. Outside of those hours we run a pager system whereby we have people on 24-hour call.

Cr TAYLOR — We will go to what Anthony has gently touched on, which is what council has proposed to address some of the issues in regard to marine safety and the Coast Guard — that is, a regional boating facility to set up permanent mooring facilities for the Coast Guard. To give you some information, as at 30 June 2013 there were, say, 12 000 recorded registered motorboat users within the peninsula region, and I believe that number is growing. Our boating facilities here are under pressure. We have just had the one at Kananook Creek upgraded, and we are very appreciative of that. That was done with state government money, and I thank the government for that. That is now under pressure, and so are the parking facilities. Once again it has added an element of danger between motorcraft, windcraft and swimmers.

There are two dedicated boating facilities in Frankston, six in Mornington and one at Patterson River. The closest safe havens for boats are at Sandringham and Safety Beach, but both are private facilities. However, they do allow public access. Frankston beach recorded the highest number of visitations of any beach in Port Phillip in 2013. It has had around 84 000 visitors this year, and that is growing. The eastern shores of Port Phillip are seriously undersupplied for places for boats to take refuge in dangerous conditions and for all-purpose or all-weather launching facilities. That is between St Kilda and Blairgowrie, so we are underutilised with infrastructure there.

What council has put up is a facility which is of a modest size and is to address a number of issues. As I said, the existing Coast Guard building is no longer fit for purpose, so this will address the issue of a new facility for the Coast Guard. It will improve response times. As you have just heard from the commander, it will halve the response times.

It will also assist in the stabilisation of Olivers Hill. There are erosion complications at Olivers Hill, and providing a buffer between the bay and Olivers Hill will address those erosion issues. If you go down to Olivers Hill now, you will see great chunks of dirt that have fallen out, and that gets worse during rough weather, with storm surges, wind surges et cetera. It will also give us new and updated public facilities — desperately needed car parking, toilets et cetera.

The proposal includes a new Coast Guard building with a state-of-the-art training facility; permanent moorings for Coast Guard vessels, which will improve response times for emergencies by up to 50 per cent; and rooms for education for boating safety practice. As I mentioned, the Coast Guard is an RTO. Discussions we have had with the Victorian Coast Guard and with the local Coast Guard are that there could be an opportunity to have an Australian Coast Guard museum with a gift shop, which would provide a retail opportunity, jobs and exposure for the region, as well as other retail opportunities with a cafe and a restaurant.

There are other public facilities that can be incorporated, including metered boat moorings so that the public can come in, park a boat for several hours to use the facilities, visit Frankston — whatever — and leave. Metering those would create a revenue stream. It could include public toilet facilities, boat ramps to take the pressure off the current boat ramp facilities and car parking.

The schematic designs are up on the screen. This is the envisaged high-level drawing. We have had this proposal costed. A lot of the planning for this has been done with the previous work for the previous marina. The planning approval is done, the cultural heritage management overlay is done and an environmental impact study has been done. Wave studies and other studies would be required, but a lot of the planning side of it has been done. We have had this costed.

This slide gives you an indicative size of the breakwaters that would be required. They are not very big at all. It would be a staged project that could be completed over several financial years to reduce the cost. Stage 1 would be the northern arm going out and the Coast Guard building, Stage 2 would be the road that would go along the front of Olivers Hill to stabilise Olivers Hill, car parking and public boat-launching facilities. Stage 3 would be the longer breakwater. I will throw over to Anthony, who will explain why this design would provide safety. He knows about the winds, the tides and all things marine, so I will let him explain why this would provide safety and easy access to the bay in all weather.

Mr McGuire — Before you do, you said you have had it costed, but you did not give the cost.

Cr Taylor — The high-level costing came back and is not public. The high-level costing is at \$45 million, but they put on 40 per cent contingencies across the board with that. It included all works as a greenfield project. As I said, a lot of the work has been done, so from council's point of view we believe it is achievable with the Coast Guard building completed for \$35 million.

