

Old Broome Development Strategy

and Concept
Plan for Town
Beach and
Conti Foreshore

Part 2



Table of Contents

1	Context	4
1.1	Planning Framework	4
1.2	Role and Character of Old Broome	4
1.2.1	History	4
1.2.2	Residential Character	4
1.2.3	Mixed Use Character	5
1.2.4	Natural Environment	6
1.3	Yawuru Indigenous Land Use Agreement	6
2	Opportunities and Constraints Analysis	7
2.1	Challenges	7
2.1.1	Coastal Processes and sea level rise	7
2.1.2	Drainage	8
2.1.3	Access to the beach	9
2.1.4	Congestion during special events	10
2.1.5	Vehicle parking	10
2.1.6	Land Use	11
2.1.7	Demco Beach facilities	11
2.1.8	Footpaths	12
2.1.9	Cycling	13
2.1.10	Public Transport	13
2.1.11	Lack of shade and shelter	13
2.1.12	Limited provision of public open space	13
2.1.13	Water Corporation Sewerage pumping station	14
2.2	Opportunities	14
2.2.1	Seasonality	14
2.2.2	Increased support for community events	15
2.2.3	Interaction with Roebuck Bay	15
2.2.4	Celebration of culture and heritage	16
3	Heritage	17
3.1	Overview	17
4	Analysis of Commercial Demand	19
4.1	Analysis of Commercial Demand	19
4.1.1	Projected Demand	19
4.1.2	Current Provision	20
4.1.3	Future Provision of Commercial Floor Space in Other Areas	20
4.1.4	Future Provision of Commercial Floor Space in Old Broome	22
4.2	Implications of Commercial Demand Analysis on Land Use Recommendations for Old Broome	27

Appendices

Appendix A	Workshop Outcomes Report
Appendix B	Indicative Costings for Concept Plan Elements
Appendix C	Community Engagement Plan
Appendix D	Schedule of Submissions

Figures

Figure 1	Planning Framework
Figure 2	Elevation Contours and Inundation
Figure 3	Places of Heritage Significance
Figure 4	Vacant Land and Redevelopment Sites

Photos

Photo 1	Matso's on the corner of Hamersley and Carnarvon Streets
Photo 2	Erosion of the pindan cliffs adjacent to Town Beach
Photo 3	Man observed climbing the bank from beach to caravan park
Photo 4	Demco Beach
Photo 5	A family walks in a section of Walcott Street where there is no footpath
Photo 6	Fishing at Town Beach
Photo 7	Development Overlooking Roebuck Bay

Tables

Table 1	AEC Group Population Projections (2012)
Table 2	AEC Group Projections – Retail Floor Space Requirements
Table 3	AEC Group Projections – Commercial Office Floor Space Requirements
Table 4	Vacant Lots in Old Broome with Commercial Potential
Table 5	Potential Redevelopment Sites in Old Broome

1 Context

1.1 Planning Framework

The development strategy sits within a planning framework that starts with the State Planning Strategy as the overarching strategic document for land use planning within Western Australia. The State Planning Strategy informs the development of State Planning Policies and regional planning strategies. Within these, the local government planning strategies are established, followed by the local planning scheme and subsidiary documents, such as local planning policies.

This development strategy will have the status of a local planning policy under Town Planning Scheme No. 4 and subsequently Local Planning Scheme No. 6 once adopted by the Western Australian Planning Commission and the Minister for Planning. It is intended to provide guidance to land owners and the Shire of Broome when planning, assessing and/or determining proposals for subdivision, development or public works within Old Broome.



Figure 1 Planning Framework

1.2 Role and Character of Old Broome

1.2.1 History

The Old Broome precinct holds a special place in the history of Broome, being the location of sites of cultural significance for the Yawuru people and also being an area where the pearl shell industry once thrived along the shores of Roebuck Bay. The Old Broome Jetty was located at Town Beach and was a focus of commercial and social activity. People and cargo arrived in Broome at the Old Jetty, and pearl shell was loaded for export to overseas markets. The shore between the Old Broome Jetty and Streeters Jetty in Chinatown was lined with luggers, camps, pearling sheds, goods sheds, and Customs House (now the museum). A tram ran between the two jetties, providing a means of transport for people and goods. As the town grew, Old Broome became the location for the pearling masters' homes, a few of which still remain today.

Today the precinct is a focal point for tourist activity. It is the location of several hotel/resorts and other short term accommodation and numerous heritage listed buildings including the Courthouse (former Cable Station), Old Customs House (now the museum), and the well-known Matso's Brewery (former Union Bank). Town Beach itself is a popular swimming and fishing spot for locals and tourists, and is the favourite venue for viewing the Staircase to the Moon phenomenon, which is accompanied by the popular Staircase to the Moon night markets.

1.2.2 Residential Character

„Neighbourhood character“ is defined by Planisphere (2010) as „the qualitative interplay of built form, vegetation and topographic characteristics, in both the private and public domains, that make one place different from another.“ „Qualitative interplay“ is a term that describes how distinctive elements of an area come together to produce an overall sense of place. Trying to identify the character of a neighbourhood is attempting to determine how the buildings and the landscapes interact.

Old Broome was created in a grid road pattern, with wide road reserves (up to 40 metres) including generous verges which over time have dotted with mature vegetation. Some roads such as Stewart Street and portions of Walcott Street are somewhat haphazard; lacking kerbing, formal paved crossovers, and footpaths. Older buildings are set

back a considerable distance from the street as well as from side and rear boundaries, giving an impression of spaciousness. Front fencing is seldom provided, and when it is provided it is typically of a low height and does not appear visually dominant, enhancing a sense of openness. Most lots now contain lush vegetation which further adds to character and gives passers by the impression of wildness and secrecy. The oldest homes are low height with large open verandahs which ensures that the landscape is dominated by vegetation and not buildings. Although only a short distance from the heart of Chinatown, when walking the streets of the Old Broome residential areas you feel far away from the urban environment.

While the above paragraph describes the traditional residential character of Old Broome, it must be acknowledged that the area is under transition. Over the years there have been several „spot“ rezonings to a higher density coding, leading to isolated sites of grouped and multiple dwellings. As these developments are able to have lesser setbacks under the *Residential Design Codes of WA*, developers attempt to maximise yield which leads to a larger building footprint and erodes the appearance of spaciousness. Grouped and multiple dwellings also generate a greater need for vehicle access and car parking, and if these areas are not sited sensitively (such as along the side or to the rear of buildings) this can lead to paved areas and vehicles, rather than trees, dominating the streetscape.

It is possible to design grouped and multiple dwellings in a way that is sympathetic to the traditional neighbourhood character of Old Broome and this will ultimately be addressed through the preparation of Design Guidelines.

1.2.3 Mixed Use Character

The eastern areas of Old Broome already have a mixed use function, particularly along Carnarvon Street, Hamersley Street, and Robinson Street south of Guy Street. Mixed Use development also occurs on Frederick Street. Mixed use development in Old Broome is characterised by resort-style tourism developments, a scattering of restaurants and cafes, residential development and civic uses including the police station, prison, Shire offices, court house, hospital and numerous state agencies offices. Businesses supporting civic uses such as offices and consulting rooms have also been developed throughout the precinct. There is limited retail in the precinct, with the exception of the Seaview Local Centre across from the Museum.

Mixed use development has not proceeded in any particular form, which leads to a disjointed appearance. Along the main „spine“ of Hamersley Street most developments have on street or verge parking in different configurations.



Photo 1 Matso's on the corner of Hamersley and Carnarvon Streets

1.2.4 Natural Environment

It is impossible to consider the character of Old Broome without considering the stunning vistas of Roebuck Bay. Roebuck Bay is an ecologically diverse area that was declared a „Wetland of International Importance“ under the Ramsar Convention in June 1990. The shallow bay has more than 150 kilometres of mudflats attracting hundreds of thousands of migratory shorebirds annually. It is also home to dugong, turtles, three species of dolphins and a large number of fish and invertebrates that get sustenance from the seagrass meadows.

The colours of Roebuck Bay form an intrinsic part of the character of Old Broome – from the pindan cliffs to the lush green mangroves to the mudflats and the turquoise water. Travellers heading eastward along Guy Street are presented with an uninterrupted view of the bay, with Town Beach, the Mangrove Hotel and the Roebuck Bay Caravan Park also popular viewing places. The area's large tidal variation ensures that the bay is ever changing with the ebb and flow of the tides. This variation creates a unique atmosphere as the fresh smell of the changing tides is carried by prevailing winds.

For the Yawuru people, Roebuck Bay has always been an abundant source of food – fish, dugong, oysters, cockles, crabs and stingrays – as well as a place of cultural significance.

1.3 Yawuru Indigenous Land Use Agreement

On 25 February 2010 agreements recognising the connection of the Yawuru People with land in and around Broome were signed. These agreements are known as an Indigenous Land Use Agreements (ILUAs) and were registered by the National Native Title Tribunal on 6 August 2010.

ILUAs between Yawuru Native Title Holders, the WA Government, and the Shire of Broome create a framework for addressing Native Title and Aboriginal heritage issues. The ILUAs recognise the primary and principal rights of the Yawuru community in protecting and preserving heritage values.

Various lands were transferred to Yawuru ownership, enabling the traditional owners to actively participate in the development of Broome. The ILUA also sets aside land as conservation estate to be jointly managed by Nyamba Buru Yawuru (NBY), the Department of Parks and Wildlife, and the Shire of Broome.

Within and adjacent to the Old Broome precinct there are several sites that are under some form of tenure by the Yawuru - variously direct (freehold) ownership, being within the Yawuru Conservation Estate, or other forms of reserve. The entire foreshore is significant to the Yawuru, with Roebuck Bay being a traditional source of food. Kennedy Hill is very significant and contains archaeological material such as shell middens.

Heritage consultations and agreements (where necessary) with the Yawuru are required to ensure the management of affected land within the precinct is aligned with the Yawuru management plans and practices.

2 Opportunities and Constraints Analysis

2.1 Challenges

There are a number of challenges affecting the future development and management of land within Old Broome.

2.1.1 Coastal Processes and sea level rise

The study area is subject to Broome's large 10.5m tidal range. Parts of the Roebuck Bay foreshore and some adjacent inland areas are already under threat as a result of erosion and occasional inundation during high tides and/or storm surges. The Shire of Broome has commissioned the preparation of a coastal vulnerability study, which will examine all parts of the coastal foreshore including the Roebuck Bay foreshore and identify areas that are vulnerable to coastal processes such as erosion and inundation, including projected impacts of future sea level rise.

Pending the outcomes of the coastal vulnerability study, which will provide definite planning limits, Cardno coastal engineers reviewed previous studies and topographic information to provide preliminary advice on the likely extent of inundation in Old Broome resulting from high water levels.

Previous studies on Coastal Geomorphology, the Broome Boat Facility and the Broome Seawall have determined the 50-year and 100-year Average Recurrence Interval (ARI) water levels to be 5.3m and 5.5m AHD respectively. These values are not much greater than the highest astronomical tide, as expected due to the large tidal range.

Topographic contour data provided by the Shire of Broome has been reviewed and the 6m AHD and 8m AHD contours shown overlain on an aerial photograph of Broome in Figure 4. The 6m AHD contour (white) can be interpreted as the extent of coastal inundation under the 50-year and 100-year ARI water level conditions. The 8m AHD contour (orange) is a rough estimate of the coastal inundation that could be expected when the wave action is taken into consideration. The 10m AHD contour (blue) is also shown as a frame of reference.

The main locations where coastal inundation should be considered when planning for land use within the study area are in the vicinity of Town Beach and Conti Foreshore itself, on the eastern side of Hamersley Street south of Anne Street, and in the north of the study area. The pindan cliffs between Town Beach and Catalinas have a history of erosion (see for example Photo 2) If this erosion continues, private property, public land and heritage sites such as the Pioneer Cemetery could be at risk.




Figure 2 Elevation Contours and Inundation

2.1.2 Drainage

Current Shire policy (Policy 8.10 - Parking, storage, crossover and drainage standards for planning applications) requires a combination of on-site detention and infiltration and flow across paved areas to road/drain or legal points of discharge. Pre and post development flows must be equivalent. High volumes of rainfall are experienced during storm events in Broome and the pindan soil has low capacity for stormwater retention, therefore the road network plays an important role in the management of stormwater.

There are currently stormwater outlets into Roebuck Bay that do not have any compensation or nutrient stripping. Early indications from water quality monitoring suggest that these drains may contain higher than normal nutrient loads which can lead to adverse environmental impacts such as Lyngbya algal blooms. The Shire may need to look at innovative practices to retrofit some existing drains to try and reduce the nutrient load to meet best practice urban water management. Another option is to investigate the retention of stormwater in existing landscaped areas, such as in portions of Bedford Park, to avoid nutrient discharge into Roebuck Bay. The location of existing drains must also be carefully considered in determining where to site new infrastructure, as piped drainage cannot be used due to the high rainfall events.



Photo 2 Erosion of the pindan cliffs adjacent to Town Beach

2.1.3 Access to the beach

There is no formal beach access between Demco Beach and the northern extent of the Roebuck Bay Caravan Park, a distance of approximately 700 metres. The caravan park occupies much of the beach frontage, so that pedestrian access from the area immediately west is significantly restricted. However there is evidence of informal access through the dunes and down steep embankments, which is neither safe nor good for the stability of the dunes or dunal vegetation (see for example Photo 3).

Access to the foreshore is also limited in other locations. When the tide is out, many people like to walk along the beach between the foreshore and the mangroves, however safe access to the beach is very limited. At Town Beach itself there is no safe way down from the Old Jetty groyne or the pindan cliffs.



Photo 3 Man observed climbing the bank from beach to caravan park

2.1.4 Congestion during special events

Regular events such as the Courthouse Markets and Staircase to the Moon attract crowds of locals and visitors into the Old Broome area. Crowds attending the Staircase to the Moon markets range from 1,000 to 2,500 people. Other special events, such as the annual Shinju Matsuri dragon boat regatta and Australia Day celebrations also attract larger crowds to the area. The Shire's recorded attendance for Broome's 2013 Australia Day celebrations was between 4,000 and 5,000 people. These events can create congestion on local roads, particularly near Town Beach. Parked cars fill formal car parks and also park on verges and roadsides leading to venues, causing a nuisance for residents. Informal parking on land adjacent to Town Beach restricts land availability, forcing market stalls, pavilions and people attending these events, into confined spaces. For night time events like the Staircase to the Moon, pedestrians are negotiating unmade paths and crossing roads amongst vehicles without the benefit of adequate lighting or crossing points.

The situation is exacerbated by the fact that Robinson Street, the main access to Town Beach, ends in a cul-de-sac that limits circulation options for vehicles.

Managing safe access for vehicles and pedestrians and accommodating car parking is a priority for the precinct as the Shire's intention is to continue to support community events in the area. However it is acknowledged that large scale events occur infrequently, and any design response to managing congestion should not be such that it detracts from the amenity of the area experienced during the non-peak times.

2.1.5 Vehicle parking

During peak times, such as when the Staircase to the Moon markets are in progress, the availability of car parking in some parts of the precinct is insufficient to meet demand. There are also isolated pockets of congestion, such as near the Town Beach Club in Walcott Street.

As Old Broome evolves into a more intensive residential and mixed use area, the requirements for car parking will increase. It will be important that car parking for development is sensitively sited so that does not visually dominate verges and street frontages. Apart from being very expensive to build and maintain; extensive car parking, not in use for extended periods of time, will increase the number of hard surfaces in and around Old Broome. Hard surfaces are not ideal in Broome's climate and have the potential to become visually and environmentally detrimental to the area.

Some of the developed areas within Old Broome, such as the Broome Hospital, are also beginning to experience car parking issues. The Broome Hospital's parking provisions are insufficient, resulting in staff members often resorting to the use of abutting verges abutting for day-to-day car parking opportunities.

In addition to cars, there are requirements for parking for vehicles towing boat trailers and caravans, particularly near the Town Beach boat ramp. The space requirement for these vehicles is naturally higher than for regular parking. A factor in determining the amount of parking that is required for boats in particular will be plans for recreational boat launching facilities elsewhere in Broome. Car parking and boat trailer parking is presently located close to the water's edge it would be preferable to give priority in this area to people, not cars.

2.1.6 Land Use

Old Broome is already a fairly diverse area in terms of land use, but the intensity of development is generally very low. Within the precinct there are 34 vacant lots and numerous lots that have potential for significantly more intensive development than they currently accommodate. However transition to a fully mixed use area will necessarily be incremental.

LPS 6 does not zone the whole area for Mixed Use because zoning land ahead of demand risks scattered and sub-optimal development.

The challenge for Old Broome as it evolves will be the tension between two competing priorities – the need to ensure that new mixed use development optimises development potential and the need to preserve the historic, open character of the precinct.

Within Old Broome there are a number of buildings that either have heritage significance (refer Section 3.1) or are intact examples of „Broomestyle“ residential development. Land to the west of Robinson Street will generally remain zoned „R10“ in LPS 6 (unless already assigned a higher coding under the current Town Planning Scheme No.4), which is consistent with the Shire's *Local Housing Strategy* (2009).

During the public advertising period for the LPS and LPS6, community sentiment was overwhelmingly in favour of retaining the low density R10 coding when rezoning and future mixed use development occurs within the portions of the precinct between Robinson and Herbert Streets, particularly north of Guy Street. This has now been formalised in the draft LPS. As there have already been several grouped and multiple dwelling developments constructed at higher densities in Old Broome over the years, new development at a R10 density may appear „underdeveloped“ in comparison. The reduced dwelling yield and resultant financial implications may affect the viability and timing of redevelopment in this area.

2.1.7 Demco Beach facilities

The Demco Beach parking area due to its isolation has a history of illegal camping and incidents of anti social behavior. There is a rotunda shelter but no seating, toilets, rubbish bins, drinking water or interpretive signage. However the beach is popular for fishing and dog walking, and basic amenities such as toilets and fish cleaning facilities would benefit legitimate beach users and the environment.



