

Ordinary Meeting of Council 2 September 2020

The following statements were submitted prior to the meeting. Submissions made live during the meeting include some variations and can be listened via our live stream webpage:

<http://webcast.portphillip.vic.gov.au/archive.php>

Fraser Read Smith - Item 7.3 Joint letter regarding inadequate vehicle parking - G12+ Domain Precinct Residents Group

This submission seeks the replacement of the loss of 120 car spaces which will be removed from north Albert Road as part of the new Anzac Station development.

This will see vehicle parking bays (including loading bays) dramatically reduced in number from 136 currently (and more than 150 before station construction commenced) to approximately 30 in total. This represents a 78% reduction.

By comparison, apartment numbers in north Albert Road have increased by 743 to 1,077 since 2015 -or by 223% -a major increase by any measure.

In addition, six other properties are likely candidates for future redevelopment as high-rise apartment towers. This would add a further 1,000 plus apartments to this section of Albert Road -consistent with its designation as an area for high-density development.

So, residents on north Albert Road are faced with the prospect of there being 2,000 plus apartments in the street and just 30 on-street vehicle parking bays.

Accordingly, greatly increased apartment development in north Albert Road is being juxtaposed by an enormous reduction in on-street parking bay availability. The two are entirely inconsistent.

Furthermore, it is likely that another 720 vehicle parking bays will be lost from the sub-precinct with the proposed re-development of two commercial car parks, one in Bowen Crescent/Lane and the other in Palmerston Crescent. Both within a stone's throw of north Albert Road.

What will be the consequences of these changes to north Albert Road?

The limited number of vehicle parking bays on the western side of north Albert Road currently leads to traffic conditions which are unsafe for motorists and pedestrians alike. I refer you to the photographic evidence.

With the completion of the Anzac Station project; the large-scale reduction in vehicle parking bay availability, together with significantly increased vehicle and pedestrian traffic will further exacerbate this situation and lead to even greater traffic chaos and safety issues.

The proposed parking plans would substantially diminish access to convenient on-street parking, which will negatively impact on the capacity of the many service-providers to meet the service demands of residents and businesses.

This will substantially and negatively impact on the daily lives of residents by making the provision of household services much more difficult to obtain and will be a major negative factor in the quality of their lives. Businesses in the area will be similarly affected.

The daily lives of residents will also be much diminished as visiting by family and friends will be made so much more difficult. For elderly residents in particular, this will be a major negative in the quality of their lives.

Council should seek permanent changes to the planning scheme to ensure appropriate measures are taken to increase the amount of visitor parking, trade and services parking in this vicinity. Furthermore, additional action should be taken by the Council to increase the number of visitor parking spaces in permits across the precinct area.

This issue is very important to the many residents in the sub-precinct and Council should give it careful consideration.

Megs Alston - Item 9.1 Friends of Suai Covalima Friendship Agreement

Thank you for the opportunity to support agenda item 9.1 – The Friendship Agreement between CoPP and Suai/Covalima Municipality in Timor Leste and endorsement of FoS/C Strategic Plan.

CoPP Council and our Port Phillip community have enjoyed a very strong and rich relationship with this area of Timor Leste since the first Friendship Agreement was signed in 2000. The Agreement was renewed in 2010 for another 10 years and since then the Friendship has deepened and the community development in the District of Covalima has begun to flourish after the enormous destruction of life and property in that community that followed the independence referendum in August 1999. This has been due in no small part to the support of Friends of Suai Covalima and Council.

I want to make a few points in support of the recommendation:

1. Friends of Suai/Covalima's new Strategic Plan 2020-2025 which you have before you, and which we are calling a Strengthening Strategy, is aimed at encouraging sustainability for the Covalima Community Centre in Suai over the next few years and contains targets to reduce the percentage of funding provided to the CCC and targets for FoSC to increase the amount of donations through fundraising. The Strategic Plan contains clear measures by which we can gauge our success.
2. The agreement is formally signed by the two administrations, here and in Covalima, but goes beyond that as it is also an agreement between citizens in Port Phillip and Covalima. It is facilitated by Council but goes beyond Council in its implementation. The Friendship agreement is highly valued in Covalima and it helps us to raise funds here for development programs, as we are seen to have the backing of Council.
3. This agreement does not impose any financial or budgetary obligations on Council but rather, it is a framework within which funding and financial support can be provided.
4. We have managed successfully to celebrate our 20th Anniversary this year, despite the restrictions: our 20th Anniversary webinar celebration and launch of the 20 years booklet was well attended as was the online launch last week of Ann Wigglesworth's book about the 20 years of Friendship, attended by 85 people. Having these events online meant that Councillors here and our friends in Suai were able to join in together.
5. This Friendship, and the present strength of the Community Centre are a real legacy program of the CoPP and we shouldn't jeopardise that legacy by declining to renew the Friendship Agreement.

