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CHAPTER 1: Introduction & Background

Supported jointly by the Mornington Peninsula Shire Council and Sport and Recreation Victoria, this project commenced in April 1999 to determine Council’s priorities in aquatic facility provision. During the study, a number of other issues were identified, leading to additional project requirements and a more detailed investigation of options for Council to consider. The initial period is identified as Stage 1 and the additional study requirements, leading to the final report are known as Stage 2.

1.1: Project Brief

Stage 1:
The initial brief for this project stated the following objectives:
“The purpose of the study is to determine the feasibility of an indoor heated pool within the Shire of Mornington Peninsula and to make recommendations on the level of Council subsidy, opportunities for co-development, market investigation, location of the facility, the timing of the construction and the scope of project components to be included within the proposed facility.

Aims:
1. To identify and recommend on opportunities that may exist to: promote the market, co-develop or improve access to existing aquatic facilities
2. Examine the financial viability of the above proposal(s) in regard to construction and operation, examine funding options and recommend on the most suitable alternative
3. To establish a profile of the existing aquatic facilities and their users within the municipality and the adjacent region
4. Assess the components needed within an indoor facility to meet the community’s needs and assess any opportunities to co-locate at existing indoor leisure facilities
5. Determine the impact of a new pool on Council’s Indoor Leisure Centres and outdoor pools.”

Stage 2:
The purpose of the second stage of the project, as stated in the additional brief, was:
“To broaden the scope of the project with regards to partnership opportunities outside of the traditional leisure centre arrangements, addressing the unique characteristics of the Mornington Peninsula Shire Council including the tourism industry. This includes making recommendations on the level of Council subsidy, location/s of the facility – including timing and prioritisation, scope of the project and components to be included in the proposed facility/s.”

Process Used for this study:
The chart over the page indicates the two stages of the project and the various tasks that have been undertaken to complete all project requirements, and produce an informative and comprehensive report for Council.
STAGE 1

Project Commencement

Research & Review of Current Situation

Profile of Current and Proposed Aquatic Facilities

Options & Opportunities Explored

Key Stakeholder Interviews

Community Consultation

Community Needs Assessment

STAGE 2

Additional Research

Options & Concept Ideas

Draft Concept Drawings, Preliminary Site Analysis

Final Draft Report E.M.G. Briefing

Internal Focus Group Meeting No. 1

Stakeholder Interviews

Internal Focus Group Meeting No. 2

Internal Focus Group Meeting No. 3

Council Presentation
1.2: The Mornington Peninsula Shire

The Mornington Peninsula Shire Council was constituted as a new municipality on 15 December 1994 and comprises the former Shires of Flinders, Mornington and Hastings, plus areas of Mount Eliza and Baxter. The municipality is 723 square kilometers in area and has an estimated population in 1996 of 117,800, comprising 45,392 households.

The Department of Infrastructure has recently prepared population projections, and its summary for Mornington Peninsula is:

“The population is projected to increase by 25,222 people between 1999 and 2021. This equals a growth rate of 19.7%. Households are expected to rise by 19,393 or 38.7%. Change is also expected in the age structure over the next 22 years. The 70-84 and 60-69 age groups are projected to have the greatest net growth, with the highest net loss in the 5-17 and 0-4 age groups.

Mornington Peninsula is projected to have population gains in most parts of the Shire. The growth is being fuelled by the desire to live and retire in popular coastal areas that are relatively close to Melbourne.

The current population of 117,800, is forecast to grow to over 145,600 by 2016 at an average annual growth rate of 1.07%.” (Department of Infrastructure)

In addition, Council has recently commissioned a consultancy firm to develop a set of population projections based on smaller areas within the municipality. The results of this research are different from the Department of Infrastructure results. The consultants report explains that DoI uses a “top down” approach taking into account national, state and local influences on population changes, whereas their report starts from the small area level and analyses factors that affect population.

The result of this research is summarised for population statistics. (More detail from this report has been included in Chapter 3 – Profile of communities)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>117,800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>126,761</td>
<td>9,961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>133,360</td>
<td>6,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>139,322</td>
<td>6,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>145,627</td>
<td>6,306</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Mornington Peninsula Shire: Small area population forecasts 1996-2016, March 2000 – i.d. consulting.)

It is interesting to see the population change further broken into age groups. The following table, also quoted from the consultant report, indicates how the overall population change is reflected in the age brackets of the population.
Mornington Peninsula Shire Forecast Estimated Resident Population by age group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-4</td>
<td>3,871</td>
<td>4,073</td>
<td>7,944</td>
<td>3,642</td>
<td>3,658</td>
<td>7,300</td>
<td>3,998</td>
<td>4,032</td>
<td>8,030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9</td>
<td>4,290</td>
<td>4,656</td>
<td>8,946</td>
<td>3,919</td>
<td>4,016</td>
<td>7,935</td>
<td>4,155</td>
<td>4,254</td>
<td>8,409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14</td>
<td>4,150</td>
<td>4,190</td>
<td>8,340</td>
<td>4,477</td>
<td>4,723</td>
<td>9,200</td>
<td>4,241</td>
<td>4,361</td>
<td>8,602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-19</td>
<td>3,672</td>
<td>4,139</td>
<td>7,811</td>
<td>4,512</td>
<td>4,763</td>
<td>9,275</td>
<td>4,209</td>
<td>4,283</td>
<td>8,492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>3,040</td>
<td>3,513</td>
<td>6,553</td>
<td>4,167</td>
<td>4,161</td>
<td>8,328</td>
<td>4,311</td>
<td>4,471</td>
<td>8,782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>3,439</td>
<td>3,223</td>
<td>6,662</td>
<td>3,842</td>
<td>3,812</td>
<td>7,654</td>
<td>4,337</td>
<td>4,443</td>
<td>8,780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>4,009</td>
<td>3,656</td>
<td>7,665</td>
<td>3,793</td>
<td>3,794</td>
<td>7,587</td>
<td>4,412</td>
<td>4,425</td>
<td>8,657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-39</td>
<td>4,496</td>
<td>4,199</td>
<td>8,695</td>
<td>4,307</td>
<td>4,054</td>
<td>8,361</td>
<td>4,571</td>
<td>4,419</td>
<td>8,990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-44</td>
<td>4,147</td>
<td>4,028</td>
<td>8,175</td>
<td>4,785</td>
<td>4,491</td>
<td>9,276</td>
<td>4,676</td>
<td>4,657</td>
<td>9,333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-49</td>
<td>3,904</td>
<td>3,828</td>
<td>7,732</td>
<td>5,051</td>
<td>4,806</td>
<td>9,857</td>
<td>5,177</td>
<td>4,897</td>
<td>10,074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-54</td>
<td>3,228</td>
<td>3,134</td>
<td>6,362</td>
<td>4,641</td>
<td>4,452</td>
<td>9,093</td>
<td>5,177</td>
<td>4,897</td>
<td>10,074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-59</td>
<td>3,006</td>
<td>2,612</td>
<td>5,618</td>
<td>4,361</td>
<td>4,131</td>
<td>8,492</td>
<td>5,302</td>
<td>4,929</td>
<td>10,231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-64</td>
<td>3,021</td>
<td>2,713</td>
<td>5,734</td>
<td>3,744</td>
<td>3,532</td>
<td>7,276</td>
<td>4,941</td>
<td>4,590</td>
<td>9,531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-69</td>
<td>3,424</td>
<td>3,161</td>
<td>6,585</td>
<td>3,410</td>
<td>3,079</td>
<td>6,489</td>
<td>4,544</td>
<td>4,285</td>
<td>8,829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-74</td>
<td>3,211</td>
<td>2,872</td>
<td>6,083</td>
<td>3,066</td>
<td>2,787</td>
<td>5,847</td>
<td>3,658</td>
<td>3,438</td>
<td>7,096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75-79</td>
<td>2,425</td>
<td>2,035</td>
<td>4,460</td>
<td>2,743</td>
<td>2,482</td>
<td>5,225</td>
<td>2,798</td>
<td>2,467</td>
<td>5,265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80-84</td>
<td>1,577</td>
<td>1,059</td>
<td>2,636</td>
<td>1,946</td>
<td>1,653</td>
<td>3,599</td>
<td>1,938</td>
<td>1,637</td>
<td>3,575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85-89</td>
<td>865</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>1,305</td>
<td>1,023</td>
<td>778</td>
<td>1,801</td>
<td>1,163</td>
<td>949</td>
<td>2,112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90+</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>763</td>
<td>638</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>1,121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>60,080</td>
<td>57,701</td>
<td>117,781</td>
<td>67,907</td>
<td>65,451</td>
<td>133,358</td>
<td>74,027</td>
<td>71,615</td>
<td>145,642</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Mornington Peninsula Shire: Small area population forecasts 1996-2016, March 2000 – i.d. consulting.)

The following table looks at population change from the perspective of the geographical areas as defined in the report. A list defining the “Areas” has been included following this table.

Mornington Peninsula Shire population forecasts by small area 1996 – 2016 Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>small area</th>
<th>1996 population</th>
<th>% of total</th>
<th>2006 population</th>
<th>% of total</th>
<th>total change</th>
<th>% average annual change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area 1</td>
<td>3,795</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>4,189</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>0.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 2</td>
<td>5,430</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>6,225</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>795</td>
<td>0.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 3</td>
<td>6,057</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>8,006</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>1,949</td>
<td>1.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 4</td>
<td>1,567</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1,979</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>1.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 5</td>
<td>5,840</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>7,497</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>1,657</td>
<td>1.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 6</td>
<td>1,731</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1,728</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-0.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 7</td>
<td>6,179</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>14,114</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>7,936</td>
<td>4.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 8</td>
<td>13,669</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>16,110</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>2,441</td>
<td>0.83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 9</td>
<td>16,511</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>17,600</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>1,089</td>
<td>0.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 10</td>
<td>7,479</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>9,289</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>1,810</td>
<td>1.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 11</td>
<td>4,358</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>5,332</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>974</td>
<td>1.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 12</td>
<td>2,620</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>3,391</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>770</td>
<td>1.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 13</td>
<td>17,406</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>18,871</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>1,465</td>
<td>0.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 14</td>
<td>10,709</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>13,272</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>2,563</td>
<td>1.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 15</td>
<td>14,451</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>18,024</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>3,574</td>
<td>1.11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mornington Peninsula Shire 117,800 145,627 27,827 1.07%

(Source: Mornington Peninsula Shire: Small area population forecasts 1996-2016, March 2000 – i.d. consulting.)
Areas:

1. Balnarring, Balnarring Beach, Merricks, Merricks Beach, Somers
2. Bittern, Crib Point
3. Dromana, Safety Beach
4. Flinders, Shoreham, Point Leo
5. Hastings
6. HMAS Cerberus
7. Mornington, Moorooduc, Tuerong
8. Mornington East
9. Mount Eliza
10. Mount Martha
11. Portsea, Sorrento, Blairgowrie
12. Red Hill, Red Hill Sth, Merricks Nth, Main Ridge, Arthurs Seat
13. Rosebud, Rosebud West, McCrae, Boneo, Fingal, Cape Schank
14. Rye, Tootgarook, St Andrews Beach
15. Somerville, Tyabb, Baxter, Pearcedale

In addition to the population statistics and projections for residents, the peninsula is also influenced by the tourism industry. Visitors to the region place a significant demand on infrastructure, facilities and services.