Photo 4 Demco Beach

2.1.8 Footpaths

Broome is very much a car based community and this is evident from the relatively poor pedestrian facilities and lack of pedestrian priority. There is inconsistency in the provision of pedestrian infrastructure. In several Old Broome street blocks there is no footpath on either side of the street (see for example Photo 5), and no plan to provide them in the current Broome Pathway Plan. Despite the very wide road reserves (typically 40 metres), there are very few streets with footpaths on both sides. This increases the likelihood of pedestrians putting themselves in danger by walking on the road.

Also inconsistent is the location of existing footpaths relative to property boundaries and the carriageway. In some locations the footpath is immediately adjacent to the road, in others it runs alongside the property boundary and in others it is somewhere in between.

The location of the footpath relative to the property boundary will in some cases be dictated by the manner in which car parking is dealt with. It is undesirable for cars to have to cross a footpath in order to get to car parking other than in controlled situations (such as formal crossovers). Footpaths close to the road are less likely to enjoy shade from vegetation or buildings.

If Old Broome is to become a mixed use area, including higher density housing, commercial development and business tourism development, there will inevitably be more people walking around and through the area, as well as more vehicle traffic. It will be important that there be adequate and „joined-up“ footpaths with safe road crossings. There are few formal pedestrian crossings at present, even on busy roads or near the primary school and hospital. Additionally the primary school and hospital street blocks (Weld/Robinson/Walcott/Anne/Barker) are exceptionally long, with no formal pedestrian access across them.

Notwithstanding the above, it is acknowledged that competing priorities and funding constraints may prevent a full complement of footpaths from being developed in the short to medium term. For instance, it is highly unrealistic that footpaths will be installed on both sides of the road on every street in Old Broome. It is important, however, for this Strategy to identify the key pedestrian routes and noticeable gaps in the existing network so the provision of footpaths can be planned for. The provision of street lighting along key pedestrian thoroughfares also warrants consideration.

2.1.9 Cycling

There are very few facilities for cyclists in Old Broome. Even bicycle parking rails are scarce. For children and others who either do not have access to a car or prefer not to use one, cycling and walking are the only real options for transport.

Safe routes, particularly to the schools but also for recreational cyclists would encourage more people to cycle. Evidence is widespread that even in hot and humid climates like Broome's, people will cycle if the facilities are available. For travel to work, end-of-trip facilities like showers will be important to encourage more people to cycle.

Cycling and walking are not only healthier options that result in better public health outcomes, but also reduce reliance on fossil fuel.



Photo 5 A family walks in a section of Walcott Street where there is no footpath

2.1.10 Public Transport

There is no real public transport in Broome other than taxi services, the school bus service and the tourist-focussed Town Bus service that runs hourly, with half hourly services during the peak tourist season. The Town Bus travels through Old Broome via Carnarvon Street, Hamersley Street, Louis Street, Robinson Street, Hopton Street and also Frederick Street, connecting the major tourist accommodation area and tourist destination points.

There is support within sections of the Broome community for the introduction of the tram line between Chinatown and Town Beach, and potentially beyond, however this too is likely to be primarily a tourist service and will not be a serious option for the majority of trips.

Increased population density in Old Broome may eventually justify an expanded bus service and a fare structure to suit frequent users, but in the meantime those without access to a car will have to rely on walking, cycling or taxis to move around.

2.1.11 Lack of shade and shelter

There is a lack of shade and shelter in the public realm which discourages the use of outdoor spaces. Given the climate of Broome, the provision of shade and occasional shelter is important to encourage people to walk rather than drive for shorter journeys, and to provide general protection from sun and rain. Shade trees, free-standing shelters and building verandahs and awnings are all ways to provide protection for pedestrians in the public realm.

2.1.12 Limited provision of public open space

Under the Western Australian Planning Commission's *Liveable Neighbourhoods*, an operational policy which establishes minimum standards for subdivision design, a total of 10 percent of the gross subdivisional area of any

development must be ceded free of cost to the local government for the provision of Public Open Space („POS“). POS generally takes the form of parks and other outdoor spaces, and can in some circumstances contain community facilities and/or drainage infrastructure. Whilst *Liveable Neighbourhoods* is mainly used to plan for greenfield development sites, the 10% standard is recognised as a benchmark for sufficient provision of POS within an urban area. *Liveable Neighbourhoods* also establishes the maximum distance a person should have to travel to access POS based on type of space provided. For instance, a local park (up to 3000m² in size) should be provided within 150m to 300m from each dwelling.

As Old Broome was developed prior to the requirements for mandatory provision of POS at subdivision, there is a lack of formalised areas of POS. Most of Old Broome is located outside of the walkable catchment of any local or neighbourhood parks, although located within the 1 kilometre walkable catchment for district level facilities at Town Beach, Haynes Oval, or Male Oval. The only local parks within the precinct are Bedford Park and Demco Park. Farrell Park provides another option for residents in the south western portion of the precinct to access POS, however this park is owned and managed by Nyamba Buru Yawuru and not the Shire of Broome. Whilst recreational facilities are provided at the Broome Primary School and PCYC, these are not freely accessible to members of the public.

There is a need to ensure that high quality POS is provided to meet the needs of current and future residents, particularly as residential density increases. It is important that existing open spaces are retained and enhanced to provide community benefit.

2.1.13 Water Corporation Sewerage pumping station

Lots 241 and 1913 Robinson Street are owned by the Water Corporation and used for a sewerage pumping station which contains a large underground storage tank. The Water Corporation has advised that the pumping station is permanent infrastructure and will be retained. As a result, constraints on the site restrict any form of infrastructure being developed. Opportunities to relocate the pumping station will have to be considered before infill development is permitted.

2.2 Opportunities

Whilst the above section outlines challenges to be considered in planning for the Old Broome area, this development strategy also considers opportunities that can inform future planning. In some cases, an element that is viewed as a challenge in one person's perspective can be viewed equally by others as an opportunity.

2.2.1 Seasonality

The Town Beach Cultural Plan (2010) refers to work by Gunn (1989) which described “the intangible qualities of Broome's lifestyle known as „Broome Time.” First among the seven statements are the following:

- Lifestyle is synchronised with the land, climate and tides; and
- Lifestyle flows with the seasonal change.

This „ebb and flow” is characteristic of life in Broome and reflected in the town's population, which can double over the dry season. This fluctuation provides an opportunity to consider options for short term businesses to take advantages of busy periods through „pop up” facilities and temporary trading in designated locations. Encouraging seasonal trade will provide additional amenities for tourists and locals alike, but will not result in the need for costly buildings and infrastructure which will be underutilised during the wet season when the population decreases.

„Pop up” facilities are a way to activate underutilised areas as a precursor to permanent development, which may not be feasible in some locations until the Broome's permanent population increases.



Photo 6 Fishing at Town Beach

2.2.2 Increased support for community events

Parts of Old Broome, specifically the Town Beach and Conti Foreshore and Bedford Park, are periodically used for community events, such as commemoration of ANZAC Day, Australia Day, and the Dragon Boat Regatta associated with the Shinju Matsuri Festival. The Shire of Broome is playing an active role in coordinating and publicising events, and the number of events will increase over time.

2.2.3 Interaction with Roebuck Bay

Old Broome is one of the few locations in Broome where development directly overlooks the water, and individual sites as well as public spaces are privileged with uninterrupted views of Roebuck Bay. There is the opportunity for new development in the Precinct to retain clear vistas to Roebuck Bay and to provide and enhance visual and pedestrian linkages to the foreshore.

The Shire is currently planning a Jetty to Jetty walk trail which will extend from Streeter's Jetty in Chinatown to Town Beach. Whilst the route and design of the Jetty to Jetty trail is still being finalised, it will consist of a formalised path in some locations and an informal beach path in other locations. It is envisaged that the Jetty to Jetty trail will include interpretative signage and other material which helps to share the stories of the area's history and unique environmental attributes. In tandem with initiatives such as Jetty to Jetty, new development in Old Broome can help promote the conservation and interpretation of the natural and cultural values of Roebuck Bay.



Photo 7 Development Overlooking Roebuck Bay

2.2.4 Celebration of culture and heritage

Old Broome is rich with elements of cultural heritage significance, and this connection to the past forms an intrinsic part of the area's character.

Since time immemorial the area we now know as Old Broome has been home to the Yawuru people, who lived off the abundant food sources available in Roebuck Bay. After European settlement it was, in conjunction with Chinatown and the establishment of the pearling industry, one of the first areas to be developed, and as a result contains a considerable number of historic buildings .

Future development in Old Broome has the opportunity to build on the area's unique mixture of Aboriginal, European and Asian heritage and to better interpret this for the benefit of residents and visitors. Section 3 below discusses the heritage significance of Old Broome in greater detail.

3 Heritage

3.1 Overview

Heritage defines an area's history and character and helps reinforce a local community's sense of identity and stability. From the end of the nineteenth century to the 1960s the town of Broome was arguably the most multi-cultural community in Australia. It was, and continues to be, home to Aboriginal people from diverse backgrounds. Following the arrival of the pearlers and European settlement, Broome also became home to many permanent and transient cultural groups from Asia. Pearling masters took advantage of land situated within close proximity to Chinatown to establish permanent residencies throughout the area now known as „Old Broome“.

The earliest inhabitants, dating back to more than 40,000 years ago, were the Australian Aborigines. To date the Dampier Peninsula remains home to a number of groups of people, identified largely through language – Yawuru, Djugun, Ngumbari, Jabirrjabirr, Nyulnyul, Numanburr, Warrwa, Bardi and Jawi people, often collectively referred to as Goolarabooloo, the Salt-Water People. Town Beach and Conti Foreshore form part of the coast, which for many years has been considered as the foundation of Aboriginal cultural, spiritual, social and economic life. Today, much of Old Broome is located within a Heritage site as listed on the Aboriginal Sites Register maintained by the Department of Aboriginal Affairs.

The heritage of Old Broome is one of its key defining characteristics so its conservation is critical to retaining the essence of what makes it special. This level of recognition also enhances the community's sense of identity, belonging and continuity, as many Broome residents hold strong family ties which date back to the earliest days of settlement. Existing remnant buildings have helped characterise Broome's heritage. However, considering the nature of Broome's history, a lot of its heritage remains untold or invisible; in the form of stories and memories.

A thematic history undertaken for the Shire of Broome has identified, assessed and documented all post-contact places, buildings and features of potential cultural heritage significance. There have been several sites identified within Old Broome, most of which date back the pearling industry and early European settlement such as the Broome Regional Prison, McDaniel's Homestead, the Anglican Church of Annunciation, Matso's Store and Captain Gregory's building. The significance and value of each place identified has been assessed as part of a heritage study and included on the Shires Municipal Heritage Inventory. Within Old Broome, there are several places listed on the Shire's Municipal Heritage Inventory with seventeen (17) of these places also registered on the State Register of Heritage Places. A listing on the State Register of Heritage Places affords a place the highest level of protection under the *Heritage of Western Australia Act 1990*.

The ongoing interpretation and conservation of Broome's heritage ensures new development continues to foster authenticity. One of the key actions in this Strategy is the development of design guidelines to ensure that new development conserves the heritage and character of Old Broome.

Figure 3 depicts the existing heritage places and areas on the Shire's Municipal Heritage Inventory, places on the State Register of Heritage Places, and Aboriginal heritage sites that are listed on the Aboriginal Sites Register.




Figure 3 Places of Heritage Significance

4 Analysis of Commercial Demand

4.1 Analysis of Commercial Demand

Transitioning Old Broome into a mixed use area will allow for the provision of additional commercial floor space to cater to the needs of a growing population. This section examines the current provision of commercial floor space in Broome, the projected future demand, and how this Strategy can assist in meeting the demand. It assists in providing the rationale for the land use designations and the extents of the designations in the Strategy Plan.

4.1.1 Projected Demand

In 2012, AEC Group prepared a Community Profile for the Shire of Broome to inform preparation of the LPS and LPS6. The Community Profile used four different scenarios to estimate population growth in Broome through 2031, taking into account a range of factors. Table 1 describes the four scenarios.

Scenario 1 (permanent residential population only)	WA Tomorrow medium population projections No inclusion of visitors or transient workers
Scenario 2 (permanent residents and visitors)	WA Tomorrow medium population projections Projected future visitors (i.e. tourists)
Scenario 3 (permanent residents, visitors and 35 Mtpa LNG operations at James Price Point)	WA Tomorrow medium population projections 35 Mtpa LNG operations, running up to 10 LNG trains Projected future visitors (both leisure and business travellers)
Scenario 4 (permanent residents, visitors and maximum LNG operations at James Price Point)	WA Tomorrow high population projections 50 Mtpa LNG operations, running up to 14 LNG trains Doubling of expected growth in future leisure visitation and increases business visitation from LNG activities

Table 1 AEC Group Population Projections (2012)

AEC Group also prepared an Economic Profile, which used the above scenarios to estimate future demand for, amongst other things, retail and commercial office floor space. Tables 2 and 3 outline the floor space requirements that are projected under each scenario. Please note that the AEC Group profile further broke down retail demand into categories such as „groceries and specialty food,“ „clothing and accessories“ and others, however this analysis focuses more broadly on overall totals.

Population Scenario	2011	2016	2021	2026	2031
Scenario 1	28,471 m ²	34,743 m ²	40,912 m ²	47,911 m ²	56,680 m ²
Scenario 2	37,755 m ²	46,098 m ²	52,541 m ²	59,744 m ²	68,764 m ²
Scenario 3	37,755 m ²	48,640 m ²	56,577 m ²	62,182 m ²	72,067 m ²
Scenario 4	37,755 m ²	49,134 m ²	57,636 m ²	62,745 m ²	73,366 m ²

Table 2 AEC Group Projections – Retail Floor Space Requirements

Population Scenario	2011	2016	2021	2026	2031
Scenario 1	30,247 m ²	34,207 m ²	37,628 m ²	41,409 m ²	46,113 m ²
Scenario 2	30,247 m ²	34,207 m ²	37,628 m ²	41,409 m ²	46,113 m ²

Population Scenario	2011	2016	2021	2026	2031
Scenario 3	30,247 m ²	36,303 m ²	40,721 m ²	42,627 m ²	47,555 m ²
Scenario 4	30,247 m ²	37,026 m ²	41,855 m ²	43,176 m ²	48,559 m ²

Table 3 AEC Group Projections – Commercial Office Floor Space Requirements

Given the current status of the LNG development, it is unlikely that Scenario 4 (which contemplates maximum LNG production, a doubling of tourists and the highest projections for permanent population growth) will come to pass over the life of the LPS or of this Strategy. However, it still provides a useful context as to the upper limits of growth which could be experienced if a number of factors were to align. For the purposes of this analysis we are focussing on the „mid-range“ scenarios 2 and 3 as the most likely to occur within the life of this Strategy.

Under Scenario 2, it was estimated that in 2011 there was a demand for 37,755m² of retail floor space in the Shire, and a demand for 30,247m² of commercial office floor space. By 2031, there would be a demand for 68,764m² of retail floor space, and 46,113m² of commercial office floor space – an increase of 31,009m² and 15,866m² respectively.

Under Scenario 3, it was estimated that in 2011 there was a similar demand for 37,755m² of retail floor space in the Shire, and a demand for 30,247m² of commercial office floor space. By 2031, there would be a demand for 72,067m² of retail floor space, and 47,555m² of commercial office floor space – an increase of 34,312m² and 17,308m² respectively.

4.1.2 Current Provision

In 2007, the Shire of Broome prepared a Local Commercial Strategy, which estimated a total provision of 70,000m² of commercial floor space in the Shire, 40,000m² of which was retail and 30,000m² of commercial office. Under both the Scenario 2 and 3 projections, this means there is currently a slight oversupply of retail floor space in Broome. The supply of commercial office floor space is approximately commensurate with current demand under both scenarios.

In the Chinatown Development Strategy (2013), the Shire estimated that there was currently in the order of 28,000m² – 29,000m² combined retail and commercial office floor space provided in Chinatown. Western Australian Planning Commission estimates from 2003/04 place this total somewhat lower at 23,390m², with 6,279m² being devoted to office and 17,111m² devoted to retail.

The Broome Boulevard Neighbourhood Centre provides an additional 11,541m² of retail floor space, with the rest being provided in smaller Local Centres and portions of the Light Industrial Area.

4.1.3 Future Provision of Commercial Floor Space in Other Areas

4.1.3.1 Chinatown

It can be difficult to estimate the future provision of commercial floor space in established areas such as Chinatown where the majority of development will be redevelopment rather than „greenfield“ development. To try to address this difficulty, the authors of the Chinatown Development Strategy focussed on larger vacant land parcels in single ownership as the most likely sites to be developed. Whilst this approach has some drawbacks as it does not fully account for other constraints (for instance, coastal setbacks and inundation risk) which may limit the form of development on a vacant site, it is a useful indicator of potential yield.

Using this method, the Chinatown Development Strategy identified two vacant or largely vacant areas in single ownership. They are Lots 160 and 161 Carnarvon Street and Lot 43 Dampier Terrace which have a combined area of 1.013 ha; and Lot 3067 Dampier Terrace which has a total area of 1.0358 ha. These areas are shown in the Chinatown Development Strategy Concept Plan as being suitable for infill retail and commercial development. The Chinatown Development Strategy then used the 2003 Chinatown Design Guidelines to estimate the total floor space that could be provided should these sites be developed to their full potential.

In 2013 Council adopted amended Design Guidelines for Chinatown which allow 75% site coverage and three storey development with a plot ratio of 1. Applying a plot ratio of 1 to the two sites described above would lead to the provision of a maximum floor space of 10,130m² and 10,358m² respectively. Put together, this additional 20,488m² (if split evenly between commercial office and retail) would provide an additional 10,244m² retail floor space and 10,244m² commercial office floor space. These figures do not account for additional redevelopment in Chinatown

which may take place over the life of this Strategy and as such are considered to be a reasonably conservative estimate of future floor space provision.

4.1.3.2 Kimberley Regional Offices

In addition to redevelopment which may take place in Chinatown, it is also worthwhile to consider other areas where new development or redevelopment is planned to occur,

The Kimberley Regional Offices complex is located just outside of Chinatown on portions of Lot 30 Napier Terrace and Lots 686, 951 and 1332 Frederick Street. Collectively these lots are identified as Reserve 8656 which has a Management Order in favour of the Shire of Broome for the purpose of „offices.“

The Shire is currently investigating options for redeveloping the site to provide a higher quality of facilities for the tenants. Whilst a definitive option is yet to be identified, it is possible that this may entail the demolition of one or more of the existing buildings and the construction of new building(s) to replace them. Refurbishment of the existing buildings, or some combination of refurbishment and new construction, are also options.