On behalf of FoSC I want to thank the Council for its continued support during this difficult period and I ask Council to agree to sign a new Friendship Agreement and to endorse the FoS/C draft Strategic Plan.

Leslie Rosenblatt - Item 9.3 In Our Backyard Implementation - Proposed Common Ground Project

Thanks for the opportunity. My name is Leslie Rosenblatt and I reside in Elwood.

I want to congratulate Tony Keenan and Gary Spivak for their deft and hard-won achievement in effectively delivering their expertise to Council for this important step forward in the implementation of the IOBY's policy objectives. There is still a very long and hard road to travel for the Council to assist the households of this municipality, (of which 7000 or 18% were experiencing housing-related stress in 2016, and where home ownership was unaffordable for people below the 70% mark of the income range at that time and less than 1% of private rental housing was deemed affordable). And now with the huge Covid-19 pandemic related slump in incomes and employment the fact that such an important and creative common group project is to flourish in Wellington St, St Kilda provides hope that even more will be achieved by this Council in the future when both State and Federal Governments understand the need to step up to the vastly important employment and construction opportunities realisable through much increased public investment in social and affordable housing. With tourism and the arts and hospitality and the gig economy all in tatters presently, the construction of social housing is going to prove crucial to our community. The Council should have many more opportunities in 2021-24 to leverage off the other levels of government in relation to affordable housing developments. The Council's housing review consultants, SGS, who estimated in 2018 that by 2025, even if the IOBY target of 920 new units was achieved, it would only represent 14% of the required expansion of social housing in CoPP, producing a shortfall of 6540 dwellings had not factored in the effects of the pandemic, but they may have underestimated the potential of this Council build on its legacy of creativity and leadership in this field.

Doug Whitby, Melbourne Trailable Yacht Club - Item 12.2 St Kilda Marina - Proposed New Lease Agreement - Review of Submissions

Melbourne Trailable Yacht Club have based their sailing activity from St Kilda Marina for the past 40 years. Trailable yachts offer affordable sailing without the expenses of regular slipping and antifouling. MTYC attracts a diversity of members from all walks of life, unified in their love of sailing. We welcome new members and invite the public to try sailing on Discover Sailing days organised by the Victorian Trailable Yacht Division (TYD) of Australian Sailing.

On Thursday nights during daylight saving, MTYC runs informal social races from the Marina, using members' boats which are stored mast-up on their trailers & can be quickly launched in the hard stand area. The social races last around an hour and a half, so the racing finishes before sunset. A BBQ is then enjoyed on the deck of the Coast Guard station, to which MTYC annually donates a \$500-\$1000 from funds raised at the BBQs.

We are particularly concerned with the lack of notification & engagement the marinas hardstand tenants, & regular users have received, as well as the clear disconnect these plans have with the Councils Community Engagement Report (April 2019), & Site Vision & Objectives.

The St. Kilda Marina Project Stage Three Community Engagement Report (April 2019) states "Many participants expressed concern about the removal of hardstand storage particularly regarding trailable yachts as they cannot be easily stored in dry boat storage."

The document goes on to find that the idea of "improving the dry boat storage with an increased capacity to meet demand and removing the need for hard stand storage"

“received the lowest levels of support”. The report shows that only 46% of 353 respondents supported or strongly supported the removal of the hardstand.

The document goes on to state that 64% of participants “felt that diverse storage options would be ideal”.

MTYC & its members clearly fall within The Site Vision & Objectives, for “A special place on the foreshore for everyone that welcomes a diversity of sustainable uses anchored by a working marina.”