Cmdr Mayall — As far as the design of the harbour is concerned, the main wall — the southern wall — provides a great deal of protection from the west and south-west. Whilst there are some fairly consistent and strong winds that historically come in from the north-west, the west and south-west are the most dangerous directional winds. They tend to maintain their cells for long periods of time as well, which means they generate larger waves over several days. The design of that harbour will allow vessels to get in and out of there safely in any weather conditions.

If you look at the other facilities nearby around Port Phillip, the nearest haven would be Patterson River, which has no wind protection at the mouth whatsoever. There are some shallow bars, and in high sea conditions, where winds exceed 25 or probably 35 knots, it is extremely treacherous for a vessel to try to come into that bar, not so much get out. Very few people would be silly enough to go out in those sorts of conditions.

From there, if you go north, you have Mordialloc. Again there is very little protection from the west and south-westerly direction. Going around from there you are talking about Sandringham and, as was mentioned earlier, that is a private facility but they do allow public refuge. To the south, Mornington harbour provides good protection from the west and south west but does not provide any protection whatsoever from the north west. I have seen cases where there have been boats locked up in a corner, effectively. There were about 9 to 10 of them on one occasion that were unable to get to the boat ramp because the boat ramp was unprotected in the conditions that day. I even have photographs of one of the boats that tried to tie up to the boat ramp jetty at Mornington; the waves washed it up and over the top of it. If anybody has ever been there, they will know that the jetty the boats tie up to is about 1.5 metres high off the water in the average tidal range. Then from Mornington further around you are down to Mount Martha again. Mount Martha, because of its southerliness in Port Phillip does not generate huge danger in a west or south-westerly but it can be quite tricky for small boats. This facility would provide all-weather safe haven, regardless.

Cr Taylor — That is all I have at this point, thank you.

The Chair — Is that all the evidence from the three of you?

Mr Hovenden — Anthony might like to make a comment on the ability to increase the volunteer numbers of the Coast Guard if there were improved facilities, which would then go to how safety on the bay would be improved with increased volunteers.

Cmdr Mayall — We currently have a membership at Frankston which has increased by about 25 per cent in the last 12 months to just over 40. We have the capacity at present to get up to about 70, and that is purely because of the size of the building we have at present. With a larger facility and with more activity in the area this facility would certainly attract more activity from the boating community, which at present generally goes to Carrum or Mornington because there are better ramps there. It would draw that activity back to Frankston and then, yes, we would be able to increase our numbers and again increase the level of boating safety services we are providing to the local area.

We have had quite a struggle over recent years in trying to attract members. I have been making specific efforts to try to increase that since I took over as commander, which was in June last year, and I hope to be able to

really push that forward in the future. But, again I am limited to about 70 members. With 70 members you have probably got about 40 to 45 who will actually be on the water and available for water-borne duties.

The CHAIR — Out of the 40 you have currently, how many are available for water-borne duties?

Cmdr MAYALL — I did see a figure last week that said 19, but I believe it would be closer to 25.

The CHAIR — What level do you need to be effective?

Cmdr MAYALL — Currently I have four coxswains on the roster at Frankston. I would need at least 10. I am running a coxswain course specifically for my people as I am a qualified trainer. I am also commercially qualified as a Master 5. I will be running that course at the end of next month and I hope to generate probably four or five more out of that within the next six months. Once they have completed that course they are still not qualified as far as we are concerned. As a coxswain they have the knowledge base but whether they have the skill base is another story. The Coast Guard is very fastidious about how it trains its members, and the level of skill and knowledge that we put on the water in charge of a rescue vessel — its personnel — is far greater than what is recognised by transport safety, and I say that from a commercial sense. Having worked in the industry for a number of years I would put my money on a Coast Guard coxswain above a transport safety coxswain any day.

The CHAIR — Is your existence in question at the moment? Are you dropping to numbers that are unsustainable?