A regional travel and tourism survey conducted in 1995 estimated the total number of visitors to the Mornington Peninsula was 1,875,741 per annum, with daytrippers accounting for 58% of total visitation. (Source: Greater Peninsula Tourism: Tourism Development and Marketing Plan, Urban Enterprise P/L, 1999) More recent estimates indicate that the numbers of visitors to the Peninsula each year is increasing significantly, and has probably doubled since the 1995 figures were produced. (Source: Council’s Economic Development Unit)

1.3: Document Review

The following documents were prepared for the Mornington Peninsula Shire Council or its predecessors, and are relevant to the various issues being considered in this project. A brief summary of the specific aquatic related text/actions of each report follows, and the documents are listed in chronological order, starting from the most recent:
Community Vision:
“The Mornington Peninsula’s unique characteristics and community lifestyles will be maintained and enhanced, and the Shire will continue to be a place where:

➢ Diverse communities can enjoy a quality lifestyle
➢ Environmental sustainability is applied as a guiding principle
➢ Social needs, ecological care and economic development are balanced and integrated
➢ High landscape quality is promoted and enhanced”

Relevant goals: Year 1:
Enhancing Leisure and Recreational Opportunities:
“Complete the indoor pool feasibility study and report to Council on how community needs for aquatic facilities on the Peninsula can be effectively addressed.”
Conserving the Coast, areas of Agriculture and native vegetation:
“Liaise with the State Government to refine planning policy in relation to recreational development proposals on the Peninsula” (years 1&2)
In the implementation of the economic development strategy, Council applies principles of:

**Competitiveness:** sustaining an environment for business growth and economic prosperity

**Equity:** Allowing diverse communities to enjoy a quality lifestyle

**Global:** The ability to deliver products and services in all markets, including local and international

**Comprehensive Strategies:** Linkages to a range of broader economic issues

**Regional Collaboration:** Development of relationships with neighbouring Councils and greater Melbourne

**Industry Focus:** A number of key industries in the region contribute to the local economy and offer further employment and growth potential

**Customer Orientation:** Assisting Council to define its current and potential customers

**Partnerships:** Council is in a position to play a key role in effective partnerships

**Measurement and Evaluation:** Using a range of techniques for measuring and reviewing the economic growth in the peninsula and the effectiveness of this strategy

**Learning:** Facilitating continuous improvement in all areas, including in partnership with educational institutions

**Municipality:** Mornington Peninsula Shire Council

**Document:** Greater Peninsula Tourism – Strategic documents

**Author:** Urban Enterprise P/L

**Date:** June 1999

The documents relating to Greater Peninsula Tourism were prepared as three reports:

**Tourism Development and Marketing Plan**

The Vision, stated in this report was developed during the study and its sources include an industry workshop, Bays and Peninsula Tourism Development Plan(1997) and Council’s Corporate Plan 1997-2000:

“The Mornington Peninsula will be a competitive and vibrant tourist destination with significant benefits flowing from tourism for the local economy.

The Mornington Peninsula will be acknowledged as a premier ‘short break’ tourist destination out of Melbourne providing easy access to a world class ‘clean, green’ and relaxed environment. The region will offer unique, water focused activities and experiences supported by a range of quality year-round wine and food, golfing, wildlife experiences and natural attractions. These experiences will attract high yield markets to the region throughout the year.

There will be a balanced, sustainable and co-ordinated approach to tourism development to preserve the Mornington Peninsula’s unique natural environment and community lifestyle.”
The Health of Tourism on the Mornington Peninsula

The findings of this report indicated that there was strong growth in the tourism industry, summarised by the following key indicators:

- “strong growth in employment during the six month period surveyed with the net addition of over 600 jobs
- continued growth in employment expected in the next six months, with an estimated net addition of over 320 jobs
- significant levels of capital investment by the tourism industry with over $15million invested during the six month period surveyed
- continued strong capital investment by the industry in the next six months with more than $14million expected to be invested by the tourism operators
- substantial increases in gross income of tourism operators with almost 60% of operators reporting an average increase of 20% during the six month period surveyed
- continued increase in gross income with over 40% of tourist operators expecting an increase in the next six months averaging 20%”

The Value of Tourism to the Mornington Peninsula Economy

Tourism is a significant economic sector for the Peninsula, and accounts for the largest property investment in the Shire, with over $12million in approved development. Employment in tourism related industries increased between 1991 and 1996, with 22% of all jobs on the Peninsula in this industry. A number of future tourism investments are planned, with an estimated value of $40million.

Investment in tourism has included restaurants, wineries, a country club, accommodation, golf facilities and various recreation facilities and attractions.

Planned future investment includes 2 golf courses, hot springs, ferry to/from Tasmania, Tourist Railway and development at Arthur’s Chairlift.

Municipality: Mornington Peninsula Shire Council:
Document: Municipal Strategic Statement
Author: Mornington Peninsula Shire Council
Date: May 1999

The municipal strategic statement develops a vision for the future of the Mornington Peninsula, expressed in terms of major objectives, and sets in place a strategic framework to achieve these objectives.
Relevant points throughout this document include:

- The Peninsula is Victoria’s most visited destination for informal recreation meeting both local and metropolitan needs, with its population expanding from approximately 120,000 to over 180,000 during the summer peak period. Attractions around the peninsula include: National Park, Arthur’s seat, bayside beaches, ocean surf beaches, golf courses, boating facilities, bushwalking and horse riding trails, weekend markets and historic sites.

- Proximity to the south-east growth area (Frankston, Dandenong, etc) increases the value of the Peninsula as a recreation area for the nearby regions. The population in the south-east corridor is expected to increase by over 240,000 people over the next 20 years, requiring careful management of the Peninsula’s recreational resources.

- The Peninsula’s coastal and foreshore area are also of special recreational significance and the Victorian Coastal Strategy sets a number of key directions, which include the designation of Mornington, Rosebud, Sorrento and Hastings as activity nodes with Rosebud identified as a location for larger tourism facilities.

**Municipality:** Mornington Peninsula Shire Council:

**Document:** Hastings Pool – Health & Safety Audit

**Author:** David Powick & Assoc. P/L

**Date:** March, 1999

Risk assessment report concentrating on assessment of:

- Public health and safety
- Occupational health and safety

A number of priorities were identified: immediate priority items:

- Safety rail: main steps
- Tiling in female changerooms
- Floors in changerooms Cost $2050
- Fire cabinet storage for calcium hypo.
- Safe tray for acid carboy.
- Relocation of hypo dosing line

In addition to this list, for various urgent items:

- A further $4980: immediate/prior to next season
- “ “ $7300: prior to next season
- “ “ $10800: Year 2000 / ongoing
- “ “ $5000: ongoing/desirable

Implementation: Most items have been addressed through Council’s works program.
This Aquatics Facilities Feasibility Study is an important step in the implementation of the Recreation, Culture and Open Space Plan. The 4 priority actions relating to swimming pools are:

1. Allocate and seek funds from Sport and Recreation Victoria to undertake a detailed feasibility study to develop an indoor heated pool in the Shire. (High)
2. Investigate the opportunity to obtain/purchase public access to Mornington Secondary College, Kings pool and the Somerville shopping centre developer. (High)
3. Commission a financial feasibility of the swimming pool facility which includes a detailed market analysis, management options, potential for private investment of management of the facility, a detailed business plan and a review of potential sites. (High)
4. Investigate the potential for improvements to the existing pools to enhance their viability and level of service provided, including the upgrading of change room facilities. (Medium)

The report also noted the low satisfaction level with existing aquatic facilities and widespread support for the provision of an indoor swimming pool in Shire. The report indicated that there is an expectation that Council should provide aquatic facilities, even though there are a number of private facilities.