The Social & Cultural Objectives

To create opportunities and flexible spaces for active and passive recreation, quiet enjoyment and culture, welcoming people to spend more time and build community connections, is what our Club has been doing at the marina for the past 40 years in a highly environmentally friendly manner.

The hardstand storage facilitates greater yacht usage, along with the option of yacht ownership for residents of increasingly high density living, and has been a historic feature of the working marina.

In Balancing the relationship between public and commercial uses across the site. There has been a severe lack of interaction with the marina’s hardstand tenants, that makes a mockery of any argument of balance or relationship.

The proposition of a bridge across the marina entrance would totally negate this facility’s important function as a safe harbour for not only trailable yachts, but any of the large power boats that also frequent this marina. The Marina upgrade at RMYS just up the road proves that with a bit of vision & forethought the yachts, colour & movement of a marina can be the attraction to public interaction, & interest, not the deterrent these proposed plans imply.

I’d like to thank the Council for the opportunity to speak & remain hopeful that a compromise can be reached with the proposed redevelopment.

Alan Kaaden - Item 12.2 St Kilda Marina - Proposed New Lease Agreement - Review of Submissions

My wife and I have been fortunate to have had a trailer sailer yacht for the last 22 years, that we store at St. Kilda Marina’s hardstand area during the sailing season.

We derive a lot of pleasure being able to quickly launch from St. Kilda marina, and get out sailing.

However this will stop if the current proposed Marina changes proceed, as all trailable boats shall be evicted.

The Melbourne Trailable Yacht Club (MTYC) will be effectively evicted from the marina, as they rely on stored trailable yachts attending their events. That yacht club has been operating out of the marina for over 40 years, and runs weekly events during the sailing season.

The Council’s Site Vision for this proposal is ‘A special place on the foreshore for everyone that welcomes a diversity of sustainable uses anchored by a working marina.’

Your plans do not provide “a special place for everyone” as you are evicting lower budget yachting and boating people,

Your “diversity of sustainable uses” is questionable, given the only dry storage remaining is forklift rack storage of motor boats, whilst removing all hardstand areas for trailable yachts and boats. Yachts are more sustainable than motor boats.

Your chosen option of the complete removal of over 130 lower cost hardstand areas, had the least support in your own survey of the various options.

The proposal includes removal of two of the three existing ramps, which is in conflict with your stated aims to “provide additional capacity for public boat launching in peak periods”. • The proposal’s mandatory change is to relocate the Bay Trail for cycling and pedestrian access to the seaward hardstand side of the marina, with a potential future access bridge over the marina entrance as a very likely outcome from public pressure.

The “Elephant in the Room”, is a that bridge over the marina entrance would require a minimum of 12m clearance for yachts to pass underneath, and 170m long ramparts either side to comply with the maximum Australian Standard wheelchair slope of 1:14.

The visual impact, size, complex engineering design for high wind loads and substantial costs of such a piled bridge, would force a reduction in height by the Council. Any reduction below 12m would then permanently exclude yachts using the Marina, with safety concerns during sudden storms. Any reduction below 6-7m clearance would also permanently exclude large motor boats with a flybridge, and large fishing charters. The Marina would then become a haven for small motor boats and jet skis, with more noise pollution.

The haste at which this unexpected proposal evicting all trailable yachts and boats in hardstand areas has been finalised during the lockdown, has surprised many people in the yachting community. We request a re-think to maintain 20-30 trailable yacht positions within the complex, as well as yachting representatives included within any ongoing community consultations.

30 trailable spots would take up some 2,300 square metres of the 80,000 square metres of the Marina lease. Surely this could be incorporated into the Marina’s footprint as a more balanced outcome?

Alternatively, there was the second option passed over by Council, of retaining viable hardstand areas.

Who does not love watching sailing boats out on the Bay?

Adrian Cassar, speaking to item 12.2 St Kilda Marina - Proposed New Lease Agreement - Review of Submissions

Floating Pontoon removal. Viewing the proposed plans and pictures, I cannot see the existing floating pontoon on the left hand side facing Northwards towards the lighthouse. I urge the committee to retain the floating pontoon as removing it creates additional stress and to the many users of the Marina and also makes launching and retrieving non motorised boats dangerous.

Why is this a safety concern?