At present, the two existing buildings have a total Net Lettable Area (NLA) of 2313m². Under LPS6, Reserve 8656 is proposed to be zoned „Town Centre.“ The development standards for the „Town Centre“ zone allow for 75% site coverage and a plot ratio of 1. Reserve 8656 has a total area of 8056.73m². Therefore, if the land was developed to the fullest extent possible under LPS6 a total of 8,056.73m² of commercial office floor space could be achieved. Given site constraints however, it is highly unlikely that this scale of development will occur, with potential floor space estimated to be more in the order of 3,000 to 4000m². If approximately 4,000m² is provided, this would be an additional 1,687m² of commercial floor space to what exists on the site at present, and will help meet some of the demand.

4.1.3.3 Broome North

It can also be difficult to speculate where, and how much, commercial development can be anticipated in other parts of Broome. One way of doing this is to look at adopted structure plans, such as the Broome North District Development Plan (2010). The Broome North District Development Plan allows for the creation of two Local Centres, each with a total floor space of 3,000m² (with 1,500m² of that devoted to an anchor tenant such as a supermarket). The first of these Local Centres, to be located on Lot 9007 Magabala Road, has been planned for through Local Development Plan 1. The commercial component of this centre is planned for completion in 2018. Assuming that the remaining 1,500m² of floor space within this Local Centre is split equally between retail and commercial office, this will lead to an additional supply of 2,250m² of retail floor space and 750m² of commercial office floor space.

The second Local Centre in Broome North has not been considered in detail as it will be part of subsequent stages of subdivision and will not likely be developed in the short to medium term.

4.1.3.4 Broome International Airport Land

There is also the potential for new commercial development to take place on the land directly to the east of the Broome Boulevard shopping centre (Lot 1468 and Pt. Lot 1653 MacPherson Street), as these lots have a 21 lot subdivision approval in place. Under LPS6, the area covered by the subdivision approval is proposed to be zoned „Service Commercial,“ a zone which is intended to cater for large format retail such as warehouses and showrooms. Under LPS6, a maximum plot ratio of 0.5 is permitted for development in the „Service Commercial“ zone. The total developable area of the subdivision is approximately 44.73 hectares, which translates to a potential of 22.36 hectares (223,650m²) of new development. Should this development potential be fully realised, it would far exceed the retail needs projected for Broome over the life of this Strategy and the LPS. However, construction of this subdivision has not yet commenced and the first stages of development are likely to be several years away.

It is noted that the „Service Commercial“ zone is not designed for smaller „boutique-type“ retail, and instead is intended for larger developments (such as bulky goods retail, car hire and sales etc.) that are car rather than pedestrian orientated. Should this land ultimately be developed for „Service Commercial“ purposes, it would further be desirable for some existing businesses to relocate from the „Light and Service Industry“ zone to the new area and for the vacated land to be used to meet the concurrent demand for light industrial floor space. (The requirements for light industrial land are not discussed in detail in this Strategy but are covered in the AEC Group Economic Profile.)

Furthermore this area will not be able to accommodate the demand for commercial office space as under LPS6 „office“ uses are not permitted within the „Service Commercial“ zone unless incidental to another approved use within the zone. The remaining demand for this type of floor space will have to be met elsewhere.

4.1.4 Future Provision of Commercial Floor Space in Old Broome

Like Chinatown, Old Broome is largely developed and therefore the bulk of new development will be redevelopment, the likelihood and timing of which is difficult to anticipate. In a similar fashion to the Chinatown Development Strategy, this section will examine the development potential of the precinct first by considering vacant land and then considering sites that have previously been identified as having redevelopment potential.

4.1.4.1 Vacant Land

Within Old Broome, there are currently 31 vacant lots. Of these sites, three lots are currently zoned „Mixed Use“ under TPS4, with an additional nine lots proposed to be zoned „Mixed Use“ under LPS6, with densities of either R10 (generally applied to lots west of Robinson Street) or R40. The remaining 19 lots are proposed to be zoned „Residential;“ under LPS6, with densities of either R10 or R40. Figure 4 below shows vacant land and its proposed zoning and density coding under LPS6.




Figure 4 Vacant Land and Redevelopment Sites

Table 4 shows the location and size of vacant lots that are proposed to be zoned „Mixed Use“ under LPS6, and therefore have future commercial potential.

Site	Zoning (TPS4)	Zoning (LPS6)	Lot Number	Street	Size
1	Mixed Use (R40)	Mixed Use (R40)	106	Robinson Street	2327 m ²
2	Mixed Use (R40)	Mixed Use (R40)	11	Weld Street	902 m ²
3	Mixed Use (R10)	Mixed Use (R40)	451	Hamersley Street	667 m ²
4	Residential (R10/R20)	Mixed Use (R40)	20	Robinson Street	1221 m ²
5	Residential (R10/R20)	Mixed Use (R40)	21	Robinson Street	610 m ²
6	Residential (R40)	Mixed Use (R40)*	71	Frederick Street	2026 m ²
7	Residential (R40)	Mixed Use (R40)*	72	Frederick Street	2026 m ²
8	Settlement	Mixed Use (R40)	52	Dampier Terrace	2024 m ²
9	Residential (R40)	Mixed Use (R40)	63	Robinson Street	2028 m ²
10	Residential (R10)	Mixed Use (R10)	131	Weld Street	2431 m ²
11	Residential (R10)	Mixed Use (R10)	133	Weld Street	2431 m ²
12	Residential (R10)	Mixed Use (R10)	2	Robinson Street	1498 m ²
Total Area					2.02 ha
Total Developable Area					1.01 ha

*northern portion of site only as per Scheme maps

Table 4 Vacant Lots in Old Broome with Commercial Potential

Under LPS6, a maximum plot ratio of 0.5 is proposed for sites zoned „Mixed Use.“ As the lots detailed in Table 4 have a total area of 2.02 hectares, this means that a maximum of 1.01 hectares (10,100 m²) could be developed. However it is noted that as the sites in Table 4 will be zoned „Mixed Use“ there is the potential for some of the developable area to be used for residential or tourist accommodation. These calculations represent the maximum commercial yield possible, as it is impossible to predict how individual owners will choose to develop their landholdings.

4.1.4.2 Potential Redevelopment Sites

In addition to the vacant land discussed above, the Shire has identified sites in Old Broome with redevelopment potential. In some instances, this land has been identified for more intensive development under LPS6. In other instances, the land has an existing Planning Approval in place for redevelopment; a pending Planning Application; or has been the subject of substantial discussion between the landowner and the Shire. Other lots are currently reserved for various public purposes but may be able to transition to private use over time if they are no longer required for public use. Figure 4 above shows the location and proposed zoning of potential redevelopment sites.

The lots identified are not intended to be an exhaustive account of future redevelopment sites but represent an initial analysis based on existing information available to the Shire about landowner intent.

Table 5 below outlines the lots that have been identified as having redevelopment potential that could include a commercial component. Sites 1-6 have the potential to be redeveloped immediately, whilst sites 7-9 will require a future Scheme Amendment in order to proceed. It is noted that the Department of Parks and Wildlife land, which is discussed in the Concept Plan, has not been included in Table 5 as this Strategy envisages its future use as an extension of the Roebuck Bay Caravan Park with no stand alone retail or commercial office component.

Site	Zoning (TPS4)	Zoning (LPS6)	Lot Number	Street	Size
1	Special Use	Special Use	213	Hamersley Street	2210 m ²
			214	Hamersley Street	2212 m ²
			215	Robinson Street	2210 m ²
			216	Hamersley Street	2209 m ²
2	Mixed Use (R40)	Mixed Use (R40)	1029	Carnarvon Street	933m ² (39.25 m ²)*
3	Special Use	Mixed Use (R40)	3	Anne Street	3650 m ²
	Mixed Use (R40)	Mixed Use (R40)	280	Hamersley Street	1217m ²
	Mixed Use (R40)	Mixed Use (R40)	281	Anne Street	1215 m ²
4	Settlement	Mixed Use (R40)	3061	Frederick Street	1.01 ha
5	Residential (R10)	Mixed Use (R10)	130	Weld Street	2433 m ²
6	Mixed Use (R40)	Mixed Use (R40)	143	Hamersley Street	2430 m ²
Total Area					3.08 ha***
Total Developable Area					1.39 ha****
7	Civic and Cultural Reserve	Public Purposes Reserve	135	Barker Street	2431 m ²
8	Public Purposes Reserve	Public Purposes Reserve	Pt. 99	Hamersley Street	6965 m ^{2**}
9	Public Purposes Reserve	Parks, Recreation and Drainage Reserve	Pt. 300	Robinson Street	2770m ^{2**}
Total Area					1.22 ha
Total Developable Area					6083m²
Overall Area					4.3 ha***
Overall Developable Area					2.0 ha****

*Note that whilst the total area of this lot is 933m², the current planning approval includes 39.25m² of commercial office space, with the rest of the site to be used for multiple dwellings.

** Estimated site area only as developable area will only comprise portion of site,

*** Total includes full site area of Lot 1029 Carnarvon Street.

**** Total includes 39.25m² of developable area (commercial) for Lot 1029 Carnarvon Street in recognition of existing planning approval for the site.

Table 5 **Potential Redevelopment Sites in Old Broome**

Under LPS6, a maximum plot ratio of 0.5 is proposed for sites zoned „Mixed Use.“ (It has been assumed based on their location and adjoining zoning that if the „public purposes“ site were rezoned it would be to „Mixed Use“). Based on the above, if all the redevelopment sites were developed to their full capacity this could lead to the provision of an additional 20,000m² of commercial floor space. As per Section 5.3.4.1 above, this assumes the maximum developable area for commercial purposes. It is acknowledged that many, if not all, developments will contain a residential or tourist accommodation component which will reduce the totals accordingly.

4.1.4.3 Summary of Potential Commercial Yield in Old Broome

In assessing the commercial needs of Broome until 2031, the above sections took into account the following assumptions:

- Two large vacant sites in single ownership located within Chinatown will be developed solely for commercial purposes over the life of this Strategy;
- The redevelopment of the Kimberley Regional Office Complex on the corner of Frederick Street, Weld Street and Napier Terrace will take place over the life of this Strategy, yielding a total NLA of 4,000m²; and
- The planned commercial component of one of the two Local Centres in Broome North will be fully developed over the life of this Strategy.

Based on the above assumptions, a total of 12,494m² of additional retail floor space and 12,681m² of commercial office floor space could be provided over the life of this Strategy from areas outside of Old Broome.

The development of the Broome International Airport subdivision adjacent to the Broome Boulevard was also considered, with the acknowledgement that if this area was fully developed it would alone provide more retail floor space than would be required over the planning timeframe, including under Scenario 4. Notwithstanding this, as stated above it is possible that even with an influx of available land that more boutique and tourist orientated retail would still prefer to locate elsewhere.

As stated in Section 4.4.1 above, under the AEC Group projections, it is estimated that under Scenario 2 an additional 31,009m² of retail floor space and 15,866m² of commercial office floor space will be required to meet demand by 2031. Under Scenario 3 these figures increase to 34,312m² of retail and 17,308m² of commercial office, respectively.

Should the land discussed above be developed as assumed, this would reduce the requirement to 18,515m² of retail floor space and 3,185m² of commercial office floor space under Scenario 2; and to 21,818m² of retail floor space and 4,627m² of commercial office floor space under Scenario 3. It is the Shire's intention that the majority of new retail development be located in Chinatown, however there is scope for limited tourist-orientated retail and entertainment uses to be located in portions of Old Broome.

If all the vacant land within Old Broome that is currently zoned „Mixed Use“ under TPS4, or proposed to be zoned „Mixed Use“ under LPS6, was developed to achieve the greatest extent of commercial floor space (assuming no residential or tourism development), a total of 10,100m² of floor space could be achieved. When sites with known redevelopment potential that will be appropriately zoned under LPS6 are factored in, an additional 13,900m² of floor space could be provided. Taken together, these sites with 24,000m² floor space in total would be able to supply all of Broome's additional commercial office needs under Scenario 3 as well as an additional 19,373m² of retail floor space – over 45% of the total retail floor space currently provided in the Shire and more than is provided in the Broome Boulevard.

The above total does not take into account the public land which may have redevelopment potential shown in Table 5, which would first require a Scheme Amendment and cancellation of the relevant reservations under the *Land Administration Act 1997*. It also does not account for any other redevelopment which may occur by individual landowners throughout the precinct.

4.2 Implications of Commercial Demand Analysis on Land Use Recommendations for Old Broome

The Chinatown Development Strategy clearly articulated the Shire's intentions for Chinatown to remain the heart of Broome's retail and commercial operations and to serve the primary activity centre for the Shire. Therefore it is important that the Old Broome Development Strategy does not facilitate commercial development in excess of genuine need, which may serve to divert commercial activity from Chinatown to an area where land costs and / or rents may be more favourable to a business operator.

When only taking into account vacant land in Old Broome and limited redevelopment sites, there is sufficient land to accommodate the Shire's commercial office needs as well as provide additional retail space to supplement Chinatown and the various Local Centres. This vacant land is largely located along Hamersley, Frederick, Robinson and Carnarvon Streets, where mixed use development is already taking place.

The AEC Group Economic Profile (2012) states that „land supply should always exceed demand to provide flexibility and choice to potential investors.“ It further states that „a rolling supply“ of 10-15 years of forward demand is generally sufficient.“ Whilst this is in reference to industrial land, it can also be applied more broadly to other types of development in that it is beneficial to have a greater supply of land with development potential to avoid unreasonable prices due to speculation on the part of existing landholders. A „rolling supply“ would mean that some land is „shovel-ready,“ or vacant and appropriately zoned, whilst other land would be progressively rezoned as the „shovel ready“ land is taken up.

For this reason, the OBDS makes recommendations for how future requests to rezone land to „Mixed Use“ is to be considered. Requests to rezone land along the priority active frontages of Hamersley, Frederick and Carnarvon Streets and Robinson Street south of Guy Street to „Mixed Use“ will generally be supported, and it will be required that new development in this area must contain a commercial component. The majority of this land is already zoned „Mixed Use“ under LPS6, therefore such proposals will be consistent with the existing planning framework. It also recognises that these streets already have a Mixed Use character and thus should be the primary focus for commercial activation which may or may not occur in conjunction with residential and/or tourist development.

Other portions of Old Broome are proposed to be zoned „Residential“ under LPS6 and as such offer limited commercial opportunity at present. Tourist development, should it occur, will primarily take the form of Bed and Breakfast facilities which are visually compatible with adjacent residential uses. In areas B and D proposals to rezone to „Mixed Use“ may be supported by Council on their merits, however it will be strongly encouraged that development along these streets is not strictly commercial in character. Development instead should be mixed use and contain both commercial and residential or tourist uses to integrate the development with the surrounding residential area.

Precincts G and H will remain low density residential and further rezoning will not be supported within them. Additionally, lots located within the „Old Broome Special Character Area“ with a base designation of Area B or D may be rezoned to „Mixed Use,“ however the highest density permitted will be R10 and all development will have to be consistent with future adopted Design Guidelines.

Appendix A

Stakeholder Workshop Outcomes

May 2013


Cardno (WA) Pty Ltd



Workshop Outcomes

Town Beach
Development
Strategy

Prepared for Shire of Broome
August 2013



Contact Information

Cardno WA Pty Ltd
Trading as Cardno
 ABN 77 009 119 000

11 Harvest Terrace, West Perth WA 6005

Telephone: 08 9273 3888

Facsimile: 08 9486 8664

International: +61 8 9273 3888



wa@cardno.com

www.cardno.com

Document Information

Prepared for	Shire of Broome
Project Name	Town Beach Development Strategy
File Reference	20130725-P13005-SB130005-Workshop Outcomes.docx
Job Reference	P13005
Date	August 2013

Document Control

Version	Date	Description of Revision	Prepared By	Prepared (Signature)	Reviewed By	Reviewed (Signature)
A	28/08/13	Workshop outcomes report	S. Blackwell		D. Morgan	

© Cardno 2013. Copyright in the whole and every part of this document belongs to Cardno and may not be used, sold, transferred, copied or reproduced in whole or in part in any manner or form or in or on any media to any person other than by agreement with Cardno.

This document is produced by Cardno solely for the benefit and use by the client in accordance with the terms of the engagement. Cardno does not and shall not assume any responsibility or liability whatsoever to any third party arising out of any use or reliance by any third party on the content of this document.

Table of Contents

Introduction	2
Workshop Process	2
Outcomes	3
Challenges and Opportunities	3
Opportunities	3
Challenges	3
The Personality of Town Beach	5
Aspirations for the Future	6
Design Session	7
Conclusion and Next Steps	11

Appendices

- Appendix A Workshop Agenda**
- Appendix B Workshop Attendees**
- Appendix C Workshop Responses**

Introduction

This report provides a summary of the process and outcomes of the stakeholder consultation workshop for the Town Beach precinct development strategy, which was held on Tuesday 28 May 2013 at the Shire of Broome offices. The workshop and its findings will inform the creation of the Town Beach Development Strategy. The Strategy will become a local planning policy to guide land use and development in the Town Beach precinct and will include a detailed foreshore concept plan.

The workshop represented the culmination of a three day visit to the Town Beach study area by the consultant team from Cardno.

The workshop provided an interactive and enjoyable forum where stakeholders identified the existing and desired qualities of the precinct and explored ways in which these ideas could be realised as the area grows and develops.

The Shire had issued invitations to all residents within the study area, as well as representatives of key precinct stakeholders – residents, landowners, community organisations, businesses, Government and service agencies, and user groups. The agenda of the workshop can be found in Appendix A.

Those who responded to the invitation are identified in Appendix B.

Workshop Process

The workshop took place over one weekday evening session and began with an introduction by the Shire President Graeme Campbell, reminding participants of the importance of their input on key planning projects such as this. Director of Development Services André Schönfeldt then provided some background to the study whilst Cardno's Denise Morgan introduced the team and provided an outline of the evening's agenda (see Appendix A).