The vision for the Victorian Coast, as expressed through this document is:

“The coast of Victoria will be a pleasure to experience by both present and future generations, respected by all and recognised as one of the nation’s icons.” This involves:

♦ Sustainable use of resources
♦ Protection of significant features
♦ Clear future direction
♦ Sustainable development areas

Specifically, references to the Mornington Peninsula include:

Coastal Land Use:
Activity nodes at Mornington, Rosebud, Hastings and Sorrento
Boating Access:
Sorrento: Location for existing boating facilities
Existing sheltered boat ramp
Dromana Bay: Location for existing boating facilities
Mornington: Location for existing boating facilities
Existing harbour
Existing sheltered boat ramp
Hastings: Commercial port
Existing sheltered boat ramp
Existing harbour

Road and Walking Access:
Vehicle: Scenic tourist road: Sorrento -> Rosebud -> Stony Point
Walking: Priority area for construction/upgrade: Sorrento -> Frankston
Hastings -> Flinders
Existing walking track: Rye -> Flinders

Strategic Priorities for Recreation and Tourism Facilities:
Mornington: Foreshore Improvement
Rosebud: Foreshore Improvement
Larger Tourism Facilities
Camping and/or cabin accommodation
Privately run accommodation
Sorrento: Foreshore Improvement
Cultural/Heritage/Historic sites
Point Nepean: Low Impact Tourism Facilities
Cultural/Heritage/Historic sites
Cape Schank: Low Impact Tourism Facilities
Camping and/or cabin accommodation
Lighthouses – nature based tourism
Hastings: Foreshore Improvement

Author: Tourism Victoria
Date: 1997

Issues addressed by the Strategy include:
- Increasing visitation to regional Victoria and encouraging longer stays
- Developing an integrated international strategy
- Determining Melbourne and Victoria’s international positioning
- Utilising information technology developments
- Improving the service delivery of visitor services
- Capitalising on the 2000 Olympics and the centenary of federation
- Expanding the distribution of bookable product
- Developing new product to meet target needs
- Fostering the development of tourism infrastructure
- Attracting additional direct international air services
- Capitalising on Victoria’s natural assets while protecting the environment
- Matching increasingly tough competition in both domestic and international markets
Types of strategies developed:  
Domestic  
International  
Product Development  
Visitor Services/Information Provision  
Industry Leadership & Coordination  
Infrastructure

Municipality: Shire of Mornington Peninsula:  
Document:  Crib Point & Hastings Swimming Pools  
Author:  Wadguna Water Engineering P/L T/a Aquarius Pools  
Date:  1996

This was a general physical audit undertaken of both the Hastings and Crib Point pools, covering:
♦ Administration and Buildings  
♦ Pool and surrounds  
♦ Filtration and sanitisation of each water space  
♦ Flow report

Recommendations form the report (in summary) were:  
Crib Point:  good condition, but needs regular maintenance program  
Works recommended: safety, filtration/plant, pool repairs  
Hastings:  poor condition – shell cracked in many places  
Pool gains sea water at high tides – limited capacity of current filtration and ORP/PH controllers to cope  
Chemical storage unsafe  
Concourse safety/supervision issues  
In summary, 2 options:  
1. Total reconstruction  
2. Close pool and rebuild a centre that also caters for young children, disabled and aged persons

Municipality: Shire of Hastings:  
Document:  Indoor Heated Pool Study  
Author:  Lacey Management Services  
Date:  November, 1994

Investigated the need for an indoor heated pool in the Shire of Hastings. Recommended that Council:  
➢ Recognises the viability of providing an indoor heated pool in either Somerville or Hastings as part of a multi-purpose development  
➢ Accepts preferred components are: 25m indoor heated pool, spa/sauna, learner/toddler pool, hydrotherapy pool (water play incorporated)  
➢ Adopts preferred location – Hastings Leisure Centre. (Note: report indicated that this would lead to the closure of both existing outdoor pools)  
➢ Applies for SRV funding  
➢ Recognises that other public/private facilities in the region will affect the viability of any development at the Hastings Leisure Centre.
Municipality: Shire of Hastings:
Document: Recreation Strategy Plan
Author: Shire of Hastings Department of Health & Community Services
Date: 1994

Under the objective of providing leisure opportunities based on forward plans and identified needs, and undertaking research in order to provide for future community needs, this report recommended that consultants investigate the feasibility of the Shire developing an indoor heated swimming pool facility. This action was listed as a high priority, and led to the preparation of the (above mentioned) Indoor Heated Pool Study by Lacey Management Services in November 1994.

Municipality: Shire of Flinders:
Document: Recreation Study – Summary Report and Strategy Plan
Author: Matt Viney & Associates, P/L, Strategy Consultants
Date: January, 1992

This report recommended, in relation to “Participation, Equity and Access”, that:
“Council recognises the low level satisfaction with swimming facilities identified in the recreation study research and resolves to negotiate with the commercial operator to improve facilities provided through its centre in Rosebud.”

Municipality: Shire of Mornington:
Document: Mornington Recreation Strategy Plan
Author: Lacey Management Services P/L & Scenic Spectrums P/L
Date: May, 1991

This report acknowledged the strong community support for an indoor heated pool throughout the study, and the need for Council to respond to this expressed demand. It was suggested that a pool may be best developed in conjunction with existing leisure centre components in Civic Reserve and that Council should undertake a feasibility study. The adopted strategy recommended improved beach shower facilities at the more popular swimming beaches, and that Council liaise with surrounding municipalities to explore co-operative ways of implementing common findings of recreation strategies, eg. need for indoor pool.
This report noted that a feasibility study had been undertaken in 1988, concluding that a need existed for an indoor pool in the Shire of Hastings, that provided for a range of recreational, educational, competitive and therapeutic uses and that it should be centrally located in conjunction with other recreation facilities. Council then adopted the Hastings leisure Centre as the preferred location. (1988)

During 1989, Council received approval for $350,000 of state and federal government funding. In discussing the issues of project concepts, benefits and community need, funding and timelines, the report recommended (in brief) that:

- Council develop a 25m indoor pool at the Hastings Leisure Centre
- Council accept the government grants and complete a range of internal planning, co-ordination and budget allocations to ensure that success of the project.

This report considered the future of the former Rosebud Memorial Swimming Pool, which was constructed in 1961 on the Rosebud foreshore, and demolished a few years ago. The report discussed a range of options for development and concluded that to achieve increased patronage, the pool would need to be enclosed and this would be best achieved by redeveloping the pool on another site in conjunction with other sports complex facilities. A consideration in this report was the recommendation of the Port Phillip Coastal Study that “no further sporting facilities be built”. (Source: Port Phillip Coastal Study, Melbourne, 1977)

1.4: A Regional Perspective

Aquatic facilities, like many other leisure or cultural facilities, need to be considered in the context of a larger region rather than from a municipal perspective. Residents will often disregard municipal boundaries when making decisions about the services and facilities they will use.

The idea of regional cooperation and planning for services is well supported and encouraged by State Government, and reduces the degree of duplication and “over-provision”.

Municipality: Shire of Hastings:
Document: Final Report – Development of an indoor heated swimming pool at the Hastings Family Leisure Centre
Author: Shire of Hastings
Date: February 1990

Municipality: Shire of Flinders:
Document: Rosebud Memorial Swimming Pool – Planning and Engineering Options for Development
Author: Scott & Furphy Consulting Group
Date: March 1979
The City of Frankston is probably the Peninsula’s closest and most relevant neighbour in terms of regional provision. As summarised in Chapter 2 of this document, the City of Frankston is proposing to construct a large regional aquatic facility and is now undertaking its detailed feasibility and development planning. The catchment for this proposed facility is primarily the city of Frankston but also the northern part of the Mornington Peninsula Shire.

While it is not reasonable to assume that this facility could provide for all the aquatic need of the Peninsula, one of the proposed features is a 50m pool that could provide for the (50m) needs of the Peninsula (given the relatively small demand for a pool of this size). This report will continue to discuss the merits of providing 25m and various water spaces to cater for the communities’ diverse needs.

There is an opportunity to develop complementary facilities across the two municipalities, providing a range of components and opportunities for the region.

1.5: Industry Trends

In presenting this section of the report, it is emphasized that industry trends reflect an average across similar types of facilities, and it is evident that a range of factors can lead to a particular facility performing quite differently than an industry average.

Some of the circumstances that can lead to the catchment and financial performance of a facility varying from trends and predictions are:

- Management and marketing approach at a facility
- Services, programs and packages offered at the facility
- Condition and presentation of a facility, ie: quality of facility
- Effect of competitors on the main catchment
- Physical features of the region that act as barriers, and movement of people along main roads and towards larger towns/cities
- Design of a facility and its associated operational costs
- Seasonal variation, particularly relevant for outdoor facilities
- Travelling time to facilities that residents will tolerate, influence the choices of facilities (this can vary from 5-30 minutes per trip)
- Related industry events, for example: Olympic Games, Learn-to-swim campaign

There is some interesting data and information about the provision of aquatic facilities which is relevant to consider in the context of this project. The following information outlines various trends and statistics, and demonstrate that while trends are interesting, the figures can differ significantly between facilities:
Characteristics of users of aquatic facilities

Age
Hepper and Marriot (1994) identified that 50% of visitors to aquatic facilities were aged 20-39 years with 37% of that group being aged in their 30s. 13% of visitors were in their 40’s. Only 15% of visitors were under 20, however, this figure is possibly under-represented due to the inability of 0-14 year age group to complete the survey.

These figures differ from those recorded by Hole and Elkington (1987) which showed that more visitors were under 20 years (1987:31%, 1994:15%) suggesting that fewer young people are now visiting pools. Other differences include that 10% fewer visitors were in their 30’s, while 5% more visitors were 20-29 years.

Hole and Elkington (1987) also identified that country centres attract slightly younger clientele than metropolitan centres.

Gender
Hole and Elkington (1987) identified that there is greater usage of aquatic facilities by females than males (51.6% to 48.4%).

Hepper and Marriot (1994) identified a further increase in female attendance in 1994 (53% of users compared to 28% male - non-response totaled 19%) suggesting that aquatic centres have become more attractive places for women to visit over the past several years. This increase may be explained by the increase in users in the category of home duties suggesting a greater daytime use of centres.

Visitor Patterns
Hole and Elkington (1987) identified that:

- 33.6% of users visited with family;
- 31.6% came alone; and
- 24.4% with friends.

A comparison with 1994 (Hepper and Marriot) suggests that visitors have become more inclined to visit aquatic centres alone (37%) with a corresponding decline in those attending with family (29%) or friends (15%). This may indicate a trend towards use of aquatic facilities for more individual fitness than for social outings.

Catchment
Hepper and Marriot (1994) identified that users of aquatic centres primarily come from within a 5km radius, but that a significant proportion comes from a wider area dependent on factors such as proximity of other centres and natural or built barriers.

A 10 kilometre radius catchment has often been introduced as a secondary catchment and more recent experience shows that facilities’ catchment can extend much further than 10 km radius around a facility, particularly in rural areas.
Catchment multiples, that is, the number of total attendances per year divided by the estimated population size within 5 kilometres of the centre, are generally higher for centres with indoor pools, lower for centres with both indoor and outdoor pools, and lowest for those with outdoor pools (CERM 1994).

Various multiples are applied to population catchments to estimate attendances ranging from 2.5 visits per year to 10 visits per year.

Hole and Elkington (1987) identified the majority of visits originated from home (76.3%), with the remainder from work (12.3%), school (6.6%) and other (4.9%).

These figures compare with the 1994 Hepper and Marrriot study except that slightly less originated from work (8%).

