

CORRECTED VERSION

SELECT COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LAND DEVELOPMENT

Apollo Bay — 8 November 2007

Members

Mr D. Davis

Mr P. Hall

Mr P. Kavanagh

Mr E. O'Donohue

Ms S. Pennicuik

Mr B. Tee

Mr E. Thornley

Chair: Mr D. Davis

Deputy Chair: Mr B. Tee

Staff

Secretary: Mr R. Willis

Research Officer: Ms C. Williams

Witness

Mr M. Barrow, manager, economic development, Colac Otway Shire Council.

The CHAIR — Just before you start your evidence, Mike, I just want to put on record the committee's thanks and appreciation for the tour that you conducted earlier. It was an informative tour. I think it is helpful to see things, rather than to just hear things. I invite you to begin your contribution.

Mr BARROW — Thanks, Chair. I would like to reiterate Neil's message to the committee in appreciating the Parliament of Victoria's interest in this sale or alienation or development of public land. It certainly is an important issue to every Victorian. From council's point of view, we are pleased you are in Apollo Bay because this is one of the flashpoints of development in Victoria. It has been under a great deal of development stress over the past few years, and that is particularly expressed in this development that we are using as, say, a case study. I hope the committee directs some of the questions that it directed to Neil to me as well. It seemed that they were beyond the scope of the committee's inquiry. They include issues related to representation of the local community, rate revenue and facilities in a township of less than 2000 people compared to a community with more than 10 000 — in fact 12 000, and a population of 15 000 that it services. I think those issues are beyond what I thought we would be talking about this morning, however, if they are relevant, perhaps I could make some comment later.

Mr TEE — Perhaps not relevant, but it has not stopped us in the past.

The CHAIR — I am not keen to gag committee members and prevent them from asking questions that may be coming from a greater understanding of the issues on the part of the committee.

Mr BARROW — I am just wishing to present a balanced view in putting an alternative view to that. Perhaps I could start where I started with my submission.

The Colac Otway Shire Council believes public land is vital to the social, economic and environmental wellbeing of the whole community. However, it is desirable in some cases to consider development when there is an opportunity to enhance social, economic and environmental wellbeing. It is true to say that this development that we are planning for Apollo Bay is largely about an economic outcome. However, we believe there is some strong community benefit. The development of Apollo Bay harbour has been a long-time priority of the local community, expressed through a series of community consultations going back more than 20 years, and various plans have been proposed. The current plan represents the history of those plans with some added new elements over time. It is evident when you look at all of the plans that they are related in some way. However, it is fair to say that this is the largest imposition on public land that has been proposed to date.

It is certainly true to say that some of the development that is proposed is not coastal dependent. However, the Victorian coastal strategy talks about things being generally coastal dependent. I believe that does not exclude some kind of development where there is a net community benefit. We believe the net community benefit in this case is related to the economic development opportunities for not only the township of Apollo Bay but also the Otways, Colac and the Geelong–Otways region.

We believe Apollo Bay can be an anchor for tourism in the region and attract people not only to visit Apollo Bay who are in that higher spending target area, looking for 5-star accommodation and the like, but also those people who enjoy camping and a less expensive form of accommodation to stay longer. Our typical tourist in Apollo Bay stays one day. We would like them to stay a couple of days, which increases the tourism yield. It costs as much to service a person in a hotel for one day as it does for two days. This kind of infrastructure and facility will encourage people to stay in Apollo Bay for longer and use Apollo Bay as an anchor to explore the Great Ocean Road region and the Otways, whether it is further development in the Otway Fly and other developments that are planned for the future, and also visit the waterfalls and just drive through the Otways.

As a community priority the project became part of the council's plan, so as a local government we are expected to deliver on that plan. When you look at developing the harbour precinct area, we have included a great deal of community consultation. It is fair to say that not every element of the plan was met with enthusiasm. However, when we did our survey for most of the time that survey was out we were receiving pretty fair and even comment from both sides; there was quite a lot of encouragement to continue the development and quite a lot of positive encouragement to pursue all of these elements and to get on with it quickly.