1. **Launching.** The type of boat that I have requires to be launched unmanned with two people holding long ropes to let the boat roll off the trailer. The boat surges forward into the water and the two ropes, one at the front, one at the rear, guide the boat onto the floating pontoon. Here the two people have to walk from the boat ramp to the pontoon then hop on to the pontoon and also onto the boat to prepare the boat for sailing. The process is around twenty minutes. Such tasks include putting the engine into the water, lowering the keel via hand winch into the water and also lowering the steering rudder into the water. Until these tasks are completed, the boat is unusable as it cannot be driven or steered and by the very nature cannot be done on land in the pre-launch rigging area. It is

illegal in Victoria for a person to be on board a sail boat during the launch and retrieval to a trailer procession. The current proposal requires the boat to be floated off the trailer and swung around the right hand corner. Whilst this is possible, it requires a vacant space on the pier for the boat to be tied up to. On busy days, which is pretty much every weekend over summer, the existing floating pontoons are quite busy and full. This makes handling an unmanned and unsteerable vessel quite tricky and hence potentially damaging if it scrapes past someone else's boat. This is a significant point of difference to powered boats such as fishing boats and Jetski type PWC watercraft which can be driven straight off the trailer under self-power and self steer its way to a space anywhere it likes to tie up to.

2. **Retrieving.** After a day's outing on the bay, the boat enters the Marina and ties up at **the** floating pontoon whilst awaiting the car and boat trailer. The preferred pontoon is the one on the left hand side facing the Light House as this pontoon directly aligns with a car and trailer and the awaiting boat. During this time, for sail boats, the steering rudder is raised out of the water, as is the engine and keel. This makes the vessel unsteerable. The boat cannot have a person on board when retrieving as it is explicitly illegal here in Victoria. The only way to put the boat onto the trailer is by two people with long ropes, one at the front of the boat and one at the rear, to walk the boat to the trailer. The boat cannot be steered or motored to the trailer. Under the current proposal without the floating pontoon, then this becomes a very difficult operation, particularly on busy days where boats are both launching and retrieving simultaneously as the single pontoon on the right hand side facing the light house may be chocker block with boats awaiting to use the ramp. In addition, there is the recognition of the psychology of people who may be tired, sunburnt, or even seasick from a day's outing and unfortunately tempers can be (and have been) frayed especially where slow boats to retrieve such as sail boats hold up the relatively quick power boats and PWC craft.

Solution

As I see it, there are two alternatives which will greatly reduce the concentration of boats at the ramp.

1. **Separate defined Lanes on the Ramp.** Most public boat ramps have a launch and a separate retrieval ramp. That is a two laned ramp with a short floating ramp on each side, one on the right and one on the left. This separates the boats which are going into the water and the boats going out of the water. It gives structure to all users of the ramp as it is obvious what to do and is consistent with pretty much all other boat ramps around Australia. In addition, for those boats which do not require a jetty to launch, they can back into the middle of the ramp and drive the boats on or off their trailer. This also assists with greatly reducing congestion as it does not interfere with the left or right hand pontoons.

Retain existing Floating Pontoon. The second alternative is to retain the existing floating pontoon on the Left hand side facing the Light House. This is better than nothing but not as suitable as option a) above and does not improve the current status quo if increased boating activities are anticipated and expected. However, if the floating pontoon is removed, then I am concerned this makes launching and retrieving quite difficult and lowers the safety at the ramp by making the process more dangerous.

Vikki Grimley - Item 12.2 St Kilda Marina - Proposed New Lease Agreement - Review of Submissions

I am a member of a community sailing club that cruises and races small sailing boats out of the St Kilda marina. This is a grass roots club, not a fancy or wealthy yacht club. The boats are typically between 18 to 25 feet in length.

In my experience, the St Kilda Marina is by far the safest rigging and launching site for small sailing boats in this part of the Bay. I have 2 major concerns about the current plans for the marina. Firstly, the area for rigging and de-rigging the boats is being significantly reduced, and secondly, the removal of one of the 2 floating pontoons which would make getting sailing boats in and out of the water very difficult and potentially dangerous.

On the first point, there needs to be adequate area in the grounds for our club and other boaties to rig the boats, get them into the water, park and later get the boats out of the water and de-rig them. The rigging and derigging process for a sailing boat each takes about an hour. The process can't be sped up because we can't raise the mast until the boats are at the marina. The current plans only seem to show space for 4 cars and trailers which will be grossly inadequate for all the boats (powered and sailing) which typically get launched at the Marina from Spring through to Autumn, especially Oct through to April.