In 1987, 25.5% of visitors took less than 5 minutes to travel to centres and 75.4% less than 15 minutes (Hole and Elkington).

In 1994 cars were the favoured mode of transport for reaching centres with 69% of users driving and a further 19% arriving as passengers. Less popular modes of transport were walking (8%), bicycle (4%) and public transport (2%). These findings may have implications for the location of future centres not needing to be on major bus routes (although careful demographic analysis will be required in lower income areas where there are lower rates of car ownership).

Use of centres
Studies highlight that aquatic centres are used for four main purposes:
- Recreation;
- Fitness (incorporating lap swimmers);
- Education (incorporating swimming lessons); and
- Sport (incorporating swimming competition and training and water sports)

Other findings regarding use include the following:
There appears to have been a trend away from the recreation use of pools (highlighted in a number of surveys of users of Victorian swimming pools in the 70’s and 80’s ) and towards using centres for fitness. This is based on the findings of:

- Hole and Elkington (1987) which identified that 46.7% of users attend for lap swimming, 18.4% mainly to recreate and 13.2% for educational purposes.

- Hepper and Marrriot (1994), also identified that most visitors use aquatic leisure centres for improving health and fitness rather than a social experience. This trend was arrived at through analysing the average length of visit to aquatic centres. The most common duration was only 30 minutes to 1 hour (32%) with 24 % staying 1 to 1.5 hours, and only 4% staying longer than 3 hours.

This is comparable with Hole and Elkington’s (1987) findings that most users (58.8%) attended for only 30 minutes to 1 hour with 22.1 % staying 1 to 1.5 hours, and 9.4% staying 1.5 to 2 hours.
Length of stay was also identified as being related to recreation use of centres, with more users staying longer at recreation type pools (Hole and Elkington, 1987).

Hole and Elkington (1987) identified that the heaviest concentration of visits occurs in the late afternoon from 4.00-6.00 pm (21.1%), evenings from 6.00-8.00 pm (17.4%) and early morning before 9.00 am (13.2%) also supporting the trend that more users are visiting for fitness before or after work. There is also higher usage from 9.00 am to 10.30 am (11.7%).

Weekends attract younger and mostly male and irregular visitors (Hole and Elkington).

The frequency of use with which visitors attended demonstrated that the centres are very much part of people’s lifestyles. Hole and Elkington (1987) identified that 80% of visitors attend at least once a week, while Hepper and Marriot (1994) identified that 66% of users attended at least once a week.

Hepper and Marriot (1994) identified that only 14% of visitors would use additional services if provided. Popular suggestions included:
- diving pool (13%)
- bigger pools (11%)
- water slide (8%)
- water sports – volleyball, polo, underwater hockey (5%).

Types of Facilities
Over recent years, the trend for development of aquatic facilities has moved away from the traditional local outdoor pool, towards regional and sub-regional indoor aquatic facilities with a range a water spaces and wet and dry components (eg. gym, aerobics, stadium, etc). This trend has generally led to better patronised (year round) facilities offering packaged/multiple services and financially operating more effectively.
Leisure Participation
A survey conducted by ABS in Victoria in 1996 regarding Leisure participation, indicated that the most popular sport and physical recreation activities are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>% Male</th>
<th>% Female</th>
<th>% Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Walking</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>53.2</td>
<td>43.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycling/Mountain Bike Riding</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aerobics/Aquaerobics</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jogging/Power Walking</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bushwalking/Hiking</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weightlifting, bodybuilding or powerlifting</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Billiards, snooker or pool</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian Rules Football</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netball</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cricket (outdoor)</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawn Bowls</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Swimming has always been a popular activity in Victoria (and Australia generally), and this may be due to the following factors:

- Outdoor lifestyle and access to aquatic activities at beaches, lakes, rivers, etc.
- The extensive promotion of water safety and learn-to-swim campaigns, encouraging families and schools to teach all children how to swim, and the principles of water safety.
- The value of water therapy for rehabilitation, improved health and relaxation.
- The popularity of elite swimming and its high public profile at Olympic and Commonwealth Games and other international events.

The Local Setting:

Industry trends indicate that swimming and various aquatic pursuits are very popular among our communities and for all age groups. Council can expect that the demand for aquatic facilities will continue, as it is proven to be a common issue across Australia. Local research indicates that this demand is only partially satisfied by private operators developing and managing aquatic facilities.

The various facts and figures that exist in relation to aquatic facilities, catchments, users and activities are useful tools in the business planning, marketing and management of facilities.
Chapter 2: Profile of aquatic facilities

2.1: Existing facilities

Community Swimming Pools:

Crib Point Solar Heated Swimming pool

Location: Cyril Fox Reserve, Crib Point
Ownership: Mornington Peninsula Shire Council
Description: 25m x 7 lane outdoor heated pool, toddler pool with shade
Comments: Facility in good condition, well used for programs, general public swimming and community groups.

Hastings Swimming Pool

Location: Hastings Foreshore Reserve
Ownership: Land: DNRE, Facility: Mornington Peninsula Shire Council
Description: 30m main pool, 10m toddler pool, outdoor facility, basic amenities. Pools are very deep.
Comments: Facility is old. No programs run, few school bookings, general community access.

Private Facilities:

Kings Swim Centre, Mornington

Location: St Catherine’s Crt, Mornington
Ownership: Private ownership
Description: 20m x 5 lane indoor heated pool, 2 program pools
Comments: Program/aerobics room, centre offers a range of programs including public swimming sessions.

Indoor Swim Centre, Mount Martha

Location: Forest Drive, Mount Martha
Ownership: Private ownership
Description: 17m indoor heated salt water pool
Comments: Primary market: young children swimming lessons
Peninsula Swimming & Aquatic Centre, Rosebud

Location: Colchester Rd, Rosebud  
Ownership: Private ownership, management lease with operator  
Description: 25m x 6 lane indoor heated pool, Program pool: 6m x 3m  
Comments: Facility 13 years old, building shared with other lessees running cafe and 10-pin bowling facilities. Pool is available for public swimming

ABC Private Swim Centre, Rosebud

Location: Balaka St, Rosebud  
Ownership: Private ownership  
Description: Small indoor pool  
Comments: Programs and lessons by appointment

Mornington Aerobics, Swim & Fitness Centre

Location: Nepean Highway, Mornington  
Ownership: Private ownership  
Description: 17m x 3 lane heated indoor pool, Hydrotherapy pool  
Comments: Integrated as a fitness centre with gym, spa/sauna and professional suites. Public swimming available.

HMAS Cerberus Pool

Location: HMAS Cerberus, Westernport  
Ownership: Royal Australian Navy  
Description: Pool is on-site in Cerberus, with a range of other Defence Facilities. Pool: 1 year old, 50m indoor, Gymnasium and specialist equipment, 2 sports stadiums as part of facility.  
Comments: Facilities are used for the use and training of Defence Force personnel and not for general public use.

Tyabb Fly Inn

Location: Tyabb-Mornington Road, Tyabb  
Ownership: Private Ownership  
Description: 40ft x 20ft saltwater pool, sauna and spa  
Comments: Used by guests, plus tiny tots lessons 20 hours per week, some social nights for local groups, by arrangement. No general public access.

Delgany Country House Hotel

Location: Delgany Avenue, Portsea  
Ownership: Private Ownership  
Description: Portsea Spas: Indoor Heated pool – 15 m long, Gym, Spa, Sauna, Aromatherapy bath, Steam Room, Tennis Courts  
Comments: For use by members only – monthly membership fees apply.
School Facilities:

**Red Hill Consolidated Primary School**

- **Location:** Mornington-Flinders Rd, Red Hill
- **Ownership:** Department of Education
- **Description:** Outdoor 17m pool
- **Comments:**

**Sorrento Primary School**

- **Location:** Kerford Rd, Sorrento
- **Ownership:** Department of Education
- **Description:** Outdoor heated 12-15m pool, 12 years old
- **Comments:** Shared use and management with St. Josephs School

**Mornington Junior Secondary College**

- **Location:** Cnr Wilsons Rd & Nepean Hwy, Mornington
- **Ownership:** Department of Education
- **Description:** Outdoor 25m, solar heated pool
- **Comments:** Facility appears to be quite old, is now closed as part of site redevelopment – school has relocated.

**The Peninsula School**

- **Location:** Wooralla Dve, Mt Eliza
- **Ownership:** The Peninsula School
- **Description:** 2 outdoor heated pools, both 25m, open October-April
- **Comments:** Used by school, some community groups bookings across Summer. No general public access.

**Toorak College**

- **Location:** Old Mornington Road, Mt Eliza
- **Ownership:** Toorak College
- **Description:** Outdoor 25m pool
- **Comments:**

**Mornington Secondary College – Senior Campus**

- **Location:** Nepean Highway, Mornington
- **Ownership:** Department of Education
- **Description:** 25m x 6 lane heated indoor pool, seating for 250 people
- **Comments:** Recently built and opened. Pool is leased by agreement to the Mt.Martha Swim School outside school hours, for a range of programs, public swimming and use by community groups.
Kankama Adult Training Centre

**Location:** Racecourse Road, Mornington  
**Ownership:**  
**Description:** Small heated indoor pool  
**Comments:** Used by community for some swimming programs.

### 2.2: Proposed facilities

**Proposed Somerville Swimming Pool**

**Location:** Eramosa Road, or adjacent to Recreation Centre, Somerville  
**Ownership:** Private Ownership  
**Description:** 6 lane, 25m indoor heated pool, cold water pool, toddlers pool, spa, sauna, gym, play area, consulting suites, amenities/kiosk  
**Comments:** Proposed for programs and general public access.

**Proposed Peninsula Hot Springs**

**Location:** ‘Cups’ Area, Rye  
**Ownership:** Private Ownership  
**Description:** Geothermal spa based health and relaxation centre: indoor and outdoor bathing, massage and therapy services, plus many other components  
**Comments:** Large development estimated at $6mill. Public access unknown.

**Proposed Dromana Secondary College Aquatic Facility**

**Location:** Harrisons Road, Dromana  
**Ownership:** School Owned Facility, seeking joint funding arrangements  
**Description:** 50m indoor heated pool, change rooms, recreational facilities, function room.  
**Comments:** Project is in infancy planning stage. Proposed public access during all hours, would probably in conjunction with existing stadium facility.