Senior Landscape Architect Jeff Allot presented the consultants' own preliminary observations of the issues, opportunities and challenges in the precinct, which workshop participants were asked to consider and later confirm, modify or add to.

The workshop then guided participants through a series of interactive exercises to establish the key areas of agreement. These exercises aimed to arrive at a working 'vision' and elicit ideas of possible ways that this vision could be realised.

The first exercise asked stakeholders to identify the good and the challenging attributes of the precinct and the foreshore by writing a series of 'opportunities' and 'challenges' on post-it notes, that were then arranged into key themes by the facilitators.

A light supper was provided and participants were given the opportunity to discuss key issues among themselves.

The next exercise sought to establish an image of the precinct by asking participants to put forward key adjectives that they felt described the personality of Town Beach as a fellow human being. These traits were qualified as either positive or negative, which provided for some passionate debate among participants and indicated the many faces of the Town Beach precinct.

Participants were then led through a guided contemplation and visioning exercise in which they were asked to imagine the sights, activities, built and natural environment they might encounter when experiencing their ideal Town Beach 'of the future'.

The activities concluded with an interactive design session which gave participants the opportunity to contribute specific ideas for how the precinct and foreshore should look and feel in the future. These ideas were then presented by each group before the workshop was concluded and participants informed of how the workshop findings would be utilised going forward.

Outcomes

The combined outcomes of the four interactive exercises paint an informative and unique picture of the Town Beach precinct. Whilst this workshop represents only a small snapshot of the community's ideas and aspirations, its findings contribute an up to date and geographically targeted addition to the existing body of consultation work undertaken for Town Beach and the greater Broome township.

A concise summary of the workshop findings are outlined below, with a full record of responses provided as Appendix C of this report.

Challenges and Opportunities

Participants were asked to identify the key challenges and opportunities they saw for the Town Beach precinct as it develops, with a range of responses received. Whilst the results covered a broad range of themes, they indicated consensus around a number of key issues. The most commonly held views (four or more responses) are summarised as follows.

Opportunities

- > **Improved recreational opportunities**, creating meeting spots, family friendly, open to all users (eleven responses)
- > **Foreshore walkaway/Jetty to Jetty boardwalk**, interpretive trails and viewing platforms (ten responses)
- > **Develop/regenerate the Town Beach Foreshore**, upgrade open space, activate with retail/food (ten responses)
- > **Interpret cultural and environment heritage**, information points, interpretive trails (nine responses)
- > **Incorporate cultural heritage into design/development and/or creation of historic precinct** (six responses)
- > **Increased commercial, retail and entertainment opportunities** (six responses)
- > **Rebuilding old jetty**, and/or providing fishing spots for locals (six responses)
- > **Improved transport integration**, multimodal transport strategy, connections with China Town, encourage physical activity (five responses)
- > **Reinstate tram** (four responses)

Many of the responses mentioned the opportunity of upgrading the Town Beach foreshore open space, however opinions differed as to what form these upgrades might take, from a family picnic area to a community amphitheatre and outdoor music venue. Development and infrastructure dominated the opportunities, with almost two thirds of the responses relating to upgrade projects such as open space improvements, land use changes, integrated transport and key projects such as the Jetty to Jetty boardwalk and tram line.

Challenges

- > **Erosion**, sea level rising, degradation of pindan cliffs (eleven responses)
- > **Parking issues**, street/verge parking, managing parking at events (nine responses)
- > **Mangroves**, mangrove management, retain or remove? (seven responses)
- > **Preserving natural environmental** (eight responses)
- > **Maintain cultural and built form heritage**, heritage not destroyed by development, enhance and protect historical values (six responses)
- > **Funding**, financial resources available (six responses)
- > **Density/building heights**, maintain existing scale, preserve character of streetscape (six responses)
- > **Tides**, understanding and managing coastal processes (six responses)

- > **Maintaining the 'Broome-feel'**, erosion of character through development (four responses)
- > **Provision of open space**, increased population and use of open spaces, development pressures (four responses)

Other responses included the challenges of managing sandflies, safety/security and the difficulty and importance of gaining community consensus (three responses each).

Environmental issues were seen to be by far the greatest challenge for the future growth and development of the Town Beach Precinct, with 46 responses relating to the natural environment. Infrastructure provision and building/land use concerns were also key topics, with 24 and 33 responses respectively, with concern in these areas focused around issues of parking, funding, heritage and overdevelopment.



Figure 1 Some of the responses to the Opportunities and Constraints exercise

The Personality of Town Beach

When asked to outline the key personality traits of the Town Beach precinct, participants offered a range of adjectives that highlighted the diversity of perceptions of the area held by different stakeholders. Contrasting traits such as open/secretive, peaceful/party animal, friendly/antisocial, and restful/active show the diversity of experiences offered by the Town Beach precinct and the different ways in which people interact with and interpret the area. This contrasting perception of Town Beach was further underlined by many of the same adjectives being seen as either a positive or negative trait by different participants, such as: secretive, rigid, progressive, reserved, privileged, noisy, or a party animal.



Figure 2 Adjectives used to describe the positive personality traits of Town Beach

In fact, rather than projecting one distinct personality, Town Beach appears to be perceived as a number of different characters depending on the person experiencing it, what part they are experiencing and at what time. To some Town Beach is a wise old man: distinguished and learned, valued but rigid, restful but tired. To others it is like a playful but troubled teenager: active and sociable, noisy, exciting and changing but disheveled, moody and prone to being rash. Some see it as a kind and gentle mother: nurturing and unpretentious, welcoming, accommodating but overworked and vulnerable. To some it is like a sage: peaceful, inspiring and spiritual, cultural, authentic and unpretentious, yet reserved and enigmatic. Still others see it is a flamboyant backpacker: colourful, scruffy but relaxed, adaptable, friendly but a bit of a party animal.



Figure 3 Adjectives used to describe the negative personality traits of Town Beach

The variety of responses for this activity suggests that one of the key attributes of the Town Beach is its diversity. This manifests in the diversity of its users, the diversity of activities and functions it accommodates, and people's diverse experience and interpretations of these activities and their setting.

Aspirations for the Future

A guided visioning exercise was conducted where participants were asked to contemplate their ideal 'Town Beach of the future' by imagining the sights, activities, built and natural environment they might encounter when experiencing the precinct. Afterwards they were invited to write some of their vision down and hand it in. Not all participants provided a response to this exercise, however those that did painted a picture of a Town Beach that was active, safe, accessible, culturally grounded, and firmly focused on the experience of the natural setting. The following responses provide a good snapshot of the sentiments shared:

"Trees, beach, people (actively using space), ocean, more birds/animal life, people sharing stories/knowledge, being able to interpret past to appreciate how we got here, more surveillance from buildings, more inviting streets, no dominant car parks, less cars – more people"

"Commercial dealings along waterfront, like vans with ice-cream and coffee (not buildings) – on permits and controlled times. Historical statues or plaques at intervals to make a stroll interesting - Broome history, like pictures of Old Jetty, Meatworks, tram etc. Bench seats, as well as picnic tables, under trees. Shady trees... Water drink fountains, elderly and disabled friendly paths, especially to reach the beach, play grounds."

"Activity – swimming, playing, sand grass paths, café on boardwalk, historical links, heritage waterfront apartments"

Design Session

The workshop culminated in an interactive design session in which people were asked to take the ideas and issues raised over the course of the sessions and propose specific interventions that might help achieve their visions for the precinct. Some of the key design interventions raised were:

- > Relocate the DEC and PCYC sites
- > Establish key land use precincts, with suggested clusters being 'mixed use/high-density residential', 'civic', 'medical/health', 'tourist' and 'residential'
- > Multimodal transport system
 - Hamersley Street as key transport spine
 - Jetty to Jetty boardwalk
 - Good pedestrian infrastructure - Well lit and shaded walkways with seating
 - Bike paths
 - Reinstated tram route
 - Frequent pedestrian access ways mid-block, connecting Hamersley Street with the foreshore / boardwalk and Weld Street
 - Increased access to foreshore
- > Rebuilt old jetty, with opportunities for fishing
- > 'Graduated density profile' increasing in height to the west, before lowering down again to blend into Old Broome
- > Upgraded facilities at Demco Park
- > Celebration and interpretation of key points of interest along foreshore
- > Potential water park at town beach
- > Consider caravan park for 'future coastal interaction site' catering to families and food production
- > Reinstated tennis club

Other key objectives raised in the sessions were:

- > Preserve views of Roebuck Bay down Guys Street and other key streets
- > Improved stormwater drainage through nutrient traps etc
- > Biennale type rotating public art / community art
- > Identify new location for markets
- > Preserved cultural heritage

[illegible]

Page 8



Figure 6 Group 3 ideas from the design session

Prepared for Shire of Broome

Conclusion and Next Steps


The outputs of the workshop will inform the preparation of the development strategy and foreshore concept plan, which will be considered by Council before being advertised to allow for community comment.



Figure 8 Workshop participants discussing ideas for Town Beach

Town Beach
Development Strategy

APPENDIX A
WORKSHOP
AGENDA



Town Beach Precinct Development Strategy

Stakeholder Consultation Workshop Agenda

Date	Tuesday 28 May 2013
Time	4:00pm – 8:00pm
Venue	Shire of Broome Administration Centre, Cnr Weld and Haas Streets
Workshop Objective	Confirm a vision for the Town Beach Precinct and Roebuck Bay foreshore

Time	Activity	Facilitator/Presenter
3:45 – 4:00	Arrival and registration	
4:00 – 4:05	Welcome	Shire President
4:05 – 4:15	Introductions, housekeeping, outline of the evening and agenda confirmation	Denise Morgan, Cardno
4:15 – 4:30	Why we are here – background to the study	André Schönfeldt, Shire
4:30 – 5:00	Cardno preliminary observations about the precinct and foreshore	Jeff Allott, Cardno
5:00 – 5:30	Town Beach opportunities and challenges - identify the good and the challenging attributes of the precinct and the foreshore	Denise Morgan, Cardno
5:30 – 6:00	Break – refreshments provided	
6:00 – 6:30	The personality of Town Beach – identify qualities to keep, strengthen, modify, leave behind or introduce	Denise Morgan, Cardno
6:30 – 6:45	Aspirations and a vision for the precinct and foreshore	Denise Morgan, Cardno
6:45 – 7:30	Design session in table groups – putting ideas onto paper	Jeff Allott, Cardno
7:30 – 7:50	Report back – table facilitators share their group's ideas	Denise Morgan, Cardno
7:50 – 8:00	Next steps and close	Denise Morgan, Cardno

APPENDIX B

WORKSHOP
ATTENDEES



Name	Company/Organisation
Darren Stevens	Department of Environment and Conservation
Cate Gustavsson	Department of Planning
Hilary Wilkins	LandCorp
Chris Mitchell	Regional Development/Shire of Broome
Spencer	Resident
Fred Coates	Resident
Ross Clark	Resident
Carol Shaw	Resident
Laurence McKenzie	Resident
Brian Smith	Resident
Rita Smith	Resident
Clancy McDowell	Resident
William Willis	Resident
Helen Dorsett Bain	Resident
Alison Southern	Resident
Michael Dunnart	Roebuck Bay Caravan Park
Grant Adams	Saleeba Adams Architect
Cr Graeme Campbell	Shire of Broome
Cr Jenny Bloom	Shire of Broome
André Schönfeldt	Shire of Broome
Michelle Teoh	Shire of Broome
Kirsten Wood	Shire of Broome
Alex Mackenzie	Shire of Broome
Neels Pretorius	Shire of Broome
Monica Sullivan	Shire of Broome
Paul Martin	Shire of Broome
Michael Dale	Shire of Broome
Tim Bycroft	Nyamba Buru Yawuru
Sandra Yu	Nyamba Buru Yawuru
Denise Morgan	Cardno
Jeff Allott	Cardno
Simon Blackwell	Cardno
Andrea Brooke-Smith	Cardno

Town Beach
Development Strategy

APPENDIX C
WORKSHOP
RESPONSES



Town Beach Development Strategy Workshop – 28 May 2013

Following is a transcript of the notes taken during the interactive workshop sessions.

Opportunities and Challenges

The participants' responses regarding the opportunities and challenges facing the precinct were grouped into broad themes.

Infrastructure and Key Projects

Opportunities	Challenges
Jetty to Jetty Boardwalk	Maintain/design the area to be able to continue having Staircase to the Moon night markets and other festivals
Build old Jetty	Money to fulfil all of our visions
Develop area from the Pioneer Cemetery to the Catalina's	Better engineering of drains to stop nutrients entering the Bay and causing Lyngbya outbreaks (ie: algal bloom)
Fenced in playground for children to keep safe and locked at night	Managing traffic/parking at events
Foreshore walkways	Cars/parking
Interpretive walking trails including disabled/universal access	Drainage
Elderly and handicap friendly paths/seats/picnic areas	Parking issues relating to access to the precinct currently already an issue for residents on Stairway to the Moon nights
Broadening public access to foreshores	Parking at events eg Stairway to the Moon
Major water park on beach front	Stormwater runoff – outlets, erosion, nutrients to the Bay
Recreational spots and swim area screened off	Funding for public infrastructure – car parking
Tramway redevelopment	Parking issues
Better viewing areas for the staircase to the moon	Power lines should go underground
Get the tram going – very historic and good link to Town Beach and Chinatown	Boat launching facilities in a high use recreational area – parking for trailers and cars
Rail to Male Oval – Town Beach	The existing Water Park takes up too much space
Community Amphitheatre at Town Beach	Street lights
Improved recreation node at Demco (existing car park)	Street parking within the Residential Zones adjacent to Commercial Zones
More user friendly points along the foreshore for pedestrian/boating interaction	Parking – viewing Staircase and Markets
Beach front access for swimming to be maintained	Pedestrian security
Enclosed swimming area	Lack of car parks/traffic
Redevelop Old Jetty – need public fishing spot now New Jetty is difficult	Try not to overdevelop the area between the Old Jetty approach and Mangrove Point (Red Bluff)
Tramline form Town Beach to Dampier Terrace	Precedence of verge parking
Boardwalk along foreshore with retail/food activation opportunities	Financial resources available
Bike paths/foot paths	Funding for Jetty to Jetty Boardwalk
Jetty for fishing	Paying for a jetty

Opportunities	Challenges
Develop Old Jetty into a fishing platform and observation deck for staircase to the moon	
A jetty which would be a popular public space	
Jetty to Jetty project	
Rethink street lighting	
Employment opportunities for a growing youth population	
Love to see a boardwalk	
Increase linkage to foreshore	
View down Guy St at high tide is fantastic! Preserve! Turquoise so uplifting.	
Park 0 foreshore – trees (Savannah) and light and power and water and access and toilets	
Walkability to Chinatown	
Boardwalk (view the Bay)	
Viewing platforms over the mangroves to Roebuck Bay	
Targeted (focused) access to the foreshore	
Develop low impact pathway in the mangrove and intertidal zone	
Enhance areas which have been due for overhaul and upgrade	
Drainage – Preserve and extend Broome's old drainage system – raised roads, wide ditches each side and trees planted nearby. NOT roads as drains.	
A multimodal transport strategy along the foreshore	
Design out crime eg lighting/footpath locations	

Cultural

Opportunities	Challenges
Increasing cultural information sharing	Broome heritage NOT destroyed by progressive development, must be retained
Fishing spot for locals – jetty	Coordinating all stakeholders
Increased community access	Boats
Incorporating Cultural Heritage into design	Protection and celebration of the historical gravestones
Continued community involvement in designing the future visions for Broome	How to preserve the rich, cultural heritage
Share the cultural values specific to Broome eg multi-cultural etc	Keep surf kites off Town Beach
Interpret cultural and environment heritage	Maintaining the Cultural and historical values with development
Heritage interpretation	Security – are we providing a 5 star facility for the backpackers and the homeless
Incorporate historical/cultural area in precinct	
Better recreational activities/spaces	
Interpreting cultural, historic and environmental significance	
Historical viewpoints eg statues, plaques re Pioneers	

Opportunities	Challenges
and World War times	
Interpretation of heritage and environment with relevance for both locals and visitors	
Heritage – Yawuru and Pearling	
Historic precinct near/around museum- Tramway	
Opportunities to promote the museum	
Potential to enhance and protect the historical values of the precinct from the dangers of high rise development	
History – Indonesia, S/E Asia, pirates	
Incorporating cultural heritage into design	
Cultural heritage of the precinct	
More info displays like at Bedford Park about the Japanese attack	
Creating meeting places and socialising/recreation	
Opportunity to reengage with our heritage	

Buildings and Land Uses:

Opportunities	Challenges
Historic precinct	Caravan Park location
Higher density apartments with sea views (set back from parks)	Balance between business/commercial and residential privacy
Development of the Town Beach area for tourism	Not to create Mini- Beni dorm situation around water front (lots of hotels/high-rise)
Shop at Town Beach open most hours – not especially restaurant	Losing the unique Broome characteristics – access to foreshore
Connecting Chinatown and Town Beach	Location of cemetery
Some retail outlets – dining and other along the area from Town Beach to the Fat Trees Cafe	Attracting the right kind of development and developers
Smith's Beach and in front of Caravan Park – don't initially develop. Leave until later.	Catering for increased population and desires for space and beach access
Make wasted space by museum in to parkland landscape and maybe market area	Jail as a multi-functional arts and music facility
Land tenure reform	Developing more café's, bars and restaurants to create a vibrant precinct
Develop foreshore – POS	Do not relinquish parks for development. Maintain public areas.
Maintain access for swimming	Private ownership of land – may have no interest to redevelop
Control redevelopment of private land to maintain/protect streetscape	Like the idea of a family friendly water park
Creating interesting and often used POS	Caravan Park stopping the continual viewing
POS – varied use by many groups	Caravan park location
Entertainment opportunities – restaurants, music, entertainment	Higher density – presenting character of streetscape
Linkage with Chinatown	Pioneer Cemetery – needs more protection or promotion
Waterfront activation and linkages	Hotels/apartments height of buildings

