



MORNINGTON PENINSULA RATEPAYERS' AND RESIDENTS' ASSOCIATION INC
and
McCRAE ACTION GROUP

PO Box 4087
Rosebud Vic 3939
E-mail: alanne@ihug.com.au

15 December 2011

Yvette Goss
Change Adaptation
Productivity Commission
LB2 Collins Street East
Melbourne Vic 8003
Email: climate-adaptation@pc.gov.au

Dear Yvette,

Re: Barriers to Effective Climate Change Adaptation

The Mornington Peninsula Ratepayers' and Residents' Association Inc. and its precinct group the McCrae Action Group has a database of 800 persons who have registered interest in local issues.

Attached is an article from The Age newspaper 6 December 2011.

The Mornington Peninsula Shire Council proposes to locate its large aquatic/leisure centre on Crown land on the Rosebud foreshore despite the fact that the **Victorian Coastal Strategy 2008** states that development on the coast should be coastal dependent (egg Yacht and Life Saving Cubs) and that the particular site is amongst the worst affected by sea level rise/storm surge etc on Port Phillip Bay.

There are approximately 150 public swimming pools either council or privately owned in the Melbourne and Geelong area alone which clearly indicates that an aquatic/leisure complex is not coastal dependent. In addition, the Victorian Government's Ministerial Direction No 13 says that the precautionary principle should be applied to developments on the coast.

The Direction includes the following comments:

“In preparing an amendment which would have the effect of rezoning non-urban land for urban use **or development**, a planning authority must include in the explanatory report how the proposed amendment:

- Addresses the current and future risks and impacts associated with projected sea level rise and the individual and/or combined effects of storm surges, tides, river flooding and coastal erosion.”

However the Shire, with the support of the State Local Member, the Minister for Education, is pressing the State Minister for the Environment to approve a Foreshore Management Plan for Rosebud which includes the proposal to locate the aquatic/leisure complex on the foreshore. The Plan does not have an accompanying explanatory report which comprehensively addresses the future risks and impacts of sea level rise.

The proposal to locate the complex on a site threatened by inundation is a classic example of the barriers to “effective” climate change adaption. In order to locate the complex on the foreshore the shire is prepared to spend an estimated \$5-10 million dollars for protection of the building and relocation of other community assets when a sensible solution would be save this cost and locate the complex inland.

The Shire has prepared argument to support its case which includes being on a 7 day bus route, the complex needs to be in a high profile position, and in an attractive site and location. However there are many council aquatic centres in Melbourne (at least 20) which do not meet these requirements.

The main thrust for the location of the pool on the foreshore comes from the shire administration, the local councillor who has managed to obtain the support of other councillors, and the State Local Member. It is concerning that this small group of people, who have influence in the local scene, can jeopardise the Victorian and Australian Government’s thrust on community acceptance of climate change and sea level rise.

The location for the complex is a classic example of an organisation expressing concern about climate change and sea level rise but when it comes to implementing an action the concern is rhetoric and other factors such as perceived political and personal kudos are more important.

The Productivity Commission Issues Paper (October 2011) page 7 states:

“A barrier is something that could reduce the willingness or capacity of individuals, businesses or other organisations to adapt to the impacts of climate change. The existence of such barriers may mean that the community does not adapt to climate change as effectively as it might otherwise, or could embark on the wrong sort of adaptation. ”

A proposal such as siting the non-coastal dependant, “the largest building project undertaken by the Mornington Peninsula Shire” on the foreshore totally negates any work that governments can do to convince the community that climate change and sea level rise is a concern to be addressed now and not sometime in the distant future.

Yours faithfully

Dr Alan Nelsen
Secretary, Mornington Peninsula Ratepayers’ and Residents’ Association Inc.

Attachment 1. Copy of report from The Age, 6 December 2011
Attachment 2. Completed cover sheet

Attachment 1. Copy of the report from The Age

MP's pool push starts a wave of protest in Rosebud

Miki Perkins

December 6, 2011



Ban the pool: Rosebud locals are angry about a proposed swimming pool development on the foreshore of Port Phillip Bay. Photo: Wayne Taylor

A COUNCIL plan to build a large swimming pool complex on the Rosebud foreshore will set a dangerous precedent for developments along Victoria's coastline, residents say.

In a tight 6-5 vote Mornington Peninsula Council has agreed to lodge a coastal management strategy for Rosebud - which includes the aquatic centre on the foreshore - with Environment Minister Ryan Smith.

A pool in Rosebud has been on the cards for about eight years, but resident groups say the process is now being rushed through without proper consultation because local state MP and Education Minister Martin Dixon is in favour of the proposal. He recently organised a meeting with Mr Smith, the Department of Sustainability and the Environment and the council to accelerate the process.

The council is yet to develop a detailed plan for the aquatic centre - which is likely to be in the region of 5000 square metres - or undertake appropriate costings, but it must first establish if the minister will allow the construction of a pool on a foreshore.

Dr Alan Nelsen, secretary of the Rosebud Ratepayers and Residents Association, said the council had assured residents it would collaborate with them to produce a draft plan but surprised many when it announced a month ago that the plan would be going before the council.

"If this pool goes on the foreshore then what sorts of other developments does it set a precedent for - basketball stadiums, cinemas, schools, hospitals?" Dr Nelsen asked.

The Victorian Coastal Strategy states that new developments must be coast dependent or, if not, bring a net community benefit.

Commonwealth modelling showed the Rosebud foreshore area would be one of the first to be inundated in the event of sea-level rise, Dr Nelsen said.

Councillor Tim Rodgers, who voted against the plan, said the department had repeatedly asked the council over a number of years to demonstrate why the project was coast-dependent.

"They always said, 'no, no, no', so what has changed?" Cr Rodgers asked.

Mr Dixon said he estimated about 90 per cent of the local community were in favour of a pool, and the foreshore location had good public transport links. Even if Mr Smith approved it, it would still go through a proper planning process, he said.

"The community has been waiting for it for years and years," he said.

The area where the pool is likely to go includes a community hall, a preschool and a bowling club. It is unclear what will happen to those: Some councillors say they will remain or be incorporated into the new development, others insist they will have to move.

Cllr David Gibb, who voted for the plan, said it was "mischievous" to suggest these facilities would have to move.

The coastal management strategy had been sent to the Environment Minister because the council needed to know if he would approve of the location in principle before pushing ahead with expensive and detailed designs, he said.

A DSE spokeswoman said it would ensure the draft coastal strategy met all the Coastal Management Act requirements.



This reporter is on Twitter [@perkinsmiki](https://twitter.com/perkinsmiki)