On the second point, the launching process for sailing boats is tricky because it has to be controlled by 2 ropes (one at the front, and one at the rear) controlled by people on the land. No-one is allowed in a sailing boat during the launching or retrieval process. Therefore we need pontoons near the ramp so we can manage this process and tie up the boats while the car is being parked and to get the motor as well as the steering equipment (keel and rudder) in the water. The current plans appear to remove one of the 2 floating pontoons (namely the one near Riva) making the launching and retrieval process difficult and potentially dangerous.

These 2 issues could be addressed fairly easily by tweaking the current plans namely, by increasing the proposed space for rigging and de-rigging boats and by leaving the existing pontoons in place.

Peter Holland – Item 12.2 St Kilda Marina - Proposed New Lease Agreement - Review of Submissions

I support the proposed lease. I wish to address two matters

- (1) The removal of hardstand storage for trailable yachts and
- (2) The Bridge

(1) The removal of hardstand storage for trailable yachts

The current marina is a higgledy-piggledy collection of run down buildings and is perceived largely as a private area. It is not welcoming of the general public.

It is legitimate for the Council to develop the new marina, not just for the boating community, but also for the general public. The legislation controlling the marina is the *St. Kilda Land Act* 1965. The Act includes this in the definition of a marina: 'an area where facilities are provided for ... the recreation, comfort and convenience of ... members of the public'.

Council's vision for the marina in the Site Brief is: 'A special Place on the foreshore **for everyone** (my emphasis) that welcomes a diversity of sustainable uses anchored by a working marina'. It is completely proper for the new lease to offer many benefits for the general public. One benefit is that it provides bucket-loads of public open space.

In particular, the hardstand for boats behind the dry storage building is replaced by a shared pathway and plantings. This throws open to the general public the peninsular leading to the beacon. This enables the public to enjoy the best views of the Bay in Melbourne. I acknowledge that this is a hardship for the boat owners who have enjoyed a privatised use of the area. But there are other ways that their needs can be satisfied.

2. The Bridge

Council's expert witness on Urban Design, Professor Rob McGauran, submitted to the Independent Panel on the Planning Scheme Amendment that a bridge over the marina mouth would be a wonderful extension to the Bay Trail. However he also said that because this conferred a broad public benefit, the funding for this should come from the public purse, not the marina operator. A bridge would be expensive as it would have to be retractable to provide for boats with tall masts and boats seeking shelter from the storm.

In its wisdom, Council failed to provide sufficient commercial incentives for AMDC to include a bridge over the marina mouth in its successful proposal. This was a 'nice to have', not a 'have to have'. But there is an opportunity to provide a bridge at a later stage.

It appears that Council will receive an appropriate market rental, unlike the current position. AMDC will pay a base rent of \$750,000 pa (indexed), about three times more rent than at present (after the initial four years at a reduced rent of \$134,000).

Council is not free to treat this rental income as part of its general revenue. The St Kilda Land Act gives Council power to enter into a long-term lease but imposes restrictions on what Council can do with its rental income.

Section 6(2) of the St Kilda Land Act states that:

The moneys received by way of premium or rent in respect of any such lease shall be applied by the council of the City of St. Kilda towards the maintenance and improvement of so much of the land which is subject to the Orders in Council referred to in this Act and of which it is the committee of management as is not leased under this Act or for such other purposes as the Minister in any particular case approves.

It is appropriate that a significant proportion of the Council's rental income be pledged to the future construction of a bridge. I suggest that Council should hypothecate \$100,000 for the first four years and \$250,000 each subsequent year towards building a bridge in the future.

Ron Parker - Item 12.2 St Kilda Marina - Proposed New Lease Agreement - Review of Submissions

Following the Q&A session on Thursday 30 August regarding the St Kilda Marina project, I searched emails and found the email response from Council regarding my submission made in 2018. I had expressed interest to be kept informed about this project and regrettably this has not occurred during the evolution of the project over the last two years.

I have not received any further updates (myself and other trailable yacht owners) suggests that the consultation process has been flawed and therefore the final plan is flawed and doomed to failure.