Opportunities	Challenges
Commercial opportunities linked to water front access	No more commercial development on streets away from foreshore
Expand Town Beach foreshore – POS – relocate car park	Public Open Space in residential areas
Creating historical precinct – integrated	Development of the Kennedy Hill
Museum area could be a much better tourism attraction with money	Noise levels/access issues for residents in the precinct
From Town Beach right around to Museum – multifunctional water front public space – secure and large, music outdoor venue, recreation	Cost of development
Use of public areas	Maintaining existing scale and characteristics
Leave foreshore open for all	Activation/vibrancy – how do we bring more people into the area?
More POS	No more residential development on foreshore
Restore old building on cnr Louis St and Hamersley	Location of Caravan Park in regard to foreshore - POS
Preserving public space	
Caravan Park to stay but access through or around	
Safe and friendly, inviting family picnic area at Town Beach	

Natural Environment

Opportunities	Challenges
Landscape sensitive walk-ways/footpaths throughout the precinct	Erosion and sea level rising
Water/views	Mangroves
Remove a few mangroves at Town Beach – stabilise pindan cliffs	Sandflies
Roebuck Bay is the most important shore, bird watching site in Australia – opportunity for an interpretive centre on birds/cultural values of the Bay. Best ground – bare ground near Fat Tree Café	Reducing erosion
Incorporating the natural environment into the design	Protecting natural environment
Interface with mangroves	Foreshore erosion
Study of sea-like in the Bay	Removing mangroves forever 0 not possible
Ecological – the value of the Bay and foreshore	Pindan Cliffs
Highlighting Broome's landscape	Mangroves to be removed?
Preserving the natural environment (mangroves)	Control erosion to pindan cliff face and other spots
An inter-tidal coastal ecology experience	Environmental issues
The environment values of Roebuck Bay itself – unique	Making the cliffs safe but don't change
	Erosion foreshore – 50m lost to the sea over 40 years
	Big tides
	Pindan cliffs – erosion – how to manage well?
	Mangroves – seek scientific indigenous advice before removing
	Kennedy Hill
	Marine environment/coastal processes

Opportunities	Challenges
	Sandflies, jellyfish, council restrictions
	The tide in and out and all these nice ideas with the tide in. Think about half the time when no water.
	Environmental concerns uncertainty about rising sea level
	Coastal impact sediments come out from Dampier Creek – vital to be aware of impact of water ways and tidal flow
	Conservation of landscape/prevention of increased pollution in Roebuck Bay
	Physical erosion along pindan cliffs
	Environmental issues
	Mangroves – retain or remove
	Erosion and sea level rise
	Potential destruction of the goose that potentially lays the golden egg – ie conservation work on pindan cliffs etc pose specific problems
	Environmental issues eg mangroves
	Any sea front development has major problems with tidal rise and fall, cyclones and sandflies
	Environmental issues – preservation of the natural environment
	Understanding coastal tide changes and design criteria
	Huge tidal changes = challenge
	Street scaping verges within zones of the precinct
	Preserving the health of Roebuck Bay
	Mangrove control
	Preserving bird habitats
	No incorporation of climate change impacts in planning
	Coastal vulnerability – foreshore erosion
	Foreshore erosion – sea level rise

Sense of Place

Opportunities	Challenges
Connecting all areas which retain “Old Broome” and Chinatown cultural, social and environmental	Pressure from developers
More family focus for Town Beach development	Maintaining ‘Broome-ness’
Need to keep the open access and varied use of the Bay – not just looking at it, but fishing, crabbing, boating, dog walking etc	Misuse and vandalism
Social connectedness	Broome getting known as a too hard town. We need to get things done, not just talk about it
Colour of the ocean, the view	Poor incorporation of littoral tidal influences on foreshore
The heat/humidity – embrace?	Retain dynamics of ‘Broome Town’
Interpretation of important places	Keeping the ‘Broome’ feel while activating the area for the future

Opportunities	Challenges
The Town Beach Café area, great local hang out	Getting the balance of development vs keeping the vistas
Spaces, paths, destinations that encourage physical activity – walking, riding etc	Love to see the Broome Museum moved to a larger venue
Maintaining vistas and views	Over development = ‘Cairns’ style of place, not ‘Broome’ style
Climate responsive design, solar materials used breezeways	Gaining consensus
	People not able to see opportunities for change
	Erosion of character/identity through development
	Community consensus and continued consultation on planning vision
	Community owned Courthouse Markets are currently too small and have no secure tenure – support arts, crafts, music and micro industries of Broome
	Illegal campers
	Illegal living between Caravan Park and Demco needs to be addressed
	How to integrate foreshore and precinct used by range of people of socio-economic background
	Anti-social behaviour is an issue
	To not let the foreshore become a space for the privileged
	Think of Kings Park – vision vs development pressure

Personality Traits

“If Town Beach were a person, how would you describe its personality?”

Positive	Negative
Secretive	Secretive
Relaxed	Dangerous
Adaptable	Vulnerable
Visually Attractive	Scruffy
Open	Rash
Dramatic	Compromised
Home (Indigenous)	Overworked
Peaceful	Moody
Accommodating	Tired
Friendly	Bureaucratic (civil/public service)
Cultural	Dishevelled
Old (history)	Progressive
Changing	Noisy
Nurturing	Privileged
Restful	Party Animal
Moody	Antisocial
Spiritual	Conflicted
Colourful	Reserved
Active	Rigid
Civil (Community)	
Learned	
Sociable	
Progressive	
Distinguished	
Noisy	
Privileged	
Rough Diamond	
Valued	
Party Animal	
Exciting	
Reserved	
Resourceful (rich in resources)	
Enigmatic	
Inspiring	
Rigid	
Welcoming	
Unique	
Authentic	
Unpretentious	

Future

After a short guided meditation, some participants volunteered their personal visions for the future of the precinct.

- > Parkland – peace train chugging by going to Chinatown on train. Kids waving, views of ocean, mangroves, blue sea, and then mudflats. Changes in the day of view.
- > Open, spacious, safe road crossings, seating, shady, walkways – (as an aged person)
- > Trees, beach, people (actively using space), ocean, more birds/animal life, people sharing stories/knowledge, being able to interpret past to appreciate how we got here, more surveillance from buildings, more inviting streets, no dominant car parks, less cars – more people
- > Commercial dealings along front like vans with ice-cream and coffee (not buildings) – on permits and controlled times. Historical statues or plaques at intervals to make a stroll interesting on Broome history, like picture of Old Jetty, Meatworks, tram etc. Bench seats only, as well as picnic tables, under trees. Shady trees like Tamarind Cascara (Shower Tree and Poiseanna). Water drink fountains, elderly and disabled friendly paths, especially to reach the beach, play grounds.
- > A rich, cultural precinct, a Yawuru Cultural Centre on the hill, spaces for picnicking/walking/meeting people, doing creative things, a strong arts community
- > Activity – swimming, playing, sand grass paths, café on boardwalk, historical links, heritage waterfront apartments
- > Open foreshore – no buildings, walk-way – grass with interpretive signs, shady – sea views, seating, Roebuck Bay Interpretive Centre
- > Exercise Trail, Interpretation, Bough Sheds, gathering places

About Cardno

Cardno is an ASX200 professional infrastructure and environmental services company, with expertise in the development and improvement of physical and social infrastructure for communities around the world. Cardno's team includes leading professionals who plan, design, manage and deliver sustainable projects and community programs. Cardno is an international company, listed on the Australian Securities Exchange [ASX: CDD].

Contact

Perth

11 Harvest Terrace
West Perth

PO Box 447
West Perth WA 6872

Phone +61 8 9273 3888

Fax +61 8 9486 8664

wa@cardno.com
www.cardno.com

Appendix B

Indicative Costings for Concept Plan Elements

Cardno (WA) Pty Ltd



TOWN BEACH DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY

FORESHORE PRECINCT COST ESTIMATE

ITEM	DESCRIPTION	UNIT	QTY	RATE	TOTAL	COSTING SOURCE
TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT						
	Intersection Upgrade & RAB Construction	Item	1		\$200,000.00	Previously tendered contractor rates
	Road Tie Ins	No	4	\$2,000.00	\$8,000.00	Previously tendered contractor rates
	Proposed Off Street Parking (90 Degree)	m2	1210	\$75.00	\$90,750.00	Previously tendered contractor rates
	Parking Area - On Road (Parallel)	m2	300	\$75.00	\$22,500.00	Previously tendered contractor rates
	Special Road Pavement	m2	1575	\$105.00	\$165,375.00	Previously tendered contractor rates
	<i>Sub-total</i>				<u>\$486,625.00</u>	
PARKLAND ENHANCEMENT						
	Pedestrian Pathways (2.0m wide concrete)	lin/m	900	250	\$225,000.00	Previously tendered contractor rates
	Paved Plazas (Coloured exposed aggregate concrete)	m2	700	125	\$87,500.00	Previously tendered contractor rates
	Shade Shelters	No	3	8000	\$24,000.00	Previously tendered contractor rates
	Rubbish Bins	No	5	3600	\$18,000.00	Previously tendered contractor rates
	Bench Seat	No	8	2500	\$20,000.00	Previously tendered contractor rates
	Picnic Settings	No	2	5000	\$10,000.00	Previously tendered contractor rates
	Electric Barbeques	No	2	12500	\$25,000.00	Previously tendered contractor rates
	Foreshore Pathway Markers (Marker plus anchoring)	No	30	500	\$15,000.00	PC Allowance for Artistic Markers
	Beach Access Stairs	m2	300	3500	\$1,050,000.00	Rawlinsons Construction Handbook 2013
	Trees	No	60	750	\$45,000.00	Previously tendered contractor rates
	Turf Works (Including soil amelioration works)	m2	18500	50	\$925,000.00	Previously tendered contractor rates
	Irrigation	m2	18500	30	\$555,000.00	Previously tendered contractor rates
	<i>Sub-total</i>				<u>\$2,999,500.00</u>	
	TOTAL FORESHORE PRECINCT				<u>\$3,486,125.00</u>	
ELEMENTS EXCLUDED						
	Pool House					Further detailed required before costing can be determined
	Café/Restaurant					Further detailed required before costing can be determined
	Tram Station					Further detailed required before costing can be determined

TOWN BEACH DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY

ITEM	DESCRIPTION	UNIT	QTY	RATE	TOTAL	COSTING SOURCE
------	-------------	------	-----	------	-------	----------------

TOWN BEACH FORESHORE ENHANCEMENT WORKS COST ESTIMATE

TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT

Intersection Upgrade & RAB Construction	Item	1			\$200,000.00	Previously tendered contractor rates
New Roads - Item 54 & 14	m2	3000		\$75.00	\$225,000.00	Previously tendered contractor rates
Road Tie Ins	No	6		\$2,000.00	\$12,000.00	Previously tendered contractor rates
Proposed Off Street Parking (90 Degree)	m2	3000		\$75.00	\$225,000.00	Previously tendered contractor rates
Relocated Town Beach Parking	m2	3200		\$75.00	\$240,000.00	Previously tendered contractor rates
Boat Trailer and Caravan Parking - Formal	m2	2000		\$75.00	\$150,000.00	Previously tendered contractor rates
Boat Trailer and Caravan Parking - Informal	m2	1800		\$75.00	\$135,000.00	Previously tendered contractor rates
Boat Ramp Access Road	m2	1500		\$75.00	\$112,500.00	Previously tendered contractor rates
Boat Ramp	Item	1		\$100,000.00	\$100,000.00	Previously tendered contractor rates
Residential Access Sliplane	m2	500		\$75.00	\$37,500.00	Previously tendered contractor rates

Sub-total

\$1,437,000.00

RECREATION FACILITIES & ENHANCEMENTS

Skate Park	Item				\$750,000.00	PC Allowance based on costs for similar in South Hedland
Water Park	Item				\$1,000,000.00	PC Allowance based on costs for similar in Carnarvon
Tidal Pool (2500m2 in size)	Item				\$300,000.00	Rawlinsons Construction Handbook 2013
(Allowance for earthworks, bund wall, boulder revetment, liner and valve/pumping station)						
Amphitheatre	Item				\$500,000.00	Previously tendered contractor rates
(Earthworks, turfing, irrigation plus allowance for Limestone block walling with blocks supplied ex Broome)						
Proposed Market Area Redevelopment	m2	2500		150	\$375,000.00	Rawlinsons Construction Handbook 2013
Fencing to Pioneer Cemetry	lin/m	120		175	\$21,000.00	Previously tendered contractor rates
Café Plaza (Coloured exposed aggregate concrete)	m2	600		125	\$75,000.00	Previously tendered contractor rates
Museum Plazas (Coloured exposed aggregate concrete)	m2	1500		125	\$187,500.00	Previously tendered contractor rates

Sub-Total

\$3,208,500.00

TOWN BEACH DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY

ITEM	DESCRIPTION	UNIT	QTY	RATE	TOTAL	COSTING SOURCE
PARKLAND ENHANCEMENT						
	Pedestrian Pathways (2.0m wide concrete)	lin/m	500	250	\$125,000.00	Previously tendered contractor rates
	Shade Shelters	No	5	8000	\$40,000.00	Previously tendered contractor rates
	Rubbish Bins	No	20	3600	\$72,000.00	Previously tendered contractor rates
	Bench Seat	No	10	2500	\$25,000.00	Previously tendered contractor rates
	Picnic Settings	No	10	5000	\$50,000.00	Previously tendered contractor rates
	Electric Barbeques	No	5	12500	\$62,500.00	Previously tendered contractor rates
	Foreshore Pathway Markers (Marker plus anchoring)	No	10	500	\$5,000.00	PC Allowance for Artistic Markers
	Beach Access Stairs	m2	100	3500	\$350,000.00	Rawlinsons Construction Handbook 2013
	Trees	No	60	750	\$45,000.00	Previously tendered contractor rates
	Turf Works (Including soil amelioration works)	m2	24000	50	\$1,200,000.00	Previously tendered contractor rates
	Irrigation	m2	24000	30	\$720,000.00	Previously tendered contractor rates
	<i>Sub-total</i>				<u>\$2,694,500.00</u>	
COASTAL PROTECTION WORKS						
	Foreshore stabilisation (Allowance of 5m3 per linear metre. Rock within 5km of site)	lin/m	600	450	\$270,000.00	Previously tendered contractor rates
	<i>Sub-total</i>				<u>\$270,000.00</u>	
	TOTAL TOWN BEACH				<u>\$7,610,000.00</u>	
ELEMENTS EXCLUDED						
	Relocated Café					Further detailed required before costing can be determined
	Tram Terminus					Further detailed required before costing can be determined
	Catalina Hanger					Further detailed required before costing can be determined
	Floating Pontoon					Further detailed required before costing can be determined

Appendix C

Community Engagement Plan





***Old Broome
Development
Strategy***

***Community
Engagement Plan***

March 2014

Project name:	Old Broome Development Strategy
Project owner:	Andre Schonfeldt, Director Development Services
Project manager:	Monica Sullivan, Strategic Planning Coordinator

BACKGROUND

The Shire's adopted *Corporate Business Plan 2013-2017* includes Strategy 1.4.2: 'Develop and Implement a Town Beach Development Strategy.' The Old Broome Development Strategy (OBDS) has been designed to achieve the strategy described above.

The name of the document has been changed from the 'Town Beach Development Strategy' to the 'Old Broome Development Strategy,' as it provides guidance for the entirety of the area identified as 'Precinct 2 – Old Broome' under the Shire of Broome Local Planning Strategy. Precinct 2 – Old Broome encompasses the area bound by Frederick Street to the north, Herbert Street to the west, Roebuck Bay to the east and Reserve 51304 to the south of the Demco residential subdivision to the south.

The Local Planning Strategy was adopted by Council in November 2013 after substantial community engagement and is now awaiting final approval from the Western Australian Planning Commission and Minister for Planning. It contains an objective that Precinct 2 will develop into a mixed use area consisting of residential, tourist and office uses in an open form of development that recognises the historic character of the area. The aim of the OBDS is to provide greater detail as to how this can occur. It does this by presenting objectives, strategies and actions for a variety of key strategy areas, including land use, open space, community facilities, movement, natural resource and environmental management, heritage, urban form and utilities. The OBDS also contains a Concept Plan that visually depicts actions which represent one way of implementing the broad vision of the OBDS, with a focus on Town Beach and the Conti Foreshore.

The Shire engaged consultants to develop the draft OBDS. In May 2013 the consultants held a workshop with the residents in the area, other key stakeholders and the Shire. The outcomes of this workshop have informed the strategic recommendations of the OBDS.

The draft OBDS will be presented to Council for its consideration in March as a Local Planning Policy. In accordance with legislative requirements the wider public will be then invited to provide formal comment on the Local Planning Policy. This plan will set out the manner in which stakeholders and the community will be encouraged to participate in the public comment process to ensure the OBDS is accepted by the Broome community.

ESTABLISH ENGAGEMENT PARAMETERS

Legislative – Under Clause 2.5 of the Shire's Town Planning Scheme No. 4 Local Planning Policies are required to be advertised for a minimum of 21 days, which includes publication of newspaper advertisements once a week for two consecutive weeks.

In February 2014 the Shire adopted a draft Local Planning Policy – Public Consultation – Planning Matters which provides guidance on appropriate consultation levels based upon the potential impact of various proposals. Under this draft policy, a Development Strategy is designated 'Level E' which requires the preparation of a Community Engagement Plan. The minimum consultation requirements for Level E consultation are the same as for a Local Planning Policy as outlined above.

Geographic boundaries – Targeted engagement is planned with landowners,

government agencies, community organisations and Native Title holders with interests in the study area. The wider Broome community will also have the opportunity to participate in various activities.

Budget – Approximately \$5,000 has been set aside for engagement on this project.

Timelines –

31 March 2014: Public comment period begins

12 May 2014 : Public comment period ends (42 days total)

26 June 2014: Local Planning Policy adopted by Council.

ENGAGEMENT DECISION TO BE MADE / PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES

- To ensure the community and key stakeholders in the Shire of Broome are aware of the proposed OBDS and what it will mean from a land use and development perspective if adopted, and that they have the opportunity to consider and comment on these recommendations prior to Council adoption.
- To fulfil the statutory requirements in order to adopt a Local Planning Policy in accordance with *Town Planning Scheme No. 4*.
- To provide the opportunity for the community and key stakeholders to comment on a variety of conceptual ideas, generally involving publicly owned land in Old Broome, that may ultimately proceed as separate projects subject to detailed design and budget considerations.