**Proposed Mt. Eliza Secondary College Recreation Facility/Aquatic Centre**

**Location:** Canadian Bay Road, Mt Eliza  
**Ownership:** School Owned Facility, seeking partnership opportunities  
**Description:** 25m indoor heated pool adjoining a 2-court stadium facility, with shared amenities and administration areas. Concept proposal only.  
**Comments:** Part of the school’s overall master plan, including the development of arts/media/technology facilities. Vacant area of land at rear of school could be part of the consideration for proposed capital development.
Proposed Martha Cove Marina Project

Location: Safety Beach  
Ownership: Private developer: Pac Rim P/L  
Description: Water spaces provided as contribution for public open space. 2 lagoons, connected by rock shelves, sandy beaches, recreational area including picnic facilities and walking trails.  
Comments: While proposed for public access, the lagoons are sited within the residential development estate. Extent of actual public access and use once facility is developed, is unknown.

Proposed City of Frankston Regional Aquatic Facility

Location: Preferred site: Samuel Sherlock Reserve (rear Frankston TAFE)  
Ownership: City of Frankston  
Description: 51.5m indoor heated pool with moveable boom, up to 500 sq.m of leisure water, hydrotherapy pool, spa, sauna, health & fitness space, amenities, reception, carparking for minimum of 200 cars.  
Comments: Feasibility study has been accepted by Council, and staff are now proceeding with further consultation and funding. It is suggested that Jubilee Park would be closed and The Pines would be kept open. Catchment for development takes into account part of Mornington Peninsula Shire.
CHAPTER 3: Profile of Communities in Shire

The following few pages outline each of the community areas of the Shire as defined in the recently completed “Small area population forecasts” document. For each area, population and local characteristics are noted, current access to aquatic opportunities and future access if Council develops additional facilities.

The column titled – “Impact of Strategy”, discusses the access to aquatic facilities if Council proceeds with a long term strategy to develop 3 aquatic facilities in the Shire. This strategy is discussed in the following chapters of this report. In considering the response, attention has been given primarily to issues of access (geographic, hours of access and financial). It is interesting to note that travel time to facilities doesn’t necessarily change with the increased number of facilities, but the components and services available would have a significant impact on provision and opportunities.

Sources for this section are:
## TOWNSHIP PROFILE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AREA: TOWNSHIPS</th>
<th>CURRENT POPULATION (1996 census)</th>
<th>POPULATION PROJECTIONS (2016)</th>
<th>COMMUNITY PROFILE</th>
<th>CURRENT ACCESS TO AQUATIC FACILITIES</th>
<th>FUTURE ACCESS TO AQUATIC FACILITIES – IMPACT OF PROPOSED STRATEGY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AREA 1: BALNARRING,</td>
<td>Population: 3,795</td>
<td>Assumptions:</td>
<td>Area is made up of a number of small townships with up to 50% of residences</td>
<td>Beach Access: Local beach Private household pools: 103 Access to public/private facilities: Crib Point</td>
<td>Access to: Hastings Indoor Facility: (10-20 mins)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BALNARRING BEACH,</td>
<td>Characteristics: Young adults,</td>
<td>Some development, significant</td>
<td>being holiday homes. Situated at junction of several regional roads. Access to</td>
<td>outdoor pool (10-15 mins), Rosebud indoor heated pool (20-25 mins)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MERRICKS, MERRICKS</td>
<td>young families, teenagers &amp;</td>
<td>aging Population Forecast:</td>
<td>the north very good. Access to the west more difficult road conditions, although</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEACH, SOMERS</td>
<td>35-44 yr olds.</td>
<td>4,189</td>
<td>bus services have improved. Closest train station: Bittern: (5-10 minutes).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average Household size: 2.7</td>
<td>Average household size: 2.27</td>
<td>Households with 2 or more cars: Balnarring: 58.2% Merricks: 65% Somers: 47%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>middle aged and retired</td>
<td></td>
<td>Major Features: Coolart Homestead, Somers Childrens School Camp, Balbirooroo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wetlands, Westernport foreshore.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AREA: TOWNSHIPS</th>
<th>CURRENT POPULATION (1996 census)</th>
<th>POPULATION PROJECTIONS (2016)</th>
<th>COMMUNITY PROFILE</th>
<th>CURRENT ACCESS TO AQUATIC FACILITIES</th>
<th>FUTURE ACCESS TO AQUATIC FACILITIES – IMPACT OF PROPOSED STRATEGY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population: 5,430</td>
<td>Characteristics: Significant number of young families, less elderly and middle aged</td>
<td>Population Forecast: 6,225</td>
<td>Average household size: 2.98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Characteristics: Young and mature families</td>
<td>Average household size: 2.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### AREA: TOWNSHIPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AREA 3: DROMANA, SAFETY BEACH</th>
<th>CURRENT POPULATION (1996 census)</th>
<th>POPULATION PROJECTIONS (2016)</th>
<th>COMMUNITY PROFILE</th>
<th>CURRENT ACCESS TO AQUATIC FACILITIES</th>
<th>FUTURE ACCESS TO AQUATIC FACILITIES – IMPACT OF PROPOSED STRATEGY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Characteristics: Retirees, elderly</td>
<td>Average Household size: 2.27</td>
<td>Average household size: 1.87</td>
<td>Characteristics: Broad range of age groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


---

**Indoor Pool Feasibility Study**

**Mornington Peninsula Shire Council**

**April, 2000**

**Sykes, Humphreys & Associates**

**Peddle Thorp Melbourne - Architects**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AREA: TOWNSHIPS</th>
<th>CURRENT POPULATION (1996 census)</th>
<th>POPULATION PROJECTIONS (2016)</th>
<th>COMMUNITY PROFILE</th>
<th>CURRENT ACCESS TO AQUATIC FACILITIES</th>
<th>FUTURE ACCESS TO AQUATIC FACILITIES – IMPACT OF PROPOSED STRATEGY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Population: 1,567
Characteristics: Young families, middle aged
Average Household size: 2.4

Assumptions: 1996 population aging
Population Forecast: 1,979
Average household size: 1.88
Characteristics: Range of age groups with significant numbers of middle aged.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AREA: TOWNSHIPS</th>
<th>CURRENT POPULATION (1996 census)</th>
<th>POPULATION PROJECTIONS (2016)</th>
<th>COMMUNITY PROFILE</th>
<th>CURRENT ACCESS TO AQUATIC FACILITIES</th>
<th>FUTURE ACCESS TO AQUATIC FACILITIES – IMPACT OF PROPOSED STRATEGY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AREA 6: HMAS CERBERUS</td>
<td>Population: 1,700</td>
<td>Population Forecast: 1,700</td>
<td>Aust. Naval establishment providing employment for over 1000 naval personnel. Several naval facilities, with limited civilian access. Households with 2 or more cars: 30%</td>
<td>Beach Access: Somers / Balnarring (5-10 mins) Access to public/private facilities: Has own 50m indoor heated pool for exclusive use of defense personnel.</td>
<td>No impact. Residents have exclusive use of on-site facility.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AREA: TOWNSHIPS</th>
<th>CURRENT POPULATION (1996 census)</th>
<th>POPULATION PROJECTIONS (2016)</th>
<th>COMMUNITY PROFILE</th>
<th>CURRENT ACCESS TO AQUATIC FACILITIES</th>
<th>FUTURE ACCESS TO AQUATIC FACILITIES – IMPACT OF PROPOSED STRATEGY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AREA: TOWNSHIPS</th>
<th>CURRENT POPULATION (1996 census)</th>
<th>POPULATION PROJECTIONS (2016)</th>
<th>COMMUNITY PROFILE</th>
<th>CURRENT ACCESS TO AQUATIC FACILITIES</th>
<th>FUTURE ACCESS TO AQUATIC FACILITIES – IMPACT OF PROPOSED STRATEGY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AREA 8: MORNINGTON EAST</td>
<td>Population: 6179</td>
<td>Assumptions: Significant amount of new development attracting young and mature families</td>
<td>Split from Mornington for analysis due to the significant supply of residential land. Therefore the area is a young developing residential area, attracting young family housing market. This area is between the Nepean Hwy and Mornington Peninsula Fwy – road access is very good. Major Features: Civic Reserve, Mornington</td>
<td>Beach Access: Local beach (5 mins) Access to public/private facilities: Mornington facilities, particularly Kings indoor facility - local</td>
<td>Same as existing, plus Mornington Sub-regional facility (local)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Characteristics: Young families Average Household size: 2.75</td>
<td>Population Forecast: 14,114 Average household size: 2.55 Characteristics: Young and mature families, high number of teenagers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AREA: TOWNSHIPS</th>
<th>CURRENT POPULATION (1996 census)</th>
<th>POPULATION PROJECTIONS (2016)</th>
<th>COMMUNITY PROFILE</th>
<th>CURRENT ACCESS TO AQUATIC FACILITIES</th>
<th>FUTURE ACCESS TO AQUATIC FACILITIES – IMPACT OF PROPOSED STRATEGY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AREA: TOWNSHIPS</th>
<th>CURRENT POPULATION (1996 census)</th>
<th>POPULATION PROJECTIONS (2016)</th>
<th>COMMUNITY PROFILE</th>
<th>CURRENT ACCESS TO AQUATIC FACILITIES</th>
<th>FUTURE ACCESS TO AQUATIC FACILITIES – IMPACT OF PROPOSED STRATEGY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AREA 10: MT MARTHA</td>
<td>Population: 7,479</td>
<td>Assumptions: 1996 population aging, some development of broadhactare land</td>
<td>Significant amounts of development have taken place in recent years. The area is one of the dominant landscape features of the peninsula. Road access is very good along various routes and a bus service is provided. Households with 2 or more cars: 60% School enrolments (1999/2000): Mt Martha primary: 620 Osborne Primary: 653 Major Features: “The Briars” historic park Mt Martha public park Port Phillip bay foreshore</td>
<td>Beach Access: Local beach Private household pools: 328 Access to public/private facilities: Indoor swim centre – local, Mornington pools – (5-10 mins)</td>
<td>Access to existing pools, plus: Mornington sub-regional facility</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Characteristics: Retirees, young families Average Household size: 2.64