The council has been pursuing that, and it is now at the stage where it is looking at design guidelines and having a feasibility study done on various elements of the project, and then a presentation back to the community and then back to council, hopefully by the end of the year; and subsequent to that we would be seeking funding through

public and private means. The public-private partnership is something we have been encouraged to seek because the development of the harbour, if you took it even in a — —

The CHAIR — Who encouraged you to seek it?

Mr BARROW — We have been encouraged by government. We understand the current government is interested in public-private partnerships. We understand this development, if you took away its commercial elements, would involve some millions of dollars. The council's revenue base is around \$30 million, and one-third of that goes on road maintenance. We just do not have another \$10 million to spend on infrastructure in the Apollo Bay harbour. We are hoping the state government will make a contribution, and we understand that contribution would be encouraged by a partnership with private interests, and the private interest is driven by the development of the hotel. So there is incentive from that point of view for us to be pursuing this to gain a contribution to the public infrastructure, which is that new roadway and the commercial elements and the moving of the commercial activities from the western section over to the eastern section of the harbour. The harbour development roadway looks like a heavy piece of infrastructure, but it does open up the view scope to the township and it does open up a whole lot of walking trails and parking opportunities that we really do need in Apollo Bay when it gets so crowded. The net result is an increase in public space. If you consider it, the golf club is not public open space at this point. That is a point for debate. However, try walking across it today: it is certainly not open to the public. We believe, particularly with the camping area proposed on Point Bunbury to be seasonal, there is a great deal of public space still remaining in this development.

We believe we are taking a minimal approach in the development, and the municipal building proposed in that precinct is simply to reuse the current building that houses the golf club rather than creating another footprint. There is a footprint there; the building will not be used for a golf club, so why not use it for municipal purposes, a small office plus a library? There is some justification, or reasoning at least, behind some of these developments. Rather than going further into the submission — I am sure you have all read it and understand our approach and that we believe it is consistent with state government policy — I guess we could probably go to some further questions.

The CHAIR — Thank you for that contribution. I guess my question to you comes out of the end part of your submission, where you state:

As a principle it is the position of Colac Otway shire that the sale or alienation of public land or open space is only desirable where the social, economic and environmental benefits to the community are enhanced.

Mr BARROW — Yes.

The CHAIR — I would generally accept that principle. I just wondered whether you might explain exactly how you go about making that calculation.

Mr BARROW — A calculation on this project to say where the benefits are?

The CHAIR — In general, but also on this project.

Mr BARROW — Yes, I think in regard to this project we see the social benefit in the increasing community infrastructure. We believe the infrastructure in this particular precinct is underdeveloped. There is limited public access and limited linkages to the precinct. We have included shared trails for walking and cycling and they are looping and linking within that precinct to encourage greater recreational activity. We believe that is a clear social benefit. The swimming pool proposed also has some benefit in serving a local community need. Whether that pool is in fact feasible or not is still open for discussion. We are at the stage at the moment where there is a feasibility being done. The greatest benefit would be that the pool could be heated, but heated pools in this environment are expensive. It may be that that pool is not in fact feasible, but if it was that would provide the benefit. When our feasibility is completed in a couple of weeks we will be able to state that, and maybe that pool disappears from the plan. At this stage it is still a draft plan, it still has not been finalised by council, so there is still opportunity for further discussion.

We believe the boating facilities that we are providing will provide greater access for the community in access to recreational fishing and boating. The new boat ramp will provide a greater facility for getting in and out of the water. There is, we believe, improved parking opportunities and improved facilities for getting boats out of the water, and for maintenance and repair. There is also greater marina space available so I guess we see all those as

contributing to the greater social wellbeing in terms of recreation and community interaction. The environmental outcomes are that we are taking an already significantly damaged or modified environment and seeking to, in changing that environment again, establish indigenous planting, which will restore some parts of this harbour precinct and golf course to a more natural look and feel. The economic outcome I think I have mentioned before in terms of discussing the tourism benefits.

