

Political verses practical

Sir,- Re. Bastion Point Ocean Access. After extensive process the planning panel recommends "that an upgrade of the existing ramp and parking be undertaken."

Minister Madden said nothing for a year, then approved the extra-expensive breakwall development 3b anyway, but states, should the EGSC decide to proceed, requirements include consultation, design for climate change, traffic management, safety audit, search/rescue capacity...

How much more good tax/ratepayer money is to be thrown after bad? Especially when the panel concluded there would be "an overall net detriment to tourism" and that "the economic case for the project is very weak".

The "concern is that the facility should not become an essentially failed project that becomes a financial burden on the people of East Gippsland".

Regarding dredging it considers "the operational cost on EGSC or the facility operator could be such as to render the facility unviable".

Minister Madden cites safety for disregarding proper planning process! Yet after full investigation, the panel "has serious concerns in relation to the safety of all the new proposals", and although there were some advantages, they "are more than offset by the unacceptable risks."

Yours etc.,
M. Gibson,
Mallacoota.

PS: The only 'Australian standard' is for marinas. It "does not apply well to ocean boat ramps".

Brownstate
Advertiser
July 3 2009