Characteristics: Mature families, middle aged, retirees

| Population Forecast: 9,289 | Average household size: 2.06 |

Major Features: The Briars historic park

(Source: Mornington Peninsula Shire Council: Economic and Demographic Profiles, 1998 ABS Consultancy.
Mornington Peninsula Shire – Small area population forecasts 1996-2016, March 2000, i.d. consulting.)
### AREA: TOWNSHIPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AREA 11: PORTSEA SORRENTO BLAIRGOWRIE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Population:</strong> 4,358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Characteristics:</strong> Retirees, elderly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average Household size:</strong> 2.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CURRENT POPULATION (1996 census)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POPULATION PROJECTIONS (2016)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assumptions:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996 population aging, some</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intensification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population Forecast:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average household size:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMUNITY PROFILE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Substantially lower occupancy rate than other areas – significant supply of vacant lots. Quiet seaside holiday lifestyle with high tourist profile. Access along Nepean Hwy, rural bus service. Townships provide for immediate needs of permanent and transient residents as well as passing visitors. Further opportunities exist to cater for growing tourism market. Households with 2 or more cars: Blairgowrie: 39% Portsea: 34% Sorrento: 34% School enrolments (1999/2000): Sorrento Primary: St Josephs: Major Features: Mornington Peninsula National Park (Point Nepean), Port Phillip Bay / Bass Strait foreshore, Passenger / vehicle ferry to Queenscliff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CURRENT ACCESS TO AQUATIC FACILITIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beach Access: Local beach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private household pools: 232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public/private facilities: Rosebud indoor heated pool (10-15 mins)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FUTURE ACCESS TO AQUATIC FACILITIES – IMPACT OF PROPOSED STRATEGY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access to existing, plus: Rosebud Regional aquatic facility (10-15 mins)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### AREA: TOWNSHIPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AREA 12: RED HILL</th>
<th>RED HILL STH MERRICKS NTH MAIN RIDGE ARTHURS SEAT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Population:</strong> 2,620</td>
<td>Characteristics: Mature families, middle aged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assumptions:</strong> 1996 population aging</td>
<td>Average Household size: 2.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Population Forecast:</strong> 3,391</td>
<td>Characteristics: Middle aged, retirees</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CURRENT ACCESS TO AQUATIC FACILITIES – IMPACT OF PROPOSED STRATEGY

- Beach Access: Port Phillip bay beaches: (5-10 mins)
- Private household pools: 129 Access to public/private facilities: Rosebud indoor heated pool: (10-15 mins), Mt Martha & Mornington pools (15-20 mins)

### POPULATION PROJECTIONS (1996 census)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AREA 12: RED HILL</th>
<th>RED HILL STH MERRICKS NTH MAIN RIDGE ARTHURS SEAT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Population:</strong> 2,620</td>
<td>Characteristics: Mature families, middle aged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assumptions:</strong> 1996 population aging</td>
<td>Average Household size: 2.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Population Forecast:</strong> 3,391</td>
<td>Characteristics: Middle aged, retirees</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### COMMUNITY PROFILE

Predominantly rural with a small number of townships, featuring wineries and fruit orchards. Diverse range of tourism is available, offered in the hinterland of the peninsula. Area is central in Shire, with reasonable road access to all parts of peninsula. Rural bus service. Households with 2 or more cars: Main ridge: 69% Red Hill: 71%


Major Features: Arthurs seat state park, Seawinds picnic area, Vineyards.

### CURRENT ACCESS TO AQUATIC FACILITIES

- Beach Access: Port Phillip bay beaches: (5-10 mins)
- Private household pools: 129 Access to public/private facilities: Rosebud indoor heated pool: (10-15 mins), Mt Martha & Mornington pools (15-20 mins)

### FUTURE ACCESS TO AQUATIC FACILITIES

Existing access, plus: Rosebud regional facility: (10-15mins)

### Area: Townships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area 13: Rosebud, Rosebud West, McCrae, Boneo, Fingal Cape Schank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Population</strong>: 17,406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Characteristics</strong>: Retirees, middle aged, elderly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average Household size</strong>: 2.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assumptions</strong>: 1996 population aging, some redevelopment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Population Forecast</strong>: 18,871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average household size</strong>: 1.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Characteristics</strong>: Range of age groups, mature families</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Community Profile**: Rosebud area is a popular seaside holiday destination from Melbourne, and the largest urban and commercial centre on southern peninsula. Provides for both commercial and industrial business. Cape Schank – significant development. Excellent freeway access and rural bus service. Educational training opportunities are also available (TAFE).

**Current Access to Aquatic Facilities**: Beach Access: Local beaches Private household pools: 215 Access to public/private facilities: Local private facility in Rosebud (up to 10 mins)

**Future Access to Aquatic Facilities – Impact of Proposed Strategy**: Existing access, plus: Regional facility in Rosebud: local access (up to 10 mins)

### Sources:
- Mornington Peninsula Shire – Small area population forecasts 1996-2016, March 2000, i.d consulting.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AREA: TOWNSHIPS</th>
<th>CURRENT POPULATION (1996 census)</th>
<th>POPULATION PROJECTIONS (2016)</th>
<th>COMMUNITY PROFILE</th>
<th>CURRENT ACCESS TO AQUATIC FACILITIES</th>
<th>FUTURE ACCESS TO AQUATIC FACILITIES – IMPACT OF PROPOSED STRATEGY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### AREA: TOWNSHIPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AREA 15: SOMERVILLE, TYABB, BAXTER, PEARCEDALE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Population:</strong> 14,451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Characteristics:</strong> Young age structure, young adults, young families</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average Household size:</strong> 2.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Characteristics:</strong> Mature families, young adults</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Access to Aquatic Facilities:</strong> Beach Access: Mt Eliza, Frankston beaches (10-20mins) Private household pools: 353 Private household pools: Hastings outdoor pool (5-10mins), Frankston: Jubilee Park: (10-20mins)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CHAPTER 4: Community Aquatic Needs Assessment

During this project, various communities have shown a great deal of interest and have identified a range of issues and unmet community needs.

The previous Shire of Hastings had undertaken studies for the development of an indoor pool and had even secured funding about 10 years ago. Due to a range of circumstances including local government amalgamation, no facility was built, but there is still great interest in this project from the local community.

Similarly, in Mornington, the previous Council had considered the needs and issues, but there was no facility development. The Flinders Shire had closed its Rosebud foreshore outdoor pool (the pool was filled in after amalgamation) and no other public aquatic facility had been developed.

This background sets the scene for the public interest in the study and the local community view about inadequate provision.

Consultation Summary

Residents who participated in the various forms of consultation:

- Household Survey: 344
- Comments Sheets: 35
- Submissions: 31
- Schools Surveys: 46
- Forum Attendance: 59
- Club Survey: 6
- Schools’ Letters: 38

**TOTAL: 559**

Survey Results Summary:

Participation Rate: Respondents who swim (or a member of their family)

- Yes: 83%
- No: 17%

Reasons for visiting pools were rated as follows:

- Recreation: 24%
- Fitness: 21%
- Laps: 20%
- Lessons: 17%
- Spectator: 7%
- Hydrotherapy: 5%
- Other: 5%
Reasons given for not using pools were rated as follows:

- Pools are too far away: 42%
- Not enough time: 17%
- No value for money: 5%
- Facilities are not available: 5%
- No child care available: 2%
- Lack of information: 2%
- No-one to go with: 2%
- Programs not available: 1%
- Other: 23% (eg. home facilities, too old, non-swimmers, use beach instead, pools too crowded,)

Respondents were asked to indicate whether they agreed or disagreed with a number of statements.

The statements that attracted the highest response for “Agree” were:

- Swimming pools are important community facilities: 91%
- Council should provide swimming pools for residents: 84%
- I prefer pools that are indoor, heated and open all year round: 68%
- It doesn’t worry me who owns pools as long as my needs are met: 57%
- The aquatic facilities we have need to be upgraded: 56%

The statements that attracted the highest response for “Disagree” were:

- We don’t need swimming pools because we live so close to the beach: 84%
- There are enough indoor heated pools in my area: 66%
- If we need new facilities, residents should pay a levy: 64%
- Existing pools meet all my swimming needs: 56%

Desired travel times to access a range of facilities (for a one-way trip) were asked:

Most popular response for:

- Indoor swimming pool: 10 mins 43%
- Outdoor swimming pool: 10 mins 40%
- Beach: 5 mins 30%
- Community Centre: 10 mins 41%
- Shopping Centre: 10 mins 31%
- Playground: 5 mins 44%
- Cinema: 15 mins 31%

Summary:

The following list summarises the range of feedback received through the consultation process and the key issues raised:

- Council’s existing aquatic facilities: poor quality/location, outdoor (seasonal)
- Community aquatic needs are not being met by existing facility provision
- Opening hours and days unsatisfactory
- Depths and temperatures of pools not always suitable
- Insufficient space in pools for patrons
• Poor quality facilities and lack of provision for special groups
• Facilities too far away for residents
• No 50m pool that offers community access, lack of facility for lap & comp swimming
• Lack of knowledge about where all facilities are

• In summary, the gaps are:
  • Public access/casual use of swimming pools
  • Concession opportunities for residents (aged, pensioners, etc)
  • Hydrotherapy facilities – casual/programmed

• Services quite well covered by existing facilities:
  • Swimming lessons (Westernport – summer only)
  • Aquatics programs – aerobics, etc
  • Schools programs (although travel distance is an issue)

Other comments:
• Participation in swimming is high, consistent with swimming being in the top 10 of activities Australia wide
• There is some support for a 50m pool in Shire, expressed mainly by lap swimmers and competitive/schools events
• Beach is not considered a replacement for pools, and in fact it is used to justify the need for quality learn-to-swim programs to increase water safety and survival skills and awareness among residents.
• A number of problems with facilities existing in Shire, Council controls only 2 of them – outdoor, seasonal pools
• Access to facilities is important, and a high profile (main roads, public transport access)
• Public access to private facilities is poorly provided, in terms of time, cost, length of visit and space provided
• Residents who currently only have summer use of pool need winter access, particularly for learn-to-swim programs
CHAPTER 5: Analysis of Existing Aquatic Facility Provision

The Mornington Peninsula is in a reasonably unique situation, where a large number of aquatic opportunities are available for residents and visitors. These include bayside beaches, surf beaches, indoor and outdoor pools offered through a range of providers and private pools in residential backyards. The key issue for consideration is the range and type of access available to patrons.