Mr TEE — Thank you for that. I suppose one of the questions that I had of the early witness, the criticism as I see it, goes to process, and the process as I have indicated and my understanding of it is that it has been a number of years, there has been a community board and a number of the consultations have been ongoing. The criticism, as I discern it, is that the process has got some predetermined outcome. I am interested in your view on that; the concern has been raised and you have heard it raised and I would like to get response to it. We have also got I think a witness, Mr Stuckey, this afternoon, who has given us evidence and I will just again, give you a sentence out of his submission where he says:

I find it difficult to comprehend how a municipal council can put forward any proposal that requires the sale or long-term lease of a significant area of public land without first having sought and received the approval of both the community and the government.

I suppose I just want to give you an opportunity to respond to the concerns that have been raised about the process having a predetermined outcome, I suspect.

Mr BARROW — I guess there are two points you make. The predetermined outcome is probably one of the difficulties in talking to community about plans and processes in that you have to provide something for them to have a look at first and so there has to be some work done to present to them. To go to the community and say, 'We are thinking about doing something, what do you think?' would deny the evidence of more than 20 years of discussion and planning and say these things do not exist.

Mr TEE — If you could just give us an outline of a process that has been put in place and the opportunities for the community to have an input into that?

Mr BARROW — I might get back to the other point that Mr Stuckey makes as well in regard to when do you ask permission to do these things. I guess I would be making the same point — that before you ask permission to do something you would first of all present a case. It is difficult to say to the government, 'We would like permission to develop public land'. The first question is, 'What do you want to do?'

The CHAIR — A chicken and an egg.

Mr BARROW — Yes, a chicken and egg thing. Often it is the case where the community wants the process to work the opposite way to which it normally works so that it can have clear evidence that what you are going to do before you start doing it is the right thing to do. It is difficult, I think, because we have to make a start with the plan and then present it from that point of view.

The process started probably about two years ago for the harbour plan development, but at the same time the Apollo Bay structure plan was being done. This is our strategic plan for the township of Apollo Bay. The harbour development was included in the structure plan and so it was presented to the community through that structure plan process. Given that there was an amount of community consultation on the structure plan, and the basis for the harbour development was in the structure plan, we used that as our basis for then starting on the detail of the harbour development. We are saying that there was a strategic planning process over a couple of years that included consultation, that included a plan for the harbour, and then we started a detailed plan of the harbour, which is based on that plan.

As a starting point for the master plan development we developed a capacity study. We engaged a consultant group to look at the capacity of the harbour itself — at what sort of capacity it had to have an increased or changed amount of boating and fishing activities and commercial elements. That was another starting point. Then we started the process of developing the master plan. The process included the formation of an interdepartmental steering group, which includes representatives of Colac Otway shire, DSE, Tourism Victoria, Regional Development Victoria and our consultant group. Then we formed a community reference group; we sought to have a widely representative group of the community. One of the difficulties with that was that some members chose to not attend meetings, and so it became difficult with some of the liaison and correspondence with various groups. But we had separate meetings as we could to try to engage those people. It would have been more desirable had we been able to

get people to attend those meetings. Anyway, as it was the people who did come were able to have an opportunity to engage with the process a number of times.

We presented to the community on a couple of occasions — once on the foreshore here and once in Melbourne — and we sent out the survey forms. The design work was done by our team of consultants based on a brief that said, ‘We want to see some improvement to the infrastructure, some greater public access, certainly a retention of the commercial elements of the harbour and a net community benefit. They started with a number of designs, which lead us to this point.