Having stored a boat at St Kilda Marina for more than 15 years, and being a local resident of East St Kilda, I find this lack of consultation extremely disappointing.

The St Kilda Marina Project Community Engagement Report noted that there was significant opposition to the removal of the hard stand storage.

So why did Council continue with this complete removal of the hard stand storage?

One now suspects that there are other motives driving this project and the need to keep a close reign on the proposal to abolish all hard stand boat storage, extend the Bay Trail through the current boat storage space and consider a bridge over the Marina entrance.

I submit the following points to be considered by Council in making decisions about the future lease and development of this Marina:

Engagement / Consultation

- Council's lack of genuine engagement with key stakeholders has alienated this community of people that have historically used the marina, in particular, the boat owners that store boats on trailers with masts up (trailable yachts) at the rear of the Marina's boat storage sheds.
- The current occupants in the Marina, should be considered project partners and not project stakeholders.
- These people have invested significantly over many years and are in fact the life of a working marina.
- Did Council consider engaging more directly with this community of boat owners in the various planning phases of the project, particularly after the initial feedback?
- NO – COUNCIL SHOULD HAVE EXPLORED A DIRECT ENGAGEMENT WITH THESE PEOPLE
- Council's Community Engagement Report note *"Many participant comments expressed concern about the removal of hardstand storage particularly regarding trailable yachts as they cannot be easily stored in dry boat storage. This was a common response made by trailable yacht owners"*.

Removal of the hard-stand open boat storage area

- The proposed 100% removal of hard-stand open boat storage is an outrageous grab of land that was literally created for the Marina. The land was reclaimed to build the Marina.
- Giving some public access to this space would be reasonable but not at the 100% loss of hard stand storage.
- Council must reconsider the overall precinct plan to accommodate the displaced community of trailable yacht boat owners.
- A COMPROMISE DESIGN SOLUTION IS POSSIBLE

The site vision – a special place on the foreshore for everyone that welcomes a diversity of sustainable uses anchored by a working marina

- A working marina should include some space for mast up boat storage.
- Trailable yachts cannot be stored in dry stack storage – this is not practiced anywhere.
- Trailable yachts fall into the site vision phrase – *"a diversity of sustainable uses"*
- St Kilda Marina is already a special place – there are very few public marina facilities in metropolitan Melbourne that accommodate trailable yachts – don't take this function away.

The Civic Heart

- This key space must be kept primarily to serve the function of a public boat ramp facility in the Marina.
- The space cannot be reduced to accommodate public open space without giving more detailed consideration to the spatial requirements for boat preparation prior to launching and boat preparation after retrieving and hitting the road. Refer to the vision – a working marina
- Concepts of creating a performance space in the vicinity of the public boat ramp are at odds with the vision – a working marina.

St Kilda Marina has such a significant history and City of Port Phillip has a responsibility to ensure that the Marina's future is sustainable. The current lease and concept plan needs to

be revisited to address the points raised above and ensure that the Marina does have a sustainable future and truly realizes the site vision.

Given the missed opportunity for earlier ongoing engagement, I strongly request that I continue to be informed and kept updated on the project.

Finally,

I would welcome the opportunity to work with Council, specialist designers and the proposed lease, to inform and resolve some of the points raised above.

Michael Greaves - Item 12.2 St Kilda Marina - Proposed New Lease Agreement - Review of Submissions

What hope will our grandchildren have when councillors in the city of Port Phillip elected on environmental promises vote to remove the last facility in the bay for dry storage of non-polluting watercraft and increase facility for highly polluting motorboats? What future are you making?

The following statements were submitted prior to the meeting and a summary of the statements were read out during the meeting by the Coordinator Governance.