Private Facilities:
In considering how to address residents’ concerns, an obvious option is to better utilise the existing facilities. Council’s Recreation, Culture and Open Space Plan (1998) adopted a policy as follows: “To facilitate the effective provision and utilisation of leisure resources throughout the Shire through joint provision and shared use of facilities and services”. This policy involved 8 action statements listing a number of partnership and increased utilisation initiatives. Accordingly, this option has been discussed and explored and the following points are made:

♦ Private operators may offer some level of public access at specific times and for a limited duration. Increasing this time allocation, particularly in small facilities would require a (further) cost subsidy.
♦ Existing facilities vary in their size and components. Where pools are smaller than 25m and used primarily for programs, many residents’ needs are not met.
♦ In order to provide for hydrotherapy, water spaces need to be heated to different temperatures from the main swimming areas. This creates a more complicated access issue because it involves capital development to create water spaces that operate independently.
♦ Council has no (or little) control over the standard of provision or the quality of facilities provided by the private sector, eg: hygiene and cleanliness, water quality, physical condition. In addition, Council has no knowledge of the future of individual private facilities.
♦ If Council was to consider subsidising community access to the existing facilities, an assurance that the facilities would meet the local needs would be required.
♦ In some cases, access to facilities is only offered for people who pay a membership or enrol for specific programs. Patrons who do so expect a degree of exclusivity of access.

Having considered the issues above, it is suggested that while cooperation between operators would assist overall service, the existing facilities are limited in their potential and Council should consider other alternatives.

School Facilities
The existing school facilities generally offer very little public access, although there are exceptions and a willingness to further discuss access issues. (eg. Mornington Secondary College)

When considering partnership opportunities with schools, the following issues are important:
The image of a facility, eg; school facility with community access, or a community facility

- The degree of public access offered during school hours as opposed to outside of school hours
- Types of facilities offered for the public during school use of the facility eg, separate change rooms, etc
- Physical access arrangements and security of patrons
- Separate or combined entrances to facilities for school/public
- Level of comfort of community members in entering a school to use aquatic facilities
- Potential for a facility across all age groups to bridge the gap between a local school and the surrounding community.
- Security of tenure for community access, community groups and Council’s input/control over access arrangements
- Change to school policies/philosophies that may affect future community access to facilities on school property

While there are successful examples of council/school partnerships (and Mornington Peninsula Shire Council is currently undertaking a joint stadium development in Rosebud), Council should carefully consider this option, particularly in development of aquatic facilities, which cater for the very young, the aged and frail, disabled and all age groups in between.

Provision throughout the Shire

Council’s Recreation, Culture and Open Space Plan (1998) also adopted the following policy: “To ensure recreation facilities and services are developed, upgraded and prioritised according to Council policy”, which involves the application of population and distance standards, a minimum standards policy and preparation of management plans. The report quoted recreation facility standards produced by the South Australian Urban Land Trust, suggesting that indoor swimming pools should be provided on a ratio of 1 facility per 10,000-20,000 (min. population) with a catchment of 10km per facility. The report went on to suggest that this would require 6-12 pools, with 7 listed as currently provided.

This issue is probably more complex than suggested by the above policy. This study has shown that mere provision of aquatic facilities does not necessarily guarantee satisfaction of need and demands. Additionally, a catchment of 10km, while a reasonable guide used by the industry, is only one factor in determining overall catchment and utilisation profiles, particularly on the Peninsula, where geographical areas are diverse in size, distance and density.

To further analyse provision and the number of facilities, if Council was to consider aquatic development, it is unreasonable to expect that one facility, centrally located could cater for the whole Shire. The Mornington Peninsula Shire is not like urban municipalities where services can be centrally located. The Peninsula has geographical characteristics that isolate areas and require more careful planning. Similarly, it is unreasonable to provide a local pool in every town. The trend in
development, as discussed earlier, is to balance provision with financial viability to develop sub-regional and regional facilities in response to community needs.
Considering the following:
♦ the Shire’s geographical and population centres,
♦ high profile locations,
♦ opportunities to consolidate facilities, and
♦ diversity of needs to be catered for,
the following locations emerge:

**Hastings:** to cater for the westernport side

**Rosebud:** to cater for the Port Phillip – southern peninsula side

**Mornington:** to cater for the Port Phillip – northern peninsula side

**Priorities for Development:**
The following factors have been considered in suggesting that Council proceed with the next stage of feasibility for these priority areas:

**Priority 1: Hastings**
♦ The area has no year round indoor aquatic facility access, and no nearby private or school facilities that are accessible
♦ The facility at HMAS Cerberus is not available for public access
♦ The existing facility at Hastings – the outdoor pool, has a limited life and a decision is required on its future. (There are concerns about closing it without a replacement facility.)
♦ Financial performance (of the 2 existing outdoor pools) could be greatly improved if a single, indoor year round facility was developed, consolidating the aquatic facilities
♦ This option requires that the current Crib Point pool be closed once the new facility is developed.
♦ There is an opportunity to relocate the facilities at the Hastings Leisure Centre also to the same site to further consolidate the leisure facilities for the Hastings and surrounding communities.

**Priority 2: Rosebud**
♦ Large population base with limited access to other regional aquatic facilities
♦ Lack of access for the aged communities to affordable and appropriate facilities
♦ Opportunity for joint resident/tourism facilities to create a regional and significant facility for year round use.

**Priority 3: Mornington**
♦ Better current access to aquatic facilities than the rest of the peninsula, so this area can be considered a lower priority
♦ Young, aged and a growing population that requires greater access to quality aquatic facilities
♦ Excellent opportunity to combine aquatics with other community facilities, eg: library, community centre, welfare services, etc, or with a school/community partnership
♦ The provision in Mornington could be reviewed once the Frankston facility is developed and its impact assessed; also the impact of the Rosebud and Hastings facilities.

Mornington Peninsula Shire Council
Sykes, Humphreys & Associates
Peddle Thorp Melbourne - Architects

April, 2000
The following table presents a summary of the key issues that have been raised through the study, discusses the main opportunity for each one, then identifies a policy area that this issue relates to. (The policy statements are then presented and discussed in the next Chapter).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Opportunity</th>
<th>Policy Area/s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seasonal availability and time access</td>
<td>Development of facilities should focus on indoor, year round provision</td>
<td>ACCESS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locations of Pools</td>
<td>Acknowledge the need for facilities that meet a wide range of local needs to be located strategically across the peninsula.</td>
<td>ACCESS DEVELOPMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concessions – financial accessibility</td>
<td>Develop facilities that allow Council to offer quality aquatic provision, at affordable costs for those in need of assistance.</td>
<td>ACCESS FINANCIAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard/Presentation of Facilities</td>
<td>Regardless of who provides aquatic facilities, Council is able to assist operators with advice, information and explore further coordination of marketing and management approaches.</td>
<td>MANAGEMENT HEALTH &amp; SAFETY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access for aged and special needs populations</td>
<td>Provision of hydrotherapy pools offering appropriate water temperature and depth, casual and programmed access to meet various needs.</td>
<td>ACCESS DEVELOPMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming skills, Water safety awareness</td>
<td>Ensuring adequate year round access for residents, schools and organisations to participate in water education programs</td>
<td>ACCESS HEALTH &amp; SAFETY</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 6: Council Policy for Provision of Aquatic Facilities

The following policy statements summarise Council’s role and basis for its decisions in relation to aquatic facility provision.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Statement</th>
<th>Basis of the Policy Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACCESS:</strong> All residents should have ‘reasonable’ access to indoor, year round aquatic facilities.</td>
<td>“Reasonable” access in terms of: 1. Distance: travelling distance - meeting local expectations to access a range of services 2. Time: opening hours and days that enable aquatic needs to be met 3. Physical: for people with special needs in gaining access to and using facilities 4. Financial: able to provide concessions and pricing structures that are affordable • All facilities that are available for public use, whether public, school or private, provide a community benefit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DEVELOPMENT:</strong> Council will provide a range of aquatic facilities in response to identified community needs, either independently or in partnership with others.</td>
<td>• It is important that aquatic facilities provide for the needs of residents • Council acknowledges the important contribution of the private sector, schools and community members in satisfying some community aquatic needs • Consideration of capital investment takes into account the process of prioritisation in Council’s capital works program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MANAGEMENT:</strong> Council should play a significant role in facilitating the provision of aquatic facilities.</td>
<td>• Owners/operators of swimming pools have legal obligations to provide safe, well supervised aquatic facilities • Well maintained facilities are more likely to meet safety standards • Council is well placed to facilitate effective, quality management practices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HEALTH &amp; SAFETY:</strong> Council recognises the importance of safe, well presented aquatic facilities, and the role these facilities play in ensuring safer communities.</td>
<td>• It is important that aquatic facilities provide safe physical environments, eg. shade, range of water depth, suitable water temperature, etc, in response to community need. • Building requirements and regulations, combined with responsible management ensures clean, hygienic, health atmosphere for aquatic pursuits • Water safety education programs are important to ensure community safety in an aquatic environment – the peninsula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FINANCIAL:</strong> Council will seek funding opportunities for the provision of aquatic facilities and will manage these facilities responsibly.</td>
<td>• Council seeks government financial assistance for a range of capital projects. Eg. SRV offer a specific funding program for aquatic facilities • Other financial partnerships will be considered and pursues where appropriate • Council will consider providing a subsidy to those components of aquatic facility provision where a community benefit is required.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 7: Options and Opportunities

The following key criteria have been used to assess the options presented in this section. The assessment takes into account a range of factors that relate to the provision of aquatic facilities.

Site Assessment
Consideration of site including, location, infrastructure, area, adjacent features, etc.

Community Safety / Health

Catchment
Local, Transient and Visitor catchment information. Proposed attendances, population catchment for facility. Travel times and tolerances of local communities, also takes into account location of competitors and their catchment.

Community Need
Current and potential needs – local residents. Gaps in local provision. Local population projections and implications of provision on a local level.