One of the dilemmas, or difficulties I suppose, with the community getting involved is at which stage and at which point do they get involved? Often it seems to the community that there is a predetermined outcome when they come and see a plan that has already gone some way along. It is probably fair to say that at that stage there is some buy-in by the people who are trying to develop a plan. It is one of those tension points, and it happens all the time. There will always be local controversy when you get development, particularly on public land and in coastal spaces. I have seen that in Torquay, which is my home town and where I was on the foreshore committee for some years. Whenever we tried to do something there was controversy until it was completed and then there was acceptance because of the improved access and infrastructure that was provided. We have seen it in Lorne with Erskine House development, which is a public land private development. Certainly some people would say it is not a good development, some people would — it depends on your perspective. The council had a visit to Williamstown pier, where we saw an area that was certainly underdeveloped some years ago. People who visit now would probably think that has always been there — the Quest apartments and that mixed development around that area. It is certainly accepted as being the normal part of a coastal development.

Mr O’DONOHUE — You talked about the structure plan that has been completed. Mr Longmore in his submission speculated that there is private land available that could be developed for 5-star accommodation or for other tourist accommodation. Is there land privately owned that is appropriately zoned for accommodation?

Mr BARROW — Yes.

Mr O’DONOHUE — And could that accommodate a 5-star hotel?

Mr BARROW — Yes.

Mr O’DONOHUE — Whereabouts?

Mr BARROW — This whole Great Ocean Road strip could all be developed. You can see that it is being done. There is one on the left as you are going out of town, not far from the visitor centre; there is a new hotel being developed. Anyone can purchase land in this precinct and take away the buildings that are there and put a new development. As for free land that has not got anything on it, that is limited, but certainly people want to do that. There is no question that there is other land available.

Mr O’DONOHUE — At this stage, I suppose, the market has not determined that there is a market for that sort of product in the town.

Mr BARROW — Probably not. You are looking at a fairly high cost in purchasing existing properties and developing, but it is happening. You can see it happening.

Mr O’DONOHUE — If it is happening, is it needed then in the harbour?

Mr BARROW — We believe it is necessary for us to gain the private investment in the harbour precinct. We could have the hotel developed anywhere in Apollo Bay, but they are not going to invest in the harbour. If we provide some public land for them on a leased arrangement for 50 years, they get to make some profit out of being in that environment, and they provide us with funds to support the public infrastructure.

Mr O’DONOHUE — You spoke before about the government being supportive of the PPP model and the development as a general concept. When you say government, what do you mean? Is it DSE?

Mr BARROW — We understand that we are talking about the government of the day, which is supportive, generally, of private-public partnerships. That is just the information we have.

Mr O'DONOHUE — But specifically with regard to this project, is government supportive of it?

Mr BARROW — We understand government is supportive of this project through our contact with DSE and Tourism Victoria. They are on our steering group and have been part of discussions right through the early stages, right through this current development. It is fair to say that on that steering group they have been encouraging of us to pursue the development.

Mr O'DONOHUE — Is it fair to say, from what you said earlier, that shires such as Colac Otway do not have the resources to fund this sort of project, and it looks to the state government to assist. The state government is supportive and the state government does not want to fund it, so it looks to assist with funding through a PPP model?

Mr BARROW — That is our general understanding. We would be seeking federal government contribution as well, but initially we will be seeking state government contribution.

Ms PENNICUIK — Just following on a little bit from what Ed asked, you were talking about the development of the harbour. What actually is needed there? As opposed to what is envisaged or planned, what is actually needed?

Mr BARROW — With respect, Sue, it is our contention that all of this is needed. There are very few cheap holiday accommodation options in Victoria any more because there are not a lot of camping grounds. You will see nearby that precinct a housing development that has no houses on it at the moment; it has been subdivided. That was a camping ground. We are saying that there is a need for camping. There is a need for people to have a cheap option for holidays, so that is why that is there.