Cmdr MAYALL — It has been in the past, but again, since I have taken over I have been making a concerted effort to try to bring our numbers back up and get things moving within Frankston. But that is somewhat restricted by the facilities we have at the moment and also by the fact that we are splintered; we have our main facility at Frankston and our boats at Carrum.

The CHAIR — What would the likely result be if your group became unsustainable; if you dropped below sustainable numbers?

Cmdr MAYALL — If the group that became unsustainable? I certainly do not believe that is the aim of the Coast Guard as a state-based body, and I have had discussions with commodores. In fact I have one of them sitting behind me at the moment. There has been some talk of this over past years but that has always been negated, so to speak. Should that particular event occur then any marine incidents off Frankston would have to rely on Carrum or Mornington rescue services to respond. In optimal sea conditions you are talking probably 10 to 15 minutes for a vessel to get from those locations down to off Frankston. In heavy conditions, it could be half an hour, possibly more.

The CHAIR — That is where your boat is currently.

Cmdr MAYALL — That is where our boat is currently. Correct.

Mr RONALDS — Above what they have already got. You are saying now it takes 40 — —

Cmdr MAYALL — No. That is as things stand at the moment. We do have a rescue boat in the shed at Frankston; it is a smaller unit. It is a 6 metre rigid inflatable. That vessel needs to be launched. Again, there are delays in setting that. It was decided that we would keep our primary rescue vessel at Carrum, because it could be kept on the water in a permanent ready state. That also means that in the event of a non-emergency incident we have to putter all the way down the Patterson River at 5 knots. In the event of an absolute emergency we have the discretion to exceed the speed limits, which is not a good situation; however, there have been occasions where Coast Guard vessels have proceeded out of Patterson River past other recreational vessels at what would be classed as excessive speed, but the situations at those times did mandate it. It is also in legislation that we have the authority to do that in certain circumstances, but it is not ideal.

Mr McGUIRE — So this is fundamentally an emergency services matter?

Cmdr MAYALL — Correct.

Mr McGUIRE — And you see it that way too, Mayor?

Cr TAYLOR — Most definitely.

Mr McGUIRE — And everybody does? Okay.

Cr TAYLOR — You only need to come down during summer to see the amount of activity off Frankston, boating-wise, and to see that it is only a matter of time before something serious happens and we do not have the ability to respond.

Mr McGUIRE — Has this proposal been put to the Victorian government?

Cr TAYLOR — It has been put up there. It is the no. 5 priority on our election ask for this year. It is hard to determine how much Frankston can contribute because we do not know what the federal or state governments are looking at in regard to these sorts of facilities, but I think we are a long way from discussing that. This is a matter which we have identified for some time as requiring immediate attention given the state of the building and the impact it is having on our ability to respond.

Mr McGUIRE — Which department did you take it to?

Mr SHAW — It actually goes back over 30 years that they have been talking about a marina here in Frankston. It has been shut down a number of times because of the size and because of the issues that environmentalists and certain people have with the bay. We have got a good beach in Frankston; it was voted the best in Victoria. There are issues with putting a structure out into the bay; the community has concerns. It has said, 'We are not going to put up a boating facility for 100 or 200 people when we have a beach that is enjoyed by thousands of people'. There are some conflicting issues that would need to be addressed before anything.

Cr TAYLOR — The environmental impact study, which was done in 2000, identified this, and that design has been based upon one of the options of that study. It has indicated that it does not impact on the problems with the beach. I will point out that the sand on the beach has been replenished half a dozen times over the last 20 years, so none of the sand on our beach is the original sand. As a matter of fact we just completed a large sand replenishment program, so the idea that a facility of this size is going to wash away the sand or play off the sand is probably one that does not have any traction any more considering that we do not have the original sand on the beach now. As I indicated earlier, works have been done but further work will need to be done — it will be required — as in wave studies to check the impact, as is always the case for these sorts of infrastructure.

