

DRAFT – 29 AUGUST 2006

Edithvale-Seafood Wetlands Technical Reference Group

Minutes: 29 August 2006 meeting held at Edithvale Bowling Club

Meeting opened at 7:15pm

Independent Chair: John Arup, Arup Environmental and Planning

Minutes: Toni Meek, Melbourne Water

Attendees:

Carolyn Briggs, Victorian Boonerwung Elders Land Council

Rebecca Cohen (City of Kingston)

David Danner (local resident)

Graham Malcolm (Aspendale Gardens Residents Association Inc)

John Ronke (Ward Councillor, City of Kingston)

Jane Satchwell (Mordialloc Schools Cluster)

Andrew Silcocks (Birds Australia)

Michael Walker (local resident)

Les Williams (Friends of Edithvale-Seafood Wetlands Inc)

Paul Minifie (Minifie Nixon)

Melbourne Water:

Wayne Charlton

Toni Meek

Salyana Williams

Observers:

Genevieve Moore (Kilbreda College)

Michael Moore (Friends of Edithvale-Seafood Wetlands Inc)

Michael Ryan (local resident)

1. Welcome and Introductions:

John Arup welcomed everyone to the meeting

Apologies:

Mark Juler (City of Kingston), Greg Bain (Melbourne Water)

2. Minutes of the last meeting:

The minutes of the previous meeting were confirmed by everyone present.

3. Project Status and Ramsar approvals process update: Wayne Charlton (Melbourne Water)

Presented a project update (see presentation attached).

A key item was the preparation of the submission for EPBC Act approval (scheduled for completion within two-three weeks) to the Department of Environment and Heritage who have indicated that information to be used in consideration of the site's buffer zones will include the Victorian Civil and Administrative (VCAT) Tribunal decision in relation to the Austin Road development at Seaford. It was noted that the site's Ramsar Management Plan review scheduled for next year will also provide an opportunity to clarify buffer zones.

Les Williams asked whether the Wannarkladdin Wetland could be included in the Ramsar site. Wayne said this would be best dealt with in next year's Ramsar Management Plan review.

Wayne confirmed that copy of the submission for EPBC Act approval would be made available to technical reference group members.

In relation to the proposed site of the car park, Wayne said that Melbourne Water had noted local residents' feedback provided via their representatives on the technical reference group. He has made approaches to VicRoads and Kingston Council and is awaiting their formal advice, to be considered with all other feedback in the functional design process.

Les Williams asked if Melbourne Water could just say "no" to the car park on the northern side. Wayne said Melbourne Water would consider all options noting that the revised proposal tabled by residents' representatives does increase the overall footprint for the site; however, it will be considered, along with all other suggestions in the functional design process for the centre.

4. Functional Design Requirements (Paul Minifie):

The main agenda item for the meeting was a brainstorming session to compile ideas from the reference group in relation to what they thought would be good for people to do in and around the Discovery Centre. Notes are attached, as Appendix 1.

Wayne confirmed that, where practicable, Melbourne Water would incorporate suggestions in the functional design, and provide feedback in relation to those suggestions that could not be incorporated.

Paul confirmed that for the centre's interpretive displays, Cunningham Martyn Design (who presented at the May reference group meeting) would seek technical reference group contributions.

5. Information protocols:

Wayne reminded reference members to report to their respective groups represented on the items discussed.

It was also clarified it was not the role of observers attended meetings to report to any groups to which they might be affiliated (this was the role of technical reference group representatives).

6. Questions from the floor:

Michael Ryan:

- asked if there would be a restriction on tourist numbers in the buffer zone as he has concerns about tourism impacts.

Wayne clarified that the intention was for the Discovery Centre to be an educational, not a tourist, facility.

- asked where water would be sourced for a proposed lake in the concept plan drawing. Michael mentioned the Chelsea Heights Drain in the vicinity as a possible source.

Wayne and Paul agreed.

- Said he would be petitioning for more resident involvement in this project.

Genevieve Moore

- noted the importance of how the environmental impacts were managed and saw the actual building/displays as secondary to an experience of the wetlands themselves.
- asked if there would be a facility for students to undertake microscope examinations of the water.