There is a need for walking trails and recreation trails. That is why that is there. There is a need for parking and public access to the harbour. That is why the road is there. The boardwalks — we would say there is a need for tourism purposes and also for the local community to enjoy that harbour precinct in a greater way. At the moment to enjoy the harbour precinct you walk along either pier. One of those, the eastern pier, is generally speaking not too suitable for a casual walk as it is quite often windy and wet. The other one is something that a lot of people enjoy because they get to see big cray boats unloading. With increasing numbers there is a conflict between the commercial and the tourism use. We provide a boardwalk area for people to sit and enjoy that whole precinct in a public space. With the marina development we believe there is a growth in recreational boating, fishing and yachting. This is a safe harbour and we are providing greater facilities for those people. It is a difficult question for me to answer in that I am closely involved with the project and I see a need for all of this. There may be a view that less could be done, but that would be someone else's perspective.

Ms PENNICUIK — I suppose I am just trying to get at what are the fundamental needs in terms of what the council may see as the upgrades or upkeep of that area. I think you have outlined it.

Mr BARROW — Yes, I do not think I can say any more than I have. I think the core principle is that the harbour is retained as a commercial harbour, the fishing industry is maintained and that there is opportunity for fishing and boating and for greater resources for the people engaged in those activities so they have been retained in the plan. They are essential but where their placement is based on the movement of people in and out of that precinct. I believe it is all interconnected.

Ms PENNICUIK — So you are saying that without the 5- star accommodation you would not be able to afford these?

Mr BARROW — That is the contention at the moment. The feasibility study that is being conducted may reveal a different answer. We have an economist working on that at the moment. We are seeking some fairly good advice on the feasibility study through our consultants Meinhardt Infrastructure and Environment. PWC is doing a peer review of that work. It is our contention that we need it but we are waiting on the evidence.

Ms PENNICUIK — Can you tell me what the harbour-edge buildings are?

Mr BARROW — The harbour-edge buildings are all commercial buildings. We have seen one of them as being desirable for a seafood cafe and interpretative centre for the fishing industry. The others are proposed as shops or restaurants. It is proposed that they be built on demand. When there is a commercial demand the buildings

will be built. It is not envisaged that all of this infrastructure will be built at once. It is envisaged as a 20 year plan so that when the need is there the buildings will be built. It is possible that some of them will not be built for 30 years but we are looking at a plan that at least covers us for 20 years. When, as happens, people come to Apollo Bay saying, 'We want to spend some money to develop the town', we can say, 'Our master plan says you can be here and this is your opportunity. Outside of that you cannot'.

Ms PENNICUIK — In reference to the Victorian Coastal Strategy which says that development on the foreshore should be coastal dependent, why does the council feel it needs to move municipal buildings to the foreshore when it has municipal buildings elsewhere in the town?

Mr BARROW — It does not. That was not a driving force. It was just an opportunity when we saw a building available to move our building, which is in the back streets, into a more visible and pedestrian point so that people could have greater access to those facilities, and also there was a need to build a static library in Apollo Bay. We thought, 'Here is an opportunity'. It was not a driving force. It is not our primary concern; and if that did not happen, it was not going to be an issue. We are not going to invest any funds in doing that. The coastal strategy does talk about 'generally coastal dependent'. We believe that 'generally coastal dependent' means that there may be exceptions. Apollo Bay is a growth node, so there is pressure from tourism, from holiday home development, from residential development. Those pressures in all places like Torquay, Anglesea, Lorne, Apollo Bay and Port Campbell and all of those places mean that there is a need for some compromise to enable this kind of growth to occur.

Ms PENNICUIK — I am aware of all of those towns. I know the area very well. Most of them have the same problem that is here, where the majority of the public land and open space is on the foreshore, so that is why people want to keep it that way. There have been mistakes made elsewhere. I wanted to go off a little bit to the Barwon floodplain issue, and if you could tell me what is the status of the land there as in ownership?