Cmdr MAYALL — If I may, that impact study identified that a larger structure than this would require dredging. It estimated it at once per year in order to move any build-up of sand past the structure and it also identified that the major sand movement along this whole area commences from Olivers Hill in the Daveys Bay region, travels all the way up to Beaumaris and then comes back again. There are three distinct sand bars along the beaches between here and Beaumaris, and they start at Frankston from Olivers Hill.

Mr McGUIRE — Mayor, if I can ask you, just so that we can establish the chronology of events here, you have already taken this to the Victorian Government. When did you first pitch this idea?

Cr TAYLOR — Late last year. It might have been around about the period in the lead-up to the federal election. It was one of our asks.

Mr McGUIRE — Were you looking at it for joint federal state support?

Cr TAYLOR — Most definitely. As a council we cannot afford to do this in our own. That is most definite.

Mr McGUIRE — And \$35 million or \$45 million tops, is that the ask?

Cr TAYLOR — The \$45 million came in and that had 40 per cent contingency added across the board on all stages of the project. That included an amount on top of the planning and all the preliminary works. As I indicated, a lot of that work has been done. We have ascertained that that contingency of 40 per cent is well overcooked. From our analysis it would be achievable at around about \$35 million. We have not proceeded with any further detailed works beyond what we have done so far — these high-level schematics and getting actual consultants to cost it. Until we get some sort of indication that this facility is of a high value or high

interest, there will not be any further works done, because we do not want to proceed down the road of continuing further works if we are not going to get any interest.

Mr McGuire — Which government department did you take it to in Victoria?

Cr Taylor — We have consulted with DSE, Parks Victoria, the Department of Transport. Who else, Dennis? Can you think of more?

Mr HOVENDEN — No, you probably got them all. You should point out — —

Cr TAYLOR — We went to tourism. We have been right across the board. They have indicated they support this project.

Mr McGuire — Which departments?

Cr TAYLOR — All the departments I have mentioned — DSE especially for the stabilisation of Olivers Hill. It would quite freely give us management over the facility and over that area. DSE have no issues with that. It is just a matter of getting government buy-in and going further with investigations of the project. I would like to point out also that this project would not just service Frankston. A project of this size would be able to service the south-east, especially if we had a state-of-the-art training facility in the Coast Guard. As Anthony pointed to, this could be an excellent model for facilities in Victoria, if not Australia, as well as the opportunity for the museum and the gift shop. That is up to the Victorian Coast Guard. If it wants to pursue that option, I think it is a fantastic option, but I would say that being mayor of the city.

Mr McGuire — That is okay; you are entitled. You said that this is your no. 5 ranked priority currently before the Victorian government. What were the other four?

Cr TAYLOR — The first one is the waste transfer station; the second is the business case for the electrification and duplication of the line to Baxter, as well as the development of the land around the transit interchange once that duplication occurred; the third is our — —

Mr HOVENDEN — Regional sporting facilities.

Cr TAYLOR — The regional sporting facilities, as in our tennis and basketball facilities. Frankston is becoming a regional city. We are servicing a lot outside of our borders. Our basketball facilities are under pressure. The tennis facilities are under pressure, and especially now that Peninsula Health wants the land that they are on, and our netball facilities, being a regional facility, are also under pressure. Our other sporting precincts are no. 4 — some of our reserves. Council currently has 40 odd master plans that are incomplete, totalling about \$130 million to \$140 million worth of work. I do not want to go into why that is, because I would be here all day and we will all be bored by the end of it. The fifth is the regional boating facility.

Mr HOVENDEN — I should point out, Chair, that both sides of politics are aware of council's five stated positions, and indeed the Leader of the Opposition sat exactly where Matt is and heard a presentation from council in which the regional boating safety harbour was mentioned to the Opposition Leader. Council is prepared to talk to both sides to achieve this result.