Financial Implications
Requirements for initial (capital) and annual expenditure – the need for deficit funding to subsidise operations. Funding opportunities. A further consideration is also annual (minor capital) maintenance programs for facilities. Pricing considerations / options for generating income.

Accessibility
Opportunities that exist for community to access aquatic facilities:
- within a reasonable distance, including access via public transport
- physically – design considerations (including DDA-disability discrimination act).
- at relevant times – daily, seasonal
- financially

Identification of Markets
User profile – types of users that are likely to be attracted to facility, eg: local residents, groups, visitors, etc.

Partnership and Management Considerations
Potential for partners in development, financing and/or ongoing management. Issues for management including supervision, design implications, management models.

The assessment of each option is presented using the following symbols:

4: Option satisfies the criteria
4: Option partially satisfies the criteria
6: Option doesn’t satisfy the criteria
HASTINGS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foreshore: Sub-regional facility with: 25m heated indoor pool - lap/leisure pool, toddlers pool, spa, creche, gym/aerobics, restaurant, hydrotherapy (future stage?).</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hastings leisure centre: Local facility: 25m indoor heated pool as an additional feature to the existing sports and gym components</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Hastings: The following details are provided for each assessment rating:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Assessment:</th>
<th>Financial Implications:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. The foreshore provides a high profile local site for Hastings and surrounding communities. The proposed site is the location of the existing outdoor pool, so a degree of infrastructure is already in place. As the site is a Crown land site in the management of Council, indications are that DNRE would be prepared to negotiate a new arrangement for an indoor pool development on this site. Additionally the foreshore offers a complementary range of leisure facilities in the surrounding parkland, marina and foreshore.  
2. The location of the existing Hastings Leisure Centre is not central to the township, being ‘tucked away’ in the industrial area of Hastings. While the current users of the facility would be familiar with its location, the site doesn’t offer the high profile that is preferred for a sub-regional facility. This site is also owned by the Crown and managed by Council under arrangement, so there is no particular advantage in the site itself, except that the facility offers leisure components that are compatible with the development of a pool facility. | Both facility options offer Council better financial performance than the current provision of 2 outdoor pools. It is possible that a facility on the foreshore with its high profile and ability to attract visitors as well as surrounding communities, could operate with little or no annual subsidy from Council, depending on a number of management factors. Financially, Council would gain because it currently has responsibility for two aging facilities that are only open for a limited annual season. |
| Accessibility: | Both facilities satisfy accessibility issues that currently are not provided by any other facilities. Again, due to the higher profile and better location of the foreshore option, accessibility for residents is likely to be better than the other option. |
| Community Safety/Health/Water Safety: | Catchment: |
| Both options satisfy this criteria | Catchment for the Hastings foreshore option is likely to be higher because the facility would have a higher profile. It is expected that some use by visitors to the township can be included in expected catchment figures.  
Approximate catchment figures: 1996: 5km: 11,739  
Projected catchment figures: 2016: 10km: 37,635  
Projected characteristics: Young & mature families, range of age groups. |
| Identification of markets: | • Local residents  
• Residents from the wider region  
• Tourists/Visitors  
• Business/Corporate health and fitness  
• Schools  
Due to the higher profile, it is likely that more types of users would be attracted to the facility if it were developed on the foreshore. |
| Community Need: | Partnerships and Management Considerations: |
| Community needs satisfied by both facilities, but better met by higher profile facility providing for a region, with more attractive amenity. | Limited options for partnership in development. Opportunities for packaging of services with other facilities in Somerville and Bittern. |
### ROSEBUD:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foreshore: Regional facility with: lap/leisure pool, toddlers pool, spa, lazy river, slides, hydrotherapy, indoor/outdoor design.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjacent Council Offices: Local facility with: lap/leisure pool, toddlers pool, spa, lazy river, hydrotherapy, Indoor design.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosebud Secondary College: School/ Council partnership with a local facility: 25m heated indoor pool incorporated with stadium, change areas, possible gym area</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dromana Secondary College: School/ Council partnership with a local facility: 25m heated indoor pool incorporated with stadium, change areas, possible gym area</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rosebud: The following details are provided for each assessment rating:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Assessment:</th>
<th>Financial Implications:</th>
<th>Accessibility:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The foreshore offers the best location for high profile, proximity to the water to continue an aquatic theme, and is consistent with the Coastal Strategy’s direction for the future development of this area. Negotiations would be required with DNRE and Parks Victoria regarding the overall planning of the site. 2. Other sites considered would not be appropriate for a regional development as they are too removed from the main town centres and main road. If they were to be considered any further, local facilities would be the most appropriate type of development, as outlined in the summary of options</td>
<td>The foreshore option, if developed in partnership with a commercial interest, could provide a quality facility with little Council input. A regional facility attracting the tourist market has potential to operate at a surplus. Council’s contribution to the development, both in terms of capital and operational costs, would be subject of negotiations – and would be further explored in the next stage of feasibility. School/Council partnerships are often financially attractive to Council as schools take on the financial responsibility, even if Council contributes an agreed annual grant. The other option, adjacent Council offices, would place a local facility in too close competition with the private facility in Rosebud, affecting the financial viability.</td>
<td>The location of the foreshore option provides the most effective access out of all options due to its location and high profile, on main transport routes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Community Safety/Health/Water Safety:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catchment:</th>
<th>Identification of markets:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Catchment for the Rosebud foreshore option is likely to be higher because the facility would have a higher profile. It is expected that significant use by visitors, particularly during the holiday season, can be included in expected catchment figures. The following figures are resident population: Approximate catchment figures: 1996: 5km: 15,932 Approximate catchment figures: 1996: 10km: 32,819 Projected catchment figures: 2016: 10km: 43,540 Projected characteristics: Broad range of age groups, retirees, elderly, mature families.</td>
<td>• Local residents  • Residents from the wider region  • Tourists/Visitors  • Business/Corporate health and fitness  • Schools  Due to the higher profile, it is likely that more types of users would be attracted to the facility if it were developed on the foreshore.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Community Need:

| Partnerships and Management Considerations: |
| Community needs satisfied by all facility options, but better met by higher profile foreshore facility providing for a region and the tourist market, with more attractive amenity and larger range of features in wet and dry facilities. | Potential for Council to negotiate with commercial interest to develop a region facility on the foreshore at little cost to Council. Serious consideration must be given to access for residents, but once negotiated, there is the potential to provide a good balance of access for all. Other options have little potential for partnership opportunities because they would be local facilities. |
MORNINGTON:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wilsons Rd: Sub-regional facility with 25m heated indoor pool, leisure water, hydrotherapy, spa, gym/aerobics area</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bentons Rd: Local facility with a 25m heated indoor pool, spa/sauna, health &amp; fitness area</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt. Eliza Secondary College: School/ Council partnership with a local facility: 25m heated indoor pool incorporated with stadium, change areas, possible gym area</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mornington Secondary College: School/Council partnership to expand current facility – accessibility and/or minor capital development</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mornington: The following details are provided for each assessment rating:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Assessment</th>
<th>Financial Implications</th>
<th>Community Safety/Health/Water Safety</th>
<th>Accessibility</th>
<th>Identification of markets</th>
<th>Partnerships and Management Considerations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| The preferred option is the Wilsons Rd site on the corner of Nepean Hwy, offering a high profile, easily visible location. The site, previously the junior secondary college, is currently under consideration for Council to acquire, and shows potential for development of a range of community facilities. Other sites being considered are either school sites or not as easily accessible as the preferred site. | Council’s financial position would be strongest with school/council partnerships as schools generally take financial responsibility for the facilities. The financial performance of council owned facilities would be dependent on degree of use and impact of private and school facilities. It is likely that Council would make a significant annual contribution to the operation of a facility. | All options satisfy this criteria | Accessibility issues would be better satisfied by facilities owned and operated by Council, as indicated in the first 2 options. The school facilities may have some access limitations. | More types of users can be accommodated in a facility that is sub-regional, with a higher profile:  
- Local residents  
- Residents from the wider region  
- Some Visitors to the area  
- Business/Corporate health and fitness  
- Schools | Some potential for joint development and management strategies with other community facilities if the Wilsons Road facility is chosen. Also some packaging opportunities with Council’s other facilities on Civic reserve. School facilities offer partnership opportunities under the terms of joint use agreements. |
| Catchment: Catchment for the Mornington Wilsons Rd option is likely to be higher because the facility would have a higher profile as a sub-regional facility. Approximate catchment figures: 1996: 5km: 23,636 Approximate catchment figures: 1996: 10km: 40,463 Projected catchment figures: 2016: 10km: 55,623 Projected characteristics: Range of age groups, high number of middle aged, young and mature families, high number of teenagers, retirees. | | | | | |
| Community Need: All options have the potential to meet the local needs that are currently not being met. The school options rate lower because of the issue of public access and willingness of the community to use school facilities | | | | | |
CHAPTER 8: Recommendations

A range of recommendations are presented after consideration by the consultancy team and council’s project representatives, focus group and management team:

1. That Council investigates more detailed feasibility of development of:
   
   PRIORITY 1: Hastings Foreshore – Sub-regional facility  
   PRIORITY 2: Rosebud Foreshore – Regional facility  
   PRIORITY 3: Mornington: Wilsons Rd site – Sub-regional facility

2. In addition, that Council,
   - Develops a marketing/promotion strategy for all aquatic facilities and opportunities.
   - Convenes a coordination group of all aquatic operators in Shire.
   - Coordinates promotion of facilities with City of Frankston – encourage maximum utilisation of complementary facilities across the region.

3. Prior to proceeding with the development of facilities, that Council adopts the following policy statements:

   ACCESS:  
   All residents should have ‘reasonable’ access to indoor, year round aquatic facilities.

   DEVELOPMENT:  
   Council will provide a range of aquatic facilities in response to identified community needs, either independently or in partnership with others.

   MANAGEMENT:  
   Council should play a significant role in facilitating the provision of aquatic facilities.

   HEALTH & SAFETY:  
   Council recognises the importance of safe, well presented aquatic facilities, and the role these facilities play in ensuring safer communities.

   FINANCIAL:  
   Council will seek funding opportunities for the provision of aquatic facilities and will manage these facilities responsibly.