Mr BARROW — There is an amendment to the planning scheme called C29, which has been in development now for a couple of years. It is partly private land and partly owned by the golf club, and it was referred by council to a panel hearing. The panel hearing recommended further information from Barwon Water because the water supply issue is a big one for Apollo Bay, but there was a recommendation to approve the plan. It went to a council meeting, it would have been 25 or 26 October, and some councillors walked from the council chamber to prevent a quorum being formed, and at a subsequent meeting the same thing happened, so it is in limbo at the moment until a further council meeting. It is linked to the harbour development in that it is the future golf course for the township. If there is no alternative golf course, the golf course in its current location will probably stay as long as it needs to be until there is an alternative golf course.

Ms PENNICUIK — I think you mentioned there were about 2000 residents, is that right?

Mr BARROW — There are under 2000 permanent local residents. The latest census data tells us I think it is about 1680 or something like that.

Ms PENNICUIK — He mentions in his submission that 500 ratepayers responded to the survey they had sent out, and in general the proposal was considered to be significant overdevelopment of the area. Can you comment on that? That seems like about a quarter if not more of the — —

Mr BARROW — It seems like an interpretation made by Mr Stuckey that is based on his particular view of the development. If you would like me to forward you the full report on the survey and the results, I could do that. It is certainly true to say that to the point before Otway Forum conducted a meeting where we believe some form of misinformation was provided, the amount of feedback on those forms was 50-50, saying, 'Yes, we like some elements of it. We do not like some elements of it'. It is fair to say that within that positive group there was still some concern about the commercial elements. Following the public forum we had a flood of negative responses. It was evident that a number of those came from the same household, so we have to take some of these comments with a grain of salt. However, there is a full assessment available which I can forward to you, if you wish.

Ms PENNICUIK — Can I follow up what you just said? What misinformation?

Mr BARROW — There was a statement made that we had not consulted with the harbour master, but we had. It was like, 'Well, you have not even talked to the harbour master. How do you know anything about the

harbour?'. But we had consulted with the harbour master. It is fair to say the harbour master does not agree with some of the things that we are proposing. He sees some difficulties, but we are talking about a concept plan, not a detailed design plan. With a detailed design plan, you would go into some of the elements of the design which caused some difficulty. We believe we need some marine engineering advice on various elements of the plan, but you do not build that in. Some of the community are saying, 'You need to do that now' or, 'Why would you spend all that money doing it now when you have not got approval for it yet?'. So you develop a concept plan that says, for instance, 'We are putting the boat ramp here'. When we have the funding to be able to do that, then we will get detailed engineering design works that say, 'Here are some of the difficulties with putting it here. This is what you will need to do to make it work there'.

Mr KAVANAGH — The land that the hotel will be built on, what would be the legal arrangement for that land?

Mr BARROW — It will be a lease with the state government through DSE. The current maximum lease is usually 21 years. We are seeking advice on having an extended lease. We believe a commercial development would not be feasible. We would not be able to attract a commercial development with a lease of 21 years; we would need some longer period and we are hoping for at least 50 years to make that work.

Mr KAVANAGH — Do you anticipate any payment under the lease — ongoing lease payments of 50 years of so?

Mr BARROW — Yes, but there has been no discussion on that at this point.

Mr KAVANAGH — No idea about how much?

Mr BARROW — No.

Mr THORNLEY — I think I get how we got here and I think I understand the problems with the process. I understand the gaps in the tourism market, the yield issues, the public open space requirements. As much as I would like to see the golf course stay there, I am willing to concede that having it as pure open space that anyone can use is probably even more public than the golf course, if you have a better solution for a golf course, which sounds like it is a separate question. I get the cafes and restaurants part, and compared largely to what is there it is not obvious to me that people would object to that. It sounds like Mr Longmore and others have not focused on that with their objections. So I get how we got to where we have got, and a lot of it actually seems quite positive, but it seems like the thing that is sticking in people's craws is the hotel issue. I understand the need for filling the 5-star gap, but, as has been pointed out, that could potentially be filled elsewhere. If I understand your testimony correctly, the reason for wanting to put it there is that it could make a significant economic contribution to the rest of the development. So it is really a question that most of this development seems to be about things that most people are actually in favour of, and the question is how we are going to pay for it, and that one of the options that is being considered is a long-term lease over this space for a hotel development, and presumably the proceeds of that lease would then help fund the development. That is kind of how we got to where we are.