If I may go back to marine safety, Chair, there are a number of salient points. The building the Coast Guard operates in will not last probably 5 years, let alone the 15 years that is now anticipated because of the remedial works that have patched it up. The pressure points will move around onto the other sides of the building. The building was not meant to last as long as it has and it will require additional works. The solution is, as the mayor and Anthony have outlined, about marine safety. I think you asked a question about the numbers declining and we should all contemplate life without the Frankston Coast Guard.

The mayor is quite right. The number today — 83 000 — is only going to grow because Frankston has, as a community and a council, the foreshore as the jewel in the crown and everything we are doing is to increase the visitation; whether it is, as the mayor mentioned, the boat ramp or the yacht club, you can only see growth in those numbers. The council and the community require the knowledge that if an incident occurs, the Frankston Coast Guard will be there to respond and in a much more appropriate time than currently exists. This proposal will actually bring together the Coast Guard and its boat, which I think is a good thing.

The CHAIR — Going back then — and I know that Mr Hovenden was recently appointed as CEO — why has council left it so late? If this has been a long-term problem, why is council only now bringing this forward to get fixed?

Cr TAYLOR — Council has had five new councillors since the last election, so thoughts and position have changed. The marina option was still on the table when I got elected. I decided to look closely at that option. I have a project background. I have worked for the Department of Defence, at the Defence Materiel Organisation, as a project manager. I looked at the project and I went to the tender documents. That proposal the council put up some years ago was full of risk. It was transferring risk to whoever the potential tenderers may have been in regard to the stabilisation of Olivers Hill. It was also putting in a lot of infrastructure which should have been council's responsibility to build, including yacht clubs, Coast Guards et cetera — probably not the Coast Guard but definitely the yacht club. There was infrastructure in that request for tender that was putting additional capital requirements onto the bill, and therefore the proposal that went out was pushed to the realms of not being feasible and hence did not get a very good response.

The CHAIR — Was the marina intended to be the solution to the problem of the Coast Guard?

Cr TAYLOR — It was to be the catch-all to all of the above, with a commercial focus. There have been a number of studies done on marinas around Port Phillip. There was one done under the previous Labor government, I am led to believe, by Arup. I think it was Cabinet-in-Confidence, but my information has it that that came back, saying that out of all the places to have a marina Frankston was the most unviable because there is no land-based development. That makes sense because any marina being constructed is done either in an inlet or in a slight creek base with land-based development, where they can develop the land for housing purposes and the marina spaces are sold off in conjunction with that housing land, which makes the marinas viable.

A facility where you have to reclaim land or put in a base would cost hundreds of millions of dollars to be able to reclaim or put rockfill in so that you can build structures on it and create a marina environment down there. That would cost hundreds of millions of dollars and push it outside the realm of being commercially viable. My personal opinion is I do not think a marina is viable in Frankston based on that information. Therefore I investigated this closely and worked with the council team to come up with a public facility that is modest in size. I believe it would have the support of our foreshore committees and our beach committees here and the interested parties due to the modest size. Because of the issues it is addressing — marine safety, the environment and issues of the stabilisation of Olivers Hill — it ticks the boxes fully as a publicly funded facility.

Mr McGUIRE — Just so that we understand, are you now looking at this as a Victorian Government alone or a Victorian and federal government and local council project? Is it a three-way deal or a one-way deal?

Cr TAYLOR — Three-way.

Mr McGUIRE — What would the split be?

Cr TAYLOR — As much as possible state and federal. Of course as mayor of Frankston I am going to say that.

Mr McGUIRE — That is fair. I understand your position.

Mr RONALDS — When we look at this facility, are we looking at berths here or are we talking about purely a marina facility for launching boats? We talked a bit about inclement weather, of boats being able to come in and be protected from the weather. What is the answer to that?