Paul Minifie said there could a small laboratory room to do such examinations.

- enquired about the future of the existing bird hide and suggested the idea of mounted protected cameras on the roof of the bird hide / centre to film birds.

This will be considered, along with all feedback, in the functional design process.

Les Williams

- noted the excellence of the Kilbreda College programs.

7. Other business:

Toni handed out copies of the Edithvale-Seafood Wetlands Community Liaison Committee newsletter and copies of *The Source* magazine.

8. Next Meeting:

No date was set but it was agreed it would likely be in the next few weeks.

As agreed earlier, Melbourne Water will provide around three weeks' notice.

9. Meeting close:

John Arup thanked everyone for their attendance and closed the meeting at 9:20pm.

Edithvale-Seaford Wetlands Technical Reference Group

29 August

**Functional Design Requirements
(Notes of Brainstorming Session – agenda item 4)**

What do you think would be good for people to do in and around the Discovery Centre?

- Question is what they shouldn't do! FoESW against BBQ facilities (drink, rubbish). Public simply end up using it, with activity occurring around bird migration times. Walks are most appropriate.
- Outside gathering area for students (could be up to 90 at a time, although visits would be controlled via Melbourne Water education programs booking system). Seating, somewhere safe and 'controlled', but relaxed. Need toilet facilities - preferably within the building. Need to corral school groups. Building needs to be open when schools visit.
- Could the 'meeting' area be interior to the structure? Courtyard? At least separated from the public areas to limit vandalism. Need to keep away from Edithvale Rd. Needs to be comfortable - seating, shade.
- Concerns raised regarding sharps found around existing bird hide in garden - may also be a problem here.
- Toilets should be close to front door. Dual access preferred - both inside and outside (muddy shoes etc.)
- Some outdoor displays or interpretation to engage students.
- Wheelchair access is required. Disabled/elderly access.
- Application to Council as alcohol free zone. Will allow police the power to move people on.
- Don't want to lose the open space between houses and wetlands. Keep the area inviting – maintain passive recreation.
- How is facility to be secured?
 - Behind a fence? Problems with vandalism and arson. Fencing may be negative, but may have better results from a security perspective. Asking for trouble if not fenced.

- Motion sensing lights to deter vandals.
- Investigate what has been used for security at other education centres. Video surveillance? Dummy cameras?
- Promote sense of local community ownership – possibility of early youth involvement. Local schools are involved in the development of the centre – other possibilities include scouts, guides, and drop-in centres? Kiwanis, Rotary involvement? Junior Rangers program (environment focus).

What building features would you consider important to incorporate into the design?

- Five star energy rating. Whatever can be incorporated realistically.
- Sensitive to natural environment, in building form and colour. Use dominant colours from the surrounding environment.
- No overriding need for general community facility, as the area is well serviced for community space at present. Priority should be for those directly involved in the wetlands and associated programs.
- Interpretive exhibits – FoESW prefers displays that are ‘push button’ - audio-visual displays, interactive displays and screens.
- Space required for student displays - submissions, artwork (eg material sent to FoESW, that was tabled as examples).
- Cater for both primary and secondary students. Secondary students require a higher degree of sophistication. Projectors and multimedia facilities?
- Moveable walls for creating breakout areas or smaller useable spaces.
- Would future education programs be modified to incorporate space and technology (i.e. is current FoESW program restricted by current infrastructure?)
- Could interpretive displays reflect the six indigenous seasons/related activities, landscape and language. Impact of flooding/fire in the area.
- Kitchenette facility - not for general use, but use of key groups directly involved with the centre / programs (eg FoESW, Birds Australia, Melbourne Water)
- PABX and server room facility.
- Must be low key – do not want the building to ‘grow’ too big.
- ESD features. Natural lighting.

What activities do we feel comfortable with occurring in the immediate surrounds of the centre?

- Paths around the wetland as a walk might be ideal, but need to look at the location of the existing paths.
- South side is the controlled site from a historical perspective, and the northern wetland has been the traditional 'open' access area.
- Residents' representatives who had earlier presented a revised proposal for the car park and picnic facilities indicated that the car park could be retained on the south side of Edithvale road (according to the current draft concept plan) if the proposed BBQ facility is eliminated.