Mr BARROW — Yes.

Mr THORNLEY — I think the question was sort of asked before, and I really have not got the economic feasibility. I am just trying to understand what sorts of dollars do we think are involved in this total development, the whole thing here, and what portion of that would you think is likely to come from the hotel versus — I presume the other leasehold buildings would also help fund the development. I am just trying to get a sense of how central that part is, because it seems to be the part that people are most concerned by and particularly so because — there is something in Mr O'Donohue's point. Whilst we recognise the gap in the market, private providers have not yet, presumably, felt that it is commercially viable to fill that gap, so I would conclude from that, all other things being equal, that we would have to cut them a special deal on the land value to make it worth their while to invest in the first place. So there are going to be some lesser proceeds from that than you might have had otherwise. I am just trying understand how central that part is to the whole economics of the deal and whether there are not other ways to finance it, because it sounds like, if you could find other ways of financing the rest of the development most people here would be pretty happy.

Mr BARROW — I do not know that it is a logical argument to say because it has not happened yet that it is not feasible and that you have to cut a deal then to make public land available. I do not know that that is a step

you need to make. It may just be that it has not happened yet. We have people coming to us at Colac Otway shire regularly seeking opportunities to develop in this area. One of the difficulties for them is that the structure plan limits development to more or less the current township boundaries and that we do not want the ridge line interrupted by further development. We have had other approaches to develop high-quality tourism attractions, but we have said to them that will never be zoned for that kind of use. But because something has not happened does not mean that it is not feasible; it may be that it just has not happened yet. We have seen the growth in Apollo Bay of residential and holiday home development over the past couple of years, and significantly the increase in numbers. It may be that it could still happen without that, yes.

In regard to the total cost of the project development and the percentage required from various aspects of it, I could not pre-empt any assessment of the feasibility study, and I would not venture to. It would be wrong of me to make a guess. I guess what is said in a public forum becomes tomorrow's headlines, and I do not think it would be appropriate to do that, really.

Mr THORNLEY — I appreciate the sensitivity of that, but I presume your gut feel is that the hotel would be a substantial portion of the funding mechanism, and that is why you are pretty wedded to it.

Mr BARROW — Yes. It would be fair to say that the thing that anchors, largely, the whole concept of seeking public and private partnership is the hotel, and it is fair to say it is one of the most controversial elements of the planned development. We do not believe we will be able to fund the public infrastructure without it, and so that is why it is retained.

Mr THORNLEY — I guess we do not know that until we see the feasibility study, going to your earlier point.

Mr BARROW — Yes, true.

Mr TEE — Can I just confirm that you have provided us with some documentation which is for our use — and just for the benefit of the transcript it is not a public document, it is just for the committee's use?

Mr BARROW — Yes.

The CHAIR — You will provide us with the earlier version of that?

Mr BARROW — It is not an earlier version, it is the draft master plan. What I have provided you with is a draft of the precinct development guidelines, which is not a public document. The other document which I can provide to you I will email to Richard.

The CHAIR — Thank you for your evidence. We appreciate it.

Mr BARROW — Thanks very much for the opportunity. The comment I made at the start was not meant with any disrespect. It is just that it is disturbing to note that political element coming into this discussion in regard to the comparison between this township and Colac. I would guess that in your travels around the Great Ocean Road region you would find that same conflict occurring between places like Port Fairy and other townships in that municipality, and also with Port Campbell and Camperdown. Those sorts of conflicts exist. This is a very small township, and yes, there is great revenue coming from here, but there is also great revenue coming from the other parts of the shire, too.

The CHAIR — Thank you.

Witness withdrew.