Cr TAYLOR — Yes, if you see stage 4 up there, stage 4 is part of the cost that we put in, but that would be done if it can be afforded to be done. The proposal I have put up, and it is only a suggestion, is that those berths be metered berths, which would generate a revenue stream and would allow turnover of those berths so they are not sold to be consumed for private or exclusive use. It is a public facility, so by having metered berths, it would allow boats to come in, berth for 1 hour, 2 hours or 3 hours, go to the restaurant, the cafe or the museum and then you have turnover. If there is an option to do other berths later on, there is room, but it is designed to be a complete public facility to provide that opportunity for the public to use.

Mr RONALDS — So the fundamental issue here is to be able to provide a facility for a Coast Guard and a facility to launch boats from a recreational perspective and protection in bad weather for small craft.

Cr TAYLOR — So they can get in and out.

Mr RONALDS — A safe haven, yes.

Mr SHAW — You mentioned increased activity at Frankston — yachting, for example, on a \$12 million facility. We have been to Sandringham, Dennis, and seen what \$12 million bought there. No public funds were put into that at all. It was all by an established yacht club. While we wish there were more yachties, it was already an established yacht club there. There have been more than 200 car parks taken on the west side of the Nepean Highway, yet you want more activity. I would imagine this could create more activity. If there is already a lack of car parking there because of a lack of land space and there is no reclaiming of land, what are you expecting to happen in that foreshore? How much pressure is going to be put on that Olivers Hill region up to Wells Street, let us say, where McDonald's is and the lifesaving club. How much pressure is going to be put on there, when already 200 car parks have been taken on the west side of the Nepean Highway?

Cr TAYLOR — In this high-level schematics this facility allows for about 100-odd car parks on reclaimed land at the southern end. Also the car park that is currently existing right round would be upgraded and reconfigured to add additional car parks. Yes, you are right; very few car parks are available around where the current facility is. That is because the current facility is at capacity. Even with the upgrade now you cannot get a car park for a boat and a trailer anywhere in summer along here. All this car park and all through here is full of boats, trailers — all around near the churches. That once again comes back to that mix of motorised craft, wind craft and swimmers together. The idea is to try and get as many of those boats down this end, as well as jet skis launching down this end. They go outside of this facility, so you segregating all of that activity for motorised craft as much as possible. Then the swimmers are down the other end and smaller craft like your dinghies et cetera use Kananook Creek. But car parking is an issue, and it is going to be an ongoing issue.

The CHAIR — Dennis, before we wrap it up, did you have something to say?

Mr HOVENDEN — Just in response to the Deputy Chair's view of the funding arrangements, I was just going to make a comment. There is a perfect example of what happens when the federal, state and local governments work together in Cranbourne Road, Frankston, at the moment. It is called our new aquatics centre. That is a three-way funding split between the three levels of government. If the mayor's figures are correct, it is around \$35 million. If you go and have a look at the funding arrangements there, you could replicate that again.

Cr TAYLOR — I would be careful of that one, because council put up more than the state and federal governments combined, Dennis. I would like a genuine three-way split, if I may.

Mr HOVENDEN — It could be a good starting point for discussion.

Cr TAYLOR — It would be a good starting point, yes.

The CHAIR — We are actually out of time.

Mr McGUIRE — Chair, if I could just quickly respond. I do not know how much you know about my background, but I have done deals all the way through to try and get better coordination between the three tiers of government. I just wanted to get what the detail was. What was the feedback on why it was not approved the last time you took it to the government? Why did they knock it back?

Cr TAYLOR — This proposal? They have not knocked it back. They are still analysing it.

The CHAIR — I think we probably need to wrap this up now anyway. We are 20 minutes over time. Thank you very much. We are really grateful for your time and the evidence you have given. In two weeks or so you will receive a copy of today's proceedings. As I said earlier, please feel free to make any adjustments where you think there are typographical or grammatical errors but nothing to the substance of the document. Thank you very much.

Cr TAYLOR — Thank you, Chair, and committee members.

Witnesses withdrew.