Adrian Jackson - Public Question Time

1. Events and galleries that can't operate should be defunded, as should organisations that can't meet or carry out their mission. How is Council addressing this?
2. Can Council ban all smoking in shopping strips and outside stand-alone shops forever?
3. Sprayed graffiti has been an unsightly problem in Port Phillip for years and while council offers ratepayer funded paint remove products this does not stop the offenders. What are Councillors going to do to address this issue?
4. Is Council considering cancelling Pride March and foreshore athletic events because of the corona virus. In relation to the funds saved by cancelling the St Kilda festival this money should not be held aside for recovery purpose but returned to general revenue and use for important purpose like reducing residents' expensive council rates. What has council done about making other saving for things that can't happen like Linden Gallery and Gas Works Art Park that will remain closed for at least this financial year?
5. The council want to spend a further \$75,000 on Fitzroy St. What will this money be used for?
6. Pedal bikes use Richardson St with no problem. We have excellent 90 degree car parking which maximised parking availability for all. What would the bike proposal for this area do to that useful arrangement? Why is Council installing electric car charging stations?
7. Do churches and religious groups pay rates?

Mark Pugliese - Item 12.2 St Kilda Marina - Proposed New Lease Agreement - Review of Submissions

1. To lease a hospitality spot for a cafe/restaurant and I'd like it to give a sense of feeling like you're in Venice/Monaco with the marina. I would ask for a larger property, as with it, I'd like to have a lounge area to be used for my aviation tourism business. Which is used to transport customers to the airports for open door helicopter scenic flights and leisure tours - wineries, 12 Apostles, golf trips etc. This

would also be sued for my charity organisation Flights4Kids to advertise our cause and a share of the profits from the tourism business and the cafe/restaurant will be donated to the charity. For the tourism business, think how Skydive Australia works, but without the vehicles and as such.

2. The idea is on the west side of the boat shed, to have a helipad to be used for the helicopter scenic flights and available for emergency services. But also, to consider for the very near future - Uber Air/Elevate terminal for the air taxi services. Those vehicles will be very quiet, so there's no impact with residential properties. For the helicopters, I say west of the new boat shed, as that will block the sound. But with the distance, the open air and road traffic, that will also mask the sound. I know this proposal is very controversial and unlikely to be approved, but can guarantee the open-door helicopter scenic flights which was very popular last summer with no marketing (I will for this summer) and proposal 1 will no doubt bring so many local and visiting tourists to the area and support all associated business at the marina and St. Kilda. It will no doubt provide far more revenue chances during the week when the marina is the quietest. It will help to increase paying traffic.

Peter Tanner - Item 12.2 St Kilda Marina - Proposed New Lease Agreement - Review of Submissions

I have 3 issues that I like to be read by a council officer at the council meeting

1. Peninsula Shed massing

During the final Community Panel voting session, the panel voted on two dry boat storage options, they were "High and short" (15 meters high) received 12 votes and "Long and low" (12 meters high) received 9 votes. All of the documentation provided to the panel indicated that a "high/short option would result in shed massing of approximately 120 meters. Whilst for the "long/low" option would result in shed massing of 160 meters. No vote was made on the current proposal for a "high and long" peninsula shed massing of 240 meters that will ensure that the Peninsula open space is severely restricted. By having peninsula shed massing of the scale contained within the proposal will ensure that the building foot print will dominate the site to the detriment of amenity.

2. Public boat launching site

The proposal sites the public boat launching between two high activity locations, namely the "civic Heart" and the large Riva restaurant. The broader community engagement undertaken by the council noted majority support for the relocation of the boat ramp by moving it closer to the mouth of the marina. The proposal does not have a location close to the Marina entrance, is not away from high activity areas, does not allow for a long queuing for pre-and post launching and is not close to fuelling facility.

3. Commercialism

The proposal provides the council with a base annual rent of \$750,000 the financial details provided to the Community Panel showed that the "total current revenue from the St Kilda Marina lease" was \$170,000 pa.

This substantial increase in council revenue from the Marina lease, represents a quadrupling increase that indicates a commercial focus. This commercial focus is demonstrated by the retention of the BP service station, despite it being specifically prohibited within the site brief.

The site brief also contained a mandatory requirement of up to 3600 sqm of leasable commercial and retail floor area. That figure was based on current leases, where 646sqm meters was allocated to the BP service station. (refer attachment 1 - document dated 10t12t2018)

However, the figure allocated to the BP service station under the proposal is now reported to be 180 sqm a sizeable difference of 466 sqm. (refer attachment 2 - document Page 16 "New long term lease")

This has resulted in materially exceeding the mandatory 3600 sqm of commercial space and has contributed to the proposal containing 7 fixed buildings on Marine Parade, whereas the current fixed buildings on Marine Parade are 4 buildings.