IDENTIFY TARGET STAKEHOLDERS

Primary Stakeholders *(those who have a direct interest in an outcome)*

Council
EMG
Landowners and business owners in Old Broome
Yawuru
Department of Parks and Wildlife
Department of Environment Regulation
Water Corporation
Department of Corrective Services
WA Police
Department of Sport and Recreation
Department of Health - Kimberley Population Health Unit
Broome Hospital
Department of Education
Broome Primary School
Police and Citizens Youth Council (PCYC)
Broome Museum
Broome CIRCLE
Vinnies
Broome Out of School Care Children's Activities (BOSCA)
Centacare
RSL Club
Sisters of Saint John of God
Broome Bowling Club

Secondary Stakeholders *(those who have a general interest in a project or issue)*

Broome Community
 Broome Community Groups
 Broome Chamber of Commerce
 Heritage Council of Western Australia
 Department of Aboriginal Affairs
 Broome Historical Society
 Consultants
 Real Estate Agents


Tertiary Stakeholders *(those that do not always fit neatly into the primary or secondary)*

Media
 Shire Staff
 Broome Visitors

DETERMINE LEVEL OF ENGAGEMENT

Community Engagement Matrix:

The diagram below illustrates the Community Engagement Matrix:



Matrix Scorecard:

The below table will help you determine the level of engagement for your project. Consider your project and the below statement and place your response in the right hand column:

	SCORE: 1 - 2	SCORE: 3 - 4	SCORE: 5 - 6	Your Project Score
Degree of complexity	There is one clear issue and or problem that needs to be addresses.	There are more than one or two issues/problems that can be resolved.	There are multiple issues/problems and it is unclear how to resolve them.	3
Degree of	The project will	The project will fix a	The project will create a	4

potential community impact/political sensitivity	<p>have little effect on communities and they will hardly notice any changes.</p> <p>The project has acceptance throughout the community.</p>	<p>problem that will benefit communities and the change will cause minor inconvenience.</p> <p>There are community groups who may see potential in raising the profile of a project to gain attention for their cause.</p>	<p>change that will have an impact on communities and the living environment and the degree of impact/outrage and acceptance will vary.</p> <p>Community expectations re the project are different to those of the decision makers and there is high potential for individuals/groups to use the uncertainty to gain attention.</p>	
--------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

This project score for Degree of Complexity is: **3**

This project score for Degree of community impact/political sensitivity is: **4**

Using these scores on the graph, indicates that the project's engagement level should be:
CONSULT

Below is a table to explain what the different levels of engagement mean:

INFORM	CONSULT	INVOLVE	COLLABORATE	EMPOWER
Public Participation Goal:				
To provide the public with balanced, objective information to assist them to understand the problems, alternatives & solutions.	To obtain public feedback on analysis, alternatives and/or decisions.	To work directly with the public throughout the process to ensure that public concerns and aspirations are consistently understood and considered.	To partner with the public in each aspect of the decision including the development of alternatives and the identification of the preferred solution.	To place final decision-making in the hands of the public.
Promise to the Public:				
We will keep you informed	We will keep you informed, listen to and acknowledge concerns and provide feedback on how public input influenced the decision	We will work with you to ensure that your concerns and aspirations are directly reflected in the alternatives developed and provide feedback on how public input influenced the decision.	We will look to you for direct advice and innovation in formulating solutions and incorporate your advice and recommendations into the decisions to the maximum extent possible.	We will implement what you decide.

ENGAGEMENT TOOLS AND ACTIVITIES

The Tools selected for this project are:

- Public Displays – Shire Office and Library, Courthouse Markets
- Website
- Mailout to landowners, businesses and other key stakeholder groups
- Online Survey (paper copies also available) – participants eligible to enter random draw for \$50 voucher
- Advertising/publicity – Media Release, Broome Advertiser, ABC Radio, Spirit Radio
- Fact Sheets – distributed and displayed on notice boards around town
- Workshops – Community members, government agencies and community organisations

ENGAGEMENT ACTION PLAN – please note that dates are indicative only

Date	Tool/Activity	Responsibility	Budget	Status	Communication /message
11 March	Council workshop	DDS, SPC			
13 March	Agenda Item close				
20 March	Agenda Item goes on to website Draft content for online survey, fact sheets	SPC, PO			
27 March	Ordinary Meeting of Council				
31 March	Public comment period begins				
31 March – 4 April (then ongoing until 12 May)	Media release and start of advertising schedule (paper, radio, website). Mail out to owners, businesses and other stakeholder groups. Public displays set up in Shire office and library. Online Survey launches. Fact Sheets prepared.	MPO, SPC, PO			
5 April	Public Display – Courthouse Markets	DDS, SPC			

Attachment 3

14 April	Workshop with Yawuru Cultural Heritage section	DDS, MPS, SPC, PO			
28 April	Workshop with Government Agencies and Community Organisations	DDS, MPS, SPC, PO			
29 April	Workshop with general public	DDS, MPS, SPC, PO			
3 May	Public Display – Boulevard Shopping Centre	DDS, MPS, SPC, PO			
12 May	Public comment period closes				
26 June	Report, incorporating public submissions and outcomes of community engagement, to Council	SPC, DDS			

DDS: Director Development Services , MPS: Manager Planning Services, SPC: Strategic Planning Coordinator, PO: Planning Officer, MPO: Media & Promotions Officer.

It is recommended that the DDS have the discretion to modify the plan as may be required during the public comment period in order to implement the plan taking into account the availability of stakeholders.

ENGAGEMENT EVALUATION

1. What needs to happen for this process to be a 'success'? (consider the perspectives of both Council and community/stakeholders) Members of the community feel informed about the project and provide a range of considered feedback on documents and plans.
2. How will we know if this has been achieved? (i.e. visible sign of success) A high level of response to the public survey. A wide range of informed submissions on the Local Planning Policy. Stakeholder and community attendance at workshops and events.
3. What data will you need to indicate this? (what will you need to demonstrate the results) Schedule of submissions, collation and summary of survey responses.
4. How will you collect this data? (participant feedback, feedback forms, informal discussions etc): Survey responses and notes from discussions at workshops and public events.
5. How will you document the learning's (both positive and negative) from this process, for future learning for yourself and other in the Shire of

Broome?

A report on the engagement process will be compiled and presented to Council in tandem with the final Local Planning Policy.

REPORTING / FEEDBACK

Council will be advised of the evaluation and outcomes by: Agenda Item (anticipated June 2014) which will contain a Schedule of Submissions and a report on the outcomes of the engagement process.

Stakeholders will be advised of evaluation by: Submitters will be sent letters advising them of Council meeting date when final Item is to be considered. Schedule of Submissions and outcomes report will be publicly available.

Appendix D

Schedule of Submissions



SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS

NO.	NAME & ADDRESS	AFFECTED PROPERTY	SUBMISSION	OFFICER COMMENT	OFFICER RECOMMENDATION
1	J. Halmarick		As property owner in Walcott Street, Old Broome, I would like to submit my opinion of the intended development in the area of Old Town Beach.		
a			I fully support that improvements recommended by your department need to be made. Old Town Beach must be made to be very beautiful to safeguard its important status as the original and historical foundation of this great town. However there is one suggested development that I am absolutely against. In section 5.2, paragraph 21 of the plan it is suggested that a Skate Park might be included. I am absolutely NOT in favour of this development in the Old Town Beach area. It is my opinion that it will increase noise pollution and attract a number of unsavoury characters to the area. I am sure there are many areas more suitable to this facility nearer to the main shopping centre where noise would not be noticeable or inconvenient.	<p>The inclusion of the Skate Park in the Concept Plan was based on the outcomes of the Community Survey associated with the Broome 2040 Community Visioning Project. The survey identified the development of a ‘Skate Park – all ages’ as 12 on a list of desired projects.</p> <p>Officers have undertaken research on the land requirements for a suitable skate park facility. It has been recognised that if a Skate Park an equivalent size to the one currently at BRAC (492m²) was constructed in the environs of Town Beach as shown on the Concept Plan, it will need to be located within the Roebuck Bay Caravan Park. Should a larger and more comprehensive facility be desired to cater for a range of ages and abilities, more land area will be needed and this will be difficult to assemble given competing priorities for the area. Construction of a Skate Park within the Caravan Park is not considered to be consistent with the current or potential future use of the Park. Additionally, there are valid concerns about potential conflicts between skate park users, tourists and caravan park residents as well as the impacts of additional noise and lighting on amenity.</p> <p>Ultimately, it is considered that the focus of recreational facilities at Town Beach should continue to be water-based activities. Whilst another skate park would be a valuable asset for the Shire, alternative locations are preferable. The Draft Final Sport Recreation and Leisure Plan contemplates an upgrade to the existing facility at BRAC and future provision of a facility in Broome North.</p> <p>For these reasons it is recommended that the Skate Park be removed from the Concept Plan.</p>	<p>Support. Recommend :</p> <p>1. Amending Figure 4 – Concept Plan (‘the Concept Plan’) and Figure 6 – Town Beach Foreshore Section to remove Element 21 – Skate Park from the legend and the number 21 from the map.</p> <p>2. Amending the corresponding text in Section 5.2 – Foreshore Concept Plan to remove Element 21 – Skate Park;</p> <p>3. Amending Action 13 in Section 4.3.4 (Community Facilities) to remove ‘i.e Skate Park, location and size (Refer to Element 21 on Concept Plan).</p>
b			I love the idea of a board walk. Activities for Tourists are certainly needed, and it would be a very pleasurable thing to meander along at a leisurely pace enjoying the views and peaceful tranquillity of Roebuck Bay. If it is long enough, then fitness runners would certainly use it to for jogging as well.	The Concept Plan identifies a jetty to jetty path connecting Streeter’s Jetty in Chinatown to the rebuilt Old Jetty at Town beach. Council at the Ordinary Council Meeting of 24 July 2014 endorsed the Business Case for the Jetty to Jetty Roebuck Bay Coastal Walk and agreed to the consultant’s recommendation that Option 3 be the goal (this includes bookending the walk with facilities in Chinatown and Town Beach). The configuration and alignment of the path between Anne Street to Napier Terrace has yet to be formalised and may not be in	Note submission.

SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS

				the form of a board walk.	
C			The Tram Line would be a wonderful means of transport to get to an otherwise inaccessible area. Recently we had course to stay in the Cable Beach side of town. Many of the resorts there are located beyond walking distance to the beaches, which are the main tourist attractions to Broome. No one likes waiting a half hour for a bus so unfortunately unless you have a car, the beaches are impossible to get to, particularly for “seniors” and in the very hot weather it is impossible for any pedestrians. So I think it is most important to address this situation.	<p>The OBDS does not consider future tram linkages beyond the Precinct boundary, however the draft Local Planning Strategy (2013) (‘LPS’) contains the following strategy in Section 2.4.10 – Transport and Interchanges:</p> <p><i>Connect Town Beach to Chinatown with a tram in the medium term and consider extending the tram line to Cable Beach in the longer term.</i></p>	Note submission.
2	G. Burton PO Box 823 BROOME, WA, 6725	12 Barker Street	As per attached map. Living in a hundred year old house next door to a heritage house. Across the road from a heritage property. Not to be listed as “Old Broome” goes against “preservation of existing character”. In going from R10 to R40 takes away from concept of “Old Broome”. Try and keep what “character” is left. After living here for more than 40 years I have to go to the museum to see it.	<p>It is acknowledged that Figure 3 – Places of Heritage Significance in Part 2 of the Old Broome Development Strategy shows three places on the State Register of Heritage Places and one place on the Shire’s Municipal Inventory in the four street blocks between Robinson Streets and Weld Streets, extending south from Frederick Street to Anne Street. Given this it is considered appropriate to extend the ‘Special Character Area’ boundary to cover these blocks. This is further consistent with the Shire’s <i>Local Housing Strategy 2009</i>.</p> <p>As a result of this extension, Lot 12 Barker Street will now be included in the ‘Special Character Area.’ As per Action 4 of Section 4.1.4 of the OBDS, this means that its R-coding will remain R10.</p>	Support . Recommend amending Figure 2 – Strategy Plan (‘the Strategy Plan’) to include the area extending south from the mid block between Frederick and Stewart Streets to Anne Street between Robinson and Weld Streets in the ‘Old Broome Special Character Area.’
3	P. Newman PO Box 489 BROOME, WA, 6725	21 Baker Street	Strongly Disagree with re-opening Walcott Street at Frederick St.	<p>The opening of Walcott Street into a four-way intersection was originally intended as one of a series of potential road works designed to improve connectivity in the Precinct. Whilst it is noted that all road works are indicative and will be subject to the findings of a traffic and transport study as outlined in Action 8 in Section 4.4.4 (Movement), officers have further considered the Walcott Street proposal in detail and concluded that the opening would be likely to compromise the central spine of the Old Broome Special Character Area (OBSCA). The location of a major drain at the termination of Walcott Street would make it difficult to implement the proposal.</p> <p>Given this, it is recommended that all reference to the opening of Walcott Street be removed from the OBDS text and plans.</p> <p>As an alternative, it is recommended that an indicative four way intersection be shown on Herbert Street, which is already open to through traffic. This may increase connectivity within the Precinct.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the above, it is considered to be</p>	<p>Support Recommend:</p> <p>1. Deleting the existing text for Action 9(g) in Section 4.4.4 (Movement) to remove reference to the opening of Walcott Street and replacing with the following text:</p> <p><i>g. Undertake improvements to the intersection of Herbert Street and Frederick Street to facilitate four-way traffic (Refer to Element 27e on the Concept Plan)</i></p> <p>2. Deleting the existing text for Element 27(e) in Section 5.2 – Concept Plan Elements and replacing with:</p>

SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS

				<p>premature to designate road connections on the Strategy Plan prior to the traffic and transport study being completed as the Strategy Plan will fulfil a statutory function. Therefore it is recommended that the 'proposed new road connections' be removed from the Strategy Plan. A more appropriate place to depict these proposals would be on a 'Movement Options' figure, which could also include existing and proposed pedestrian connections, public transport links such as the tram, and proposed parking areas as many of these elements will also be subject to further investigation. It is also considered appropriate to retain the proposed road connections on the Concept Plan as it is non-statutory and will be subject to further investigations and detailed design.</p>	<p><i>e. the intersection of Herbert Street and Frederick Street will be improved to facilitate four way traffic.</i></p> <p>3. Removing all 'proposed new road connections,' 'existing and proposed pedestrian pathways,' 'proposed foreshore walks' and possible tram route' from the Strategy Plan.</p> <p>4. Amending Figure 3 – Parking Configurations to be titled 'Movement Options' and incorporate the elements listed in Point 3 above.</p> <p>5. Deleting the 'proposed new road connection' from the intersection of Walcott and Frederick Streets on the modified Figure 3- Movement Options.</p> <p>6. Including a four-way 'intersection improvement' at the intersection of Herbert and Frederick Streets on the modified Figure 3- Movement Options.</p> <p>6. Moving the notation '27e' on Figure 4 – Concept Plan from the intersection of Walcott and Frederick Streets to the intersection of Herbert and Frederick Streets.</p>
4	D. D'Antoine PO Box 184 BROOME, WA, 6725	22 Robinson Street	<p>Strongly disagree – Robinson Street is busy enough – Good to have at least 1 quiet street.</p> <p>Definitely against re-opening Walcott Street at Frederick Street.</p>	As per submission 3 above.	Support in part. As per submission 3 above.
5	P. Manning	10 Raible Rd	I would like to see the old jetty constructed into an arch walk way, finishing at/near the	Elements on the Concept Plan will be subject to	Note submission.

SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS

	PO Box 1645 BROOME, WA, 6725		current café site. People could fish off there at high tide and go for walks along the jetty for recreation. This construction could be designed to still allow for boat launching.	further investigation and detailed design. Council at the Ordinary Council Meeting of 24 July 2014 endorsed the Business Case for the Jetty to Jetty Roebuck Bay Coastal Walk and agreed to the consultant's recommendation that Option 3 be the goal (this includes bookending the walk with facilities in Chinatown and Town Beach). This includes the remediation of Town Beach Jetty.	
6	D. Dureau PO Box 262 BROOME, WA, 6725	332 Hopton St	Historically larger beach lots were issue as 1 year, foreshore leases. Reflecting the uncertainties of the pearling industry. Who was exclusive permitted to occupy them. Leases were not renewed as the industry declined and became public fore reserves in the 1970's and 1980's. As intended I oppose development of the Jack block, recommend the shire incorporate it into the foreshore reserve as was the original intention under 1 year leases.	<p>There are two freehold lots along the Conti Foreshore – Lot 451 and Lot 601 Hamersley Street. As the lots are held in freehold ownership, the landowner is allowed exclusive possession. It is not known when the transfer of land to freehold took place.</p> <p>Were the Shire to incorporate these lots into a 'Parks and Recreation' reserve under Town Planning Scheme No. 4 or subsequent local planning scheme, the landowner may be able to lodge a claim for compensation under Section 173 of the <i>Planning and Development Act 2005</i>. Such a claim could result in a substantial cost to the Shire and this action is not recommended.</p>	Reject.
7	D. Dureau PO Box 262 BROOME, WA, 6725	332 Hopton St	To resolve this situation would Shire/Council consider putting a proposal to the owner to accept an exchange block North of this site abutting existing free hold lot. This focusing development on northern end of coastal reserve, leaving a continuous foreshore reserve uninterrupted with buildings to pollute the visual amenity of this unique seascape complementary views driving down Hamersley St.	<p>Council's position on the appropriateness of development on Lot 451 Hamersley Street was made clear when the lot was zoned 'Mixed Use' under Town Planning Scheme No. 4. The 'Mixed Use' zoning has been maintained in the draft Local Planning Scheme No. 6.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the above, Action 7 in Section 4.1.4 (Land Use) recognises the prominent location of the lots and recommends that any development on the ground floor allow for a high level of public access which maintains vistas to Roebuck Bay. Action 7 also states:</p> <p><i>Any building on these sites should be sensitively designed, have a light construction and address all four sides. The development should not be privatised nor dominate the location visually.</i></p> <p>Should future development on the site be designed in accordance with the recommendations above, it is considered that amenity impacts could be minimised.</p>	Reject.
8	J. Hogan PO Box 3314, BROOME, WA, 6725	2 Ellies Crt	At present I see incomplete pedestrian/cycle pathways in the plan. There needs to be a network that includes all streets in Old Broome. At the moment there are no pedestrian paths along Walcott & Barker Street (although Barker appears to have proposed paths). My question is why hasn't Walcott been included?	The intention of the pathway plan depicted on Figure 2 – Strategy Plan, was to improve connectivity and provide for safe and publicly accessible east-west pedestrian links. This will allow residents to access the foreshore and the streets shown as priority active frontages.	Support. Recommend amending 'Figure 3 – Movement Options' to include a proposed pedestrian pathway along the length of the eastern side of Walcott

SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS

				<p>However, it is noted that Action 2 in Section 4.4.4 (Movement) states:</p> <p><i>2. Construct sealed pathways along both sides of each 'priority active frontage' within Old Broome as identified on the Strategy Plan and along at least one side of each secondary street.</i></p> <p>The Officer's response to submission 3 above recommends removing the existing and proposed footpaths from the 'Strategy Plan' and including them on a new 'Movement Options' figure. Therefore is recommended to include a north-south pathway on the 'Movement Options' figure on streets where none exists, such as Walcott and Herbert Streets and along the full length of Carnarvon Street.</p>	Street and the eastern side of Carnarvon Street.
9	C. Beausein PO Box 2411, BROOME, WA, 6725	7 Walcott St	I am concerned about the possible road opening of Walcott St. I think it will impact on the heritage and character of the area. The whole rezoning of the area would impact on heritage and character. I am astounded that Council is considering such a proposal which would only damage the environment and character of this very special part of town. I don't think a convoy of caravans down Walcott St adds to Old Broome's character. Broome has very little of its heritage intact, thus proposal is only going to negatively impact on what we have left!	<p>The potential opening of Walcott Street is addressed in submission 3 above.</p> <p>With respect to the 'rezoning of the area,' it is noted that the OBDS itself will not rezone any land. Rather, it will provide guidance to Shire staff and Council in considered rezoning requests that may be lodged by individual landowners in the future. This guidance is necessary as the entirety of the Old Broome area is shown as 'Mixed Use' under the draft LPS (2013).</p> <p>Actions 1-3 in Section 4.7.4 (Urban Form) recommend the preparation of Design Guidelines ('DGs') to control development in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the 'Mixed Use' zone under LPS6; Medium density residential development where it occurs in the Precinct; and Development within the Old Broome Special Character area. <p>The draft DGs have been prepared and subject to Council's determination will be publicly advertised. They contain a range of Development Controls to ensure that the form and bulk of development within the Precinct is compatible with the existing character and scale of development. It is considered that the application of the DGs will prevent inappropriate development from taking place.</p>	Support in part. As per submission 3 above.
10	L. Dorsett PO Box 499, BUNBURY, WA	Unit 4 Tameka Court, Robinson St	I have perused the plan to build a large car park on the grassed area adjacent to Town Beach. Although I can see there is a need to extra parking to be provided, I cannot agree to the large track of lawn area now used by picnickers and others for ball games etc. to be converted into parking area.	<p>The Concept Plan is intended to serve as a non-statutory tool to identify potential project ideas and orientate them spatially. It does not provide the level of detail of a Master Plan and will not be used as such. The elements on the Concept Plan are indicative and subject to future investigations (including an assessment of feasibility) and detailed</p>	<p>Support in part.</p> <p>Recommend:</p> <p>1. That Action 14 in Section 4.4.4 (Movement) be amended to state:</p>

SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS

				<p>design. With respect to the car parking areas, future design considerations will need to address:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The overall amount of car parking within the Town Beach environs – whether the total number of bays will be greater or fewer than currently provided;• The number of bays to be relocated to the Robinson Street area and how this area will be configured to minimise loss of green space;• The need to provide accessible bays adjacent to the cafe and water playground to ensure compliance with Australian Standards;• Parking requirements for the Town Beach boat ramp and Department of Transport standards for boat ramp areas; and• The interface between any relocated car parking and existing residential properties on Robinson Street. <p>It is proposed that these matters be addressed through the creation of a ‘Town Beach Parking Plan,’ which will also address the parking requirements associated with the Town Beach Boat Ramp upgrades.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the above, officers have reconsidered the most appropriate way to depict the potential changes to the configuration of parking at Town Beach on Figure 4 – Concept Plan and concluded that depicting major changes to the current configuration prior to the investigation of the design considerations listed above would be premature. Therefore it is recommended that the Concept Plan be amended to depict the existing configuration with an addition row of angled parking along the eastern side of Robinson Street.</p> <p>It is also recommended that the text for Action 14 of Section 4.4.4 (Movement) and Element 17 of Section 5.2 be amended to more accurately reflect the indicative nature of the recommendations regarding car parking at Town Beach.</p>	<p><i>Prepare a ‘Town Beach Parking Plan’ to investigate opportunities to reconfigure the existing Town Beach car and trailer parking to improve safety and amenity. The ‘Town Beach Parking Plan’ shall also consider parking requirements associated with upgrades to the Town Beach Boat Ramp, and may include the relocation of some parking away from the foreshore.</i></p> <p>2. That Element 17 in Section 5.2 be amended to state:</p> <p><u>17. Improve Town Beach Vehicle and Boat Trailer Parking</u></p> <p><i>Improvements to the layout of vehicle and boat trailer parking at Town Beach are recommended. A ‘Town Beach Parking Plan’ will be prepared to guide these improvements. The design of such improvements should consider the need to provide accessible parking bays to other infrastructure along the foreshore, such as the cafe and water playground, and consider the interaction between those using the Town Beach boat ramp and other foreshore users.</i></p> <p>3. That Figure 4 – Concept Plan and Figure 6 – Town Beach Foreshore Section</p>
--	--	--	--	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS

					<p><i>be amended to depict the current parking configuration at Town Beach with an additional row of angled parking on the eastern side of Robinson Street.</i></p> <p><i>4. That Item 17 on the legend of Figure 4 – Concept Plan and Figure 6 – Town Beach Foreshore Section be amended to state ‘Improvements to Town Beach Vehicle and Boat Trailer Parking.’</i></p>
11	C. McDowell PO Box 580, Broome, WA, 6725	69 Robinson St			
a			<p>I am not ticking one box above as there are elements of the plan that I think are very positive, but there are also elements that I don’t agree with and so can’t give a black or white response. My response is not undecided – it’s “mixed”.</p> <p>The elements that I think are positive include the Vision statement and ensuring that proposed elements of development adhere to that vision, such as the Jetty-to-jetty walk, preservation of the areas of special significance and ensuring there is continued community access to the foreshore and town beach areas.</p> <p>However the following features appear to be in direct contradiction of this stated vision and should not be given any priority:</p>	Noted.	Note submission.
b			<p>The tramway through town: The tram was significant for the town’s history but trying to re-build a tramline that will interrupt traffic flow, parking and walking is ridiculous. It will be expensive, unsustainable and maintenance-heavy. Why not just have a static display of a tram? Think of the Sydney monorail.</p>	<p>Discussions over reinstating the historical tram line have been ongoing since 2008. As part of this process, several design concepts have been deliberated. The design, implementation and operation of a tram line, proposed to run along Hamersley Street, between Frederick Street and the Museum; will be subject to further study.</p> <p>Asset management, traffic control, engineering constraints and operation/maintenance costs will be investigated as part of this process.</p> <p>A feasibility study will be undertaken to ensure the design and operation of a tram line is viable, prior to the commencement of any associated works. A static display may be one option explored if the outcomes of further studies uncover a number of unforeseeable constraints.</p>	Note submission.
c			<p>The continuation of the road from Hopton St to Hamersley Drive: this is an area that should be a pedestrian zone not a traffic zone. Management of traffic and increasing public</p>	<p>Extending Hamersley Street to Hopton Street is one of a series of potential road works designed to increase</p>	<p>Support in part. Recommend:</p>

SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS

			<p>transport to the events in this area should be a priority rather than increasing traffic through this public space.</p>	<p>connectivity in the Precinct. The foreshore area north of Town Beach is currently underutilised and is mostly used for unofficial parking during events held at Town Beach. The extension of Hamersley Street to Hopton Street may be one option to cater for additional traffic generated by proposed enhancements to the foreshore area. It has the potential to encourage additional activation of the area and formalise existing informal usage.</p> <p>However, it is noted that before any of the proposed road works can be implemented a traffic and transport study is required to holistically consider the existing movement network. As outlined in Action 8 in Section 4.4.4:</p> <p><i>8. Undertake a traffic and transport study including an audit of road safety and stormwater management to provide information upon which to base detailed design for transport interventions in Old Broome.</i></p> <p>It is considered to be premature to designate road connections on the Strategy Plan prior to the traffic and transport study being completed as the Strategy Plan will fulfil a statutory function. Therefore it is recommended that the ‘proposed new road connections,’ including the extension of Hamersley Street to Hopton Street, be removed from the Strategy Plan. A more appropriate place to depict these proposals would be on a ‘Movement Options’ figure, which could also include existing and proposed pedestrian connections, public transport links such as the tram, and proposed parking areas as many of these elements will also be subject to further investigation. It is also considered appropriate to retain the proposed road connections on the Concept Plan as it is non-statutory and will be subject to further investigations and detailed design.</p>	<p>1. Removing all ‘proposed new road connections,’ ‘existing and proposed pedestrian pathways,’ ‘proposed foreshore walks’ and possible tram route’ from the Strategy Plan.</p> <p>2. Amend Figure 3 – Parking Configurations to be titled ‘Movement Options’ and incorporate the elements listed in Point 1 above.</p>
d			<p>Expansion of the Area I “Old Broome Special Character Area” – Broome has unique residential and other buildings and while some of this area has been identified, the concept plan does not fully recognise the extent of heritage within that zone. The zone should be extended to include areas East to Weld St and South to Hopton St. The loss of this character area will be a loss for the nation, not just the town.</p>	<p>Submission 2 above deals with the extents of the Old Broome Special Character Area and outlines officer’s support for increasing the extents to incorporate the area between Robinson and Weld Streets from the mid-block between Frederick and Stewart Street to Anne Street.</p> <p>Officers also considered the area between Herbert and Walcott Streets from Guy to Hopton Street and recognised that this area is shown in the Shire’s <i>Local Housing Strategy 2009</i> as retaining the R10 density coding. Whilst the <i>Local Housing Strategy</i> extends this designation to Robert Street, it is not considered</p>	<p>Support in part. As per submission 2 above. Further recommend extending the ‘Old Broome Special Character Area’ to encompass land between Herbert and Walcott Streets, from Guy Street to Hopton Street.</p>

SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS

				<p>appropriate to include the block between Hopton and Robert Streets within the 'Special Character Area' as it is mainly comprised of the former Town Beach Club resort which is currently being used for staff accommodation. It is also not considered appropriate to include the block between Walcott and Robinson Streets south of Guy Street as this block will have 'Priority Active Frontage' along its eastern boundary which, as it develops, will influence the type of development that occurs on adjoining lots.</p> <p>Given the above, it is considered to that the extents of the 'Special Character Area' be broadened to include land between Herbert and Walcott Streets, Guy and Hopton Streets.</p>	
e			<p>Traffic in Weld and Robinson Streets: the congestion around the Broome Primary School and the hospital is a major safety and traffic issue. Serious consideration needs to be given to increasing parking on Robinson St at school pick up hours, and traffic flow all around the area. This includes questions of Lighting throughout the Old Broome area – street lighting is very inadequate.</p>	<p>Figure 3 – Parking Configurations in Part 1 of the OBDS (proposed to be updated to 'Movement Options') proposed formalised car parking in the road reserve of both sides of Robinson and Weld Street, between Frederick and Anne Streets.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that further work needs to be done to assess the need for car parking improvements throughout the precinct. Action 16 in Section 4.4.4 (Movement) recommends:</p> <p><i>16. Survey the current use of car parking in Old Broome to establish the nature of parking use, including duration of stay(turnover) and demand for parking, to inform preparation of a parking management strategy which will consider parking within road reserves and during events.</i></p> <p>It will be especially critical for the Broome Hospital to carefully examine parking provision and traffic flows when considering any future development or redevelopment.</p> <p>With respect to lighting in the Precinct, Action 3 in Section 4.4.4 (Movement) states:</p> <p><i>3. Ensure pathways are illuminated, shaded and equipped with legible and appropriate wayfinding signage.</i></p>	Note submission.
f			<p>The environmental preservation of the foreshore area: all along the foreshore and especially along the pindan cliffs near Town Beach there are erosion problems. Before branching out and developing the area, the fundamental issues of environmental management and maintenance needs to be tackled to ensure these areas are not destroyed.</p> <p>With this Concept plan proposing increased usage of the foreshore and Town Beach areas, there is a vital need for serious work on cliff preservation.</p>	<p>Element 28 of the Concept Plan focuses on 'Coastline Stability and Revetment' and makes specific reference to the eroded pindan cliffs at Town Beach. Element 28 recommends erosion protection and control measures to be implemented at vulnerable locations along the length of the foreshore, including a revetment to help prevent further erosion of the</p>	Support. No modifications required.

SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS

			<p>If nothing is done, there won't be a Town Beach foreshore to have any events at.</p> <p>This will impact directly on other plans such as the preservation of the Pioneer Cemetery (good), the boat ramp plans (will have an impact on environmental damage unless done properly), Rebuilding of the jetty (as above), and the moving of the Town Beach Café (plans to move it to an eroding cliff top sounds a little unsound).</p>	<p>pindan cliffs. The Shire has already prepared a plan (Town Beach Revetment Strategy / Plan) and undertaken detailed design to construct the revetment, and is currently sourcing funding to carry out the works.</p> <p>Other proposed developments along the foreshore will be subject to the findings of the Shire's Coastal Vulnerability Study (CVS) which is currently underway. The CVS may also identify further adaptive measures, which the Shire may wish to investigate.</p>	
g			<p>Overall, I congratulate the Shire for attempting to find a balance between so many competing interests and looking for a resident and visitor friendly solution to this developing area. However, while the Vision statement is bold and inclusive, the details within the plan do not always match that vision.</p> <p>Don't lose sight of the vision to preserve "Broome's history, culture and environment" in a "low-key scale, retaining the open vistas to Roebuck Bay".</p>	Noted.	Note submission.
12	R. McKenna PO Box 5103 BROOME, WA, 6725	23 Marul Rd	Object.	Noted.	Note submission.
13	A. Waters & F. Wotherspoon.	17 Walcott St	.		
a			In particular we object to opening up Walcott Street at the junction with Frederick Street to allow motor vehicle entry into Walcott Street at that point (part 27, page 30). We see no value or benefit to any party in doing so, now or into the future, and can see no evidence of need or benefit detailed in the Development Strategy. The length of Frederick Street between Hamersley Street and the Boulevard shopping centre is already, and has been for some years, a high-risk traffic area. The mitigation strategy of the Broome bypass road has helped but Frederick Street remains a main thoroughfare for local and tourist traffic, as well as light commercial use, to which the unnecessary addition of another intersection will be unhelpful. This is regardless of the fact that a roundabout is already in situ there. Likewise, the opening of Anne Street to Hamersley Street is proposed without evidence of genuine need or benefit. We believe that this too should not be progressed. Opening Walcott Street directly to Frederick Street has been proposed in the past in traffic control proposals for Frederick and Hamersley Streets but quite rightfully has not been progressed.	As per submission 3 above.	Support in part. As per submission 3 above.
b			Our residential property on Walcott Street is situated in Area B declared as "mixed use commercial/civic and administration" in the plan. This appears a long step from the current use, which includes significant residential use at least in design/construction, if not in current use.	The land use designations in the Strategy Plan do not reflect current use. Rather they are intended to provide guidance as to how the area can evolve over time and the type of uses that will be encouraged in the future. The OBDS does not rezone any land and it will be up to individual landowners to request this of Council.	Reject.
c			Section 4.4 of the Development Strategy regarding Movements appears to give mixed messages about movement modes. It notes: "Challenges often experienced by residents travelling to, from and/or within Old Broome will be addressed through the implementation of the movement network. The coordination and integration of the movement networks should be subject to detailed design." Is there objective evidence of these challenges? What evidence is there that the proposed opening of Anne and Walcott Streets in particular will alleviate these challenges. Detailed design based on evidence is required, however	As stated above the OBDS states that a traffic and transport study should be completed prior to any road works taking place, including an audit of road safety and stormwater management. The traffic and transport study will provide evidence upon which to base detailed design for transport interventions in Old Broome.	Reject.

SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS

			despite the extract above, there is evidence that this is being progressed in effect by stealth. Kerbing and crossovers have been provided only down one side of Walcott Street – perhaps leaving the other side more easily readied for widening – for increased traffic volumes, and the already in place roundabout at the Frederick Street intersection being easily amenable for opening to Walcott Street.	The OBDS does not contain any reference to widening Walcott Street. It is noted however that the current 10 year capital works program indicates that Walcott Street from Anne Street to the Kimberley Club is to be widened, kerbed and sealed in 2019-2021. Notwithstanding this, the officer's response to submission 3 above recommends removing all reference to the potential opening of Walcott Street.	
d			On the other hand the strategy espouses promotion of pedestrian and bicycle usage through improvements to lighting and paths, but there is a relative lack of development in this area. Quite frankly, given the 15-20 year period of this strategy, we firmly believe that this needs to be recognised and revised. Local government has mandates in, inter alia, public health, environmental health and ecological preservation. Over the course of the 15-20 year period and in keeping with these mandates, emerging urban design, and accepting growing fossil fuel scarcity and human contribution to greenhouse gases and climate change, liberated vehicle access should not be prioritised ahead of pedestrian and other forms of self-propelled or public transport. Even in accepting the "mixed use Commercial/Civic" planning intent of the area, efforts to control motor vehicle traffic to local traffic only should be the principle.	<p>The first objective of Section 4.4.2 (Movement) is:</p> <p><i>1. To integrate and balance a variety of movement options to create a network that meets the needs of all users.</i></p> <p>This objective makes it clear that the movement network should not focus solely on vehicles and should equally cater for cyclists and pedestrians. Strategies 1,5,7,9 and 10 in Section 4.4.3 (Movement) and Actions 1,2,3, 4,5,6, 17,18,19,20,21 and 22 in Section 4.4.4 (Movement) look to improve the network for pedestrians and cyclists and increase the usage of public transport.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this, it is not considered desirable to restrict motor vehicle traffic in the Precinct to local use only as the Precinct will continue to play an important role for the wider Broome community by fulfilling civic, recreational, and tourism functions which cater for a wide range of people, not only local residents.</p>	Reject.
e			Crystallised in section 8 Implementation is what we interpret as high levels of ambiguity and/or lack of transparency within the document. It acknowledges that the document does not have the detail of a master plan but then notes that the indicative costings inform the implementation of various actions.	Section 6 – Implementation acknowledges that the OBDS does not provide the level of detail of 'a true master plan' and also references indicative costings that were prepared for Concept Plan elements. It is acknowledged that this section as currently written is confusing and does not provide a clear 'way forward.' It is recommended that alternative text be inserted to address this.	<p>Support. Recommend replacing the entirety of Section 6 – Implementation in Part 1 with the following:</p> <p><i>Once adopted, the Old Broome Development Strategy will serve as an 'Informing Strategy' under the Shire's Integrated Planning Framework. This means that it will be considered by Council when undertaking revisions to the Strategic Community Plan, the Corporate Business Plan, and the Long Term Financial Plan.</i></p>

					<p><i>The Old Broome Development Strategy has three distinct components:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><i>• A statutory section which will be used as a town planning tool;</i><i>• A visionary section which will be used by the Shire to source funding and commence feasibility studies, project planning and detailed design for various project ideas; and</i><i>• An explanatory section (Part 2) which contains background information and analysis.</i> <p><u><i>Statutory Section</i></u></p> <p><i>The Old Broome Development Strategy will be adopted as a Local Planning Policy under the local planning scheme. When considering requests to initiate Scheme Amendments, subdivide land, or undertake new development, the Shire’s planners and/or Council will refer to the Strategy Plan as well as the ‘Objectives and Principles’ ‘Strategies and Policies’ and ‘Actions’ outlined in Part 1 of the OBDS for each of the ‘Key</i></p>
--	--	--	--	--	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

					<p><i>Strategy Areas.’ These sections form the statutory component of the OBDS. In some cases, planning decisions will be influenced by the outcomes of further studies, which are detailed in the statutory section.</i></p> <p><i>Old Broome Urban Design Guidelines will be progressed separately as a Local Planning Policy and will also provide a level of statutory control over the built form of the following types of development in the Old Broome Precinct:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>All development within the ‘Mixed Use’ zone under Local Planning Scheme No. 6;</i>• <i>Medium density Development in the ‘Residential’ zone (lots with a density of R30 or greater); and</i>• <i>All development within the ‘Old Broome Special Character Area’ as identified in the OBDS Strategy Map.</i> <p><u><i>Visionary Section</i></u></p> <p><i>The OBDS Concept Plan and corresponding explanatory text will not have a statutory role. Rather, the purpose of these sections is to identify potential project ideas and orientate them</i></p>
--	--	--	--	--	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

					<p><i>spatially. The Concept Plan does not provide the level of detail of a true Master Plan and should not be used as such. The realisation of elements on the Concept Plan will require additional work, such as feasibility studies and detailed design. In some cases, the OBDS has already identified additional investigations that will be required to realise particular elements, such as the Traffic and Transport Study and the Town Beach Parking Plan.</i></p> <p><i>To assist the Shire in commencing the process of progressing elements on the Concept Plan, Cardno (WA) Pty Ltd has prepared a set of indicative costings for some project ideas that are depicted. These costings, which are included as Appendix B to Part 2 of the OBDS, are 'high level' and will require refinement as proposals become more detailed.</i></p> <p><i>Most of the actions in the 'Visionary Section' sit outside the influence of the land use planning framework, and will require a whole of Shire approach to carry them forward. In many cases, collaboration between the Shire, the State, Native Title Holders, local business and the community will be necessary to achieve the</i></p>
--	--	--	--	--	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS

					<p><i>desired outcomes.</i></p> <p><u>Way Forward</u></p> <p><i>Further to the adoption of the OBDS, the projects depicted on the Concept Plan will be assigned to the relevant Shire department/s. Departments will then need to put forward their own project briefs to source funding through Council's annual budgetary process to undertake the necessary studies and actions. As an Informing Strategy under the Shire's Integrated Planning Framework, the OBDS will also feeds into the annual revision of the long Term Financial Plan and Corporate Business Plan.</i></p>
f			<p>Clear articulation with adjoining other parts of Broome, in particular, P3, and its ongoing development are not well stated and we believe that it is beholden on the Shire of Broome to articulate this rather than to remain silent on it or leave it to discovery by members of the community.</p>	<p>Under the LPS, Precinct 3 is named 'Streeter, Forrest and Matsumoto' and described as 'the post-war residential subdivisions of Broome located west of Herbert Street and south of Frederick Street to the boundary of the Light Industrial Area, including the Broome Cemetery reserves on Port Drive.' The objective for Precinct 3 is: 'Where appropriate, allow urban renewal and infill subdivision.'</p> <p>To date, the Shire has not undertaken any planning to determine where urban renewal and infill subdivision may be appropriate. One of the Guidelines for Precinct 3 under the LPS is to: 'Develop and Urban Renewal Strategy in conjunction with the Department of Housing and Land Owners.' When this occurs, the interface with Precinct 2 will need to be carefully considered.</p>	Support. No modifications required.
g			<p>As was reiterated at the recent public forum (29/4/14), Broome is unique. Development needs to also be progress in retaining that uniqueness. The Shire of Broome in meeting the needs of ratepayers and residents (of Old Brome) must ensure that the strategies, concepts and implementation of these constitutes advances in amenity, social capital and the public good – as can be foreseen for the 15-20 year period of this plan.</p>	Noted.	Note submission.
h			<p>In closing, we note words from South Australia's 2013 Public Health Plan, developed as a requirement of the 2011 SA Public Health Act (and note that Western Australia's equivalent act the Health Act was first proclaimed in 1911): "Stronger healthier communities are</p>	Noted.	Note submission.

SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS

			communities which are safe, connected and involved. Communities aren't manufactured by governments or by businesses. It's the people who live there that can make them a better place to live. Yes government and business planning and decisions are important and in many ways set the scene for how a community may function. But it's the people who live there who make a difference to how it actually works. "(South Australia: A Better Place to Live, p54.)		
i			Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback. We trust it will be considered in good faith.	Noted.	Note submission.
14	H. Wilkins Landcorp		We support and congratulate the Shire of Broome on the overall strategy and the encouragement of mixed uses through the precinct whilst preserving the heritage and history of the area. Our further comments for consideration include:	Noted.	Note submission.
a			The strategy doesn't provide any opportunity for absolute waterfront mixed use development. Acknowledging expectations of some sectors of the community regarding foreshore protection and the desire to keep the foreshore as undeveloped as possible, there could be very limited opportunity for development for example to the south of the existing Catalinas residential development, or fronting proposed car/trailer parking in the same area where view corridors would not be blocked.	<p>As depicted on the Strategy Plan, there are several lots in private ownership which contain absolute beach frontage which can accommodate 'Mixed Use' development.</p> <p>For instance, lots 947, 12, 21 and Part of Lot 1219 Carnarvon Street are all zoned 'Mixed Use' under Local Planning Scheme No.6 and are located within Area D – Mixed Use Tourist/Residential. These lots are depicted with a 'Priority Active Frontage' along their eastern boundary so that new development or redevelopment should address the Roebuck Bay Foreshore. Additionally, Lot 451 Hamersley Street will be zoned Mixed Use under LPS6 and Action 7 in Section 4.1.4 (Land Use) describes how a building on this site should address all four sides.</p> <p>The land south of the Catalina's residential development contains pindan cliffs which have been substantially affected by erosion. It is not considered appropriate to recommend permanent development in this vulnerable area. As stated above, the Shire is currently undertaking a CVS which will provide predicted storm surge inundation levels for 1:1, 1:10, 1:50, 1:100, 1:200 and 1:500 year events over a planning timeframe of up to 100 years. Once the CVS data has been made available, the Shire will be in a better position to assess future inundation risk and this will guide decisions as to the appropriate set back distances for absolute beach front development. In the absence of this information, a precautionary approach has been taken.</p> <p>The Concept Plan does allow for Mixed Use infill development on land south of the museum and Sail Maker's Shed. Should future development take place in this location, it could address Roebuck Bay but be sufficiently setback to avoid risk of coastal processes.</p>	Reject.
b			There could potentially be some confusion around the possibility of limited development eg. Kiosk, café etc. within the designated public open space at Town Beach. Community expectations are that open space remains as such with no development at all and this could	The Concept Plan identifies the potential for up to two buildings to be constructed along the Town Beach Foreshore – the relocated Town Beach Cafe	Note submission.

SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS

			lead to problems should development be proposed at a later date.	<p>and a ‘Catalina Plane Hangar and Museum,’ which is shown to the east of the museum. The exact location, size, and design of these buildings is yet to be determined.</p> <p>If these buildings are constructed, they will be in the ownership of the Shire and may be leased to a private operator as is the case currently with the Town Beach Cafe. This will allow for a high level of public access and usage and will prevent privatisation of the foreshore.</p>	
c			No improvements have been proposed for Carnarvon Street between the Mangrove Hotel and Frederick Street. Whilst acknowledging the cultural heritage significance of this area, there could be an opportunity to improve the streetscape within the road reserve and improve the pedestrian connection between the Mangrove Hotel and Chinatown, for example by having a continuous foot path on one or both sides of the road.	Noted. The Officer’s recommendation in submission 8 above is to amend Figure 3 – Movement Options to show a proposed footpath along the full length of the eastern side of Carnarvon Street. This will improve the pedestrian network.	Support. As per submission 8 above.
d			The designation of the PCYC and surrounds as ‘recreation’ may constrain redevelopment opportunities in the future as it creates a community expectation as to future use of the site.	<p>Of the five lots shown as ‘Recreation’ on the Strategy Plan, the two westernmost lots are known as Reserve 41185 which has a Management Order in favour of the PCYC for the purpose of ‘Youth Centre.’ Therefore it is considered appropriate to designate these lots ‘Recreation.’</p> <p>The other two lots in the ownership of PCYC currently contain the PCYC facilities, including part of the overflow caravan park. The PCYC plays an important role in providing recreational opportunities to the wider Broome community, and the designation of ‘Recreation’ is considered appropriate to ensure this function is preserved. Having additional opportunities for recreation in the Precinct is particularly important given the under-provision of Public Open Space in the area according to the standards set in the WAPC’s <i>Liveable Neighbourhoods</i>.</p> <p>Additionally, it is noted that the PCYC will be shown as a ‘Public Purpose’ Reserve for the purpose of ‘PCYC’ under Local Planning Scheme No. 6. A Scheme Amendment would be required to alter the use of this land.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the above, Element 26 on the Concept Plan notes the following:</p> <p><i>26. PCYC Improvements / Relocation</i></p> <p><i>Investigations into the long term operation of Broome PCYC will be undertaken to determine the viability of relocation as opposed to retaining and enhancing the site and its existing facilities for community purposes and overflow parking.</i></p>	Note submission.

SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS

				Should the future plans of the PCYC change over time subject to these investigations, the OBDS can be amended accordingly.	
e			Consideration should be given to locating the proposed skate park location in a more prominent position to avoid anti-social behaviour issues and promote youth activities. Research shows that locating such facilities in out of the way areas increases the likelihood of undesirable activity.	The Officer's response to Submission 1(a) above discusses the removal of the Skate Park from the Concept Plan.	Support. As per recommendation 1(a) above.
f			Consideration should also be given to extending the special heritage zone southwards to include other notable properties in the area.	The Officer's responses to 2 and 11(d) above discuss the extents of the Old Broome 'Special Character Area' and recommends that additional streets be included within the area.	Support. As per recommendations 2 and 11(d) above.
15	D. Galwey PO Box 3642 BROOME, WA, 6725	60 Walcott St			
a			Old Broome is unique in that one of the few towns in Australia to have a well defined precinct that has changed little since settlement. Its prime features of wide street vistas, large blocks, and a diverse mix of architectural styles and vegetation defines what is often stated as the "essence of Broome". Cable Beach, Roebuck, Sunset Park and Broome North have nothing to do with the allure and feeling of Broome. They are urban development that are common to any town or city in Australia and as such offer town planners every opportunity to provide a mix of alternative land use plans such as high density housing opportunities as required.	Noted.	Note submission.
b			In terms of history and heritage the Old Broome precinct gives us the opportunity to preserve the unique architectural styles inherent throughout the area. Old Pearlers as they are described are no more important than the other various styles of abodes that have been built over the years.	The OBDS acknowledges the history and heritage of Old Broome. The vision statement specifically references that development must be 'respectful of the rich cultural heritage and natural environment' and Section 4.6 contains 'Objectives and Principles,' 'Strategies/Policy' and 'Actions' relating to the preservation of heritage. Additionally the OBDS designates an 'Old Broome Special Character Area' which includes buildings of numerous architectural styles. 'Old Pearlers' are not given preference over other forms of development, however buildings listed on the Shire's Municipal Inventory or the State Register of Heritage Places are recognised as is customary in land use planning practice.	Note submission.
c			The question needs to be asked that given the recognised historic and heritage importance of Old Broome, its unarguable setting as the essence of Broome and its importance of sense of place, why should urban planning be directed at transitioning and changing the area into a mixed use high density urban landscape?	Whilst the OBDS does encourage portions of the Old Broome precinct to transition to a 'Mixed Use' function, it does not seek to apply 'high density' across the precinct. The draft LPS (2013) identifies the entirety of Old Broome as 'Mixed Use' and at the same time makes clear that development should be in an 'open form' that 'recognises the historic character of the area.' The purpose of the OBDS is to further refine the	Reject.

				<p>recommendations of the LPS and seek to concentrate particular land uses in particular areas.</p> <p>It is noted that land to the east of Weld Street is already zoned 'Mixed Use' with a density of 'R40' under the Shire's Town Planning Scheme No. 4 (TPS4). Under LPS6, the 'Mixed Use' zone will be extended west one street to Robinson Street. Within this one street, lots to the north of the Broome Primary School will maintain their R10 density coding even when zoned 'Mixed Use,' which will prevent 'high density' development from taking place.</p> <p>The OBDS includes the majority of the area north of Guy Street that does not already have a density of R40 in the 'Old Broome Special Character Area' (also described as Area I). Action 4 of Section 4.1.4 (Land Use) of the OBDS states:</p> <p><i>4. Retain the R10 density coding in Areas G and I .</i></p> <p>It is noted that officers are recommending that the extent of Area I includes the 'Mixed Use R10' properties between Weld and Robinson Streets so their density coding will be maintained into the future. Area I will also extend south of Guy Street to Hopton Street between Herbert and Walcott Streets. All development within the 'Special Character Area' will be limited to a density of R10.</p> <p>The OBDS does contemplate an increase in density on lots that are shown in 'Area D – Tourist / Residential' and not located within the 'Old Broome Special Character Area.' With the exception of the former Town Beach Club Resort which is already developed at a higher density, these areas adjoin Priority Active Frontages and it is envisaged that their character will change as the 'Priority Active Frontages' develop.</p> <p>It is important to note that a density increase will not happen as-of-right as the OBDS does not change the zoning or density coding of any lots. Rather, it will be the responsibility of individual landowners to apply to Council to up-code or rezone their land through the form of a Scheme Amendment. Scheme Amendments are subject to a lengthy administrative process, and as such it is envisaged that increases in density will be incremental.</p> <p>Characteristics of the streetscape such as the wide road reserves and generous vegetated verges will be</p>	
--	--	--	--	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS

				maintained even if higher density residential development takes place within lot boundaries. The Shire's Local Planning Policy 8.16 does not allow off-site parking in the 'Residential' zone and any parking within a road reserve (including verges) within other zones requires a resolution of Council unless a parking plan has been adopted for that area. The draft Old Broome Design Guidelines will also address the issue of verge parking and state that it will only be considered where a parking plan has been adopted and landscaping has been provided both on site and on the remainder of the verge to the satisfaction of the Shire.	
d			<p>Land Use: Strategies/Policy <i>Reference Figure 2 Strategy Plan</i> I recommend the following changes:</p> <p>Area G – Residential 1 to be extended to Hopton Street</p> <p>Area I – Old Broome Special Character Area to be extended to Hopton Street.</p> <p>The extension area incorporates block sizes and architectural styles exactly the same as the defined residential 1 area and the Broome Special Character Area.</p> <p>I see no reason why the area bounded by Herbert, Guy and Robinson Streets to Hopton Street should not be included.</p> <p>The boundaries of this area should incorporate the verges up to the boundary of each house as the streetscape appeal contributes greatly to the overall special characteristics of this area – this is carried all the way from Frederick Street to Hopton Street on Herbert, Walcott, and Robinson Streets.</p>	As per the Officer's response 11(d) above.	Support in part. As per 11(d) above.
e			<p>Residential Density Coding:</p> <p>I object to changing the density ratings within the Old Broome precinct.</p> <p>With the proposed extension of The Old Broome Special Character Area the R10 rating should be applied to this area as well.</p> <p>The Shire has already allowed compromise to ratings and is seemingly unable to control State Housing initiatives. There are enough social issues within the area without further exacerbating the problem.</p> <p>Town Planning should be taken into account the impact of zoning changes and potential social issues.</p> <p>This is why the Shire should carry out a full Social Impact Survey prior to any changes to density ratings and/or land use.</p>	<p>Increases in density are discussed in the Officer's response to 15(c) above.</p> <p>It is correct that the Shire does not 'control State Housing Initiatives' as development undertaken by the Department of Housing is considered to be a 'Public Work' under the <i>Public Works Act 1902</i>. Section 6 of the <i>Planning and Development Act 2005</i> exempts state governments from requiring Planning Approval to undertake public works. Under the <i>Planning and Development Act 2005</i>, local governments are required to be consulted when a public work is proposed but they do not have the power to stop it from taking place or to issue and enforce conditions.</p> <p>As discussed above, as the OBDS does not effect any changes to 'Residential' zoned land (either in density or in land use) and these will only be possible as a result of a Scheme Amendment. This will happen</p>	Support in part. As per submissions 2 and 11(d) above.

SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS

				incrementally and be driven by individual landowners. At this lot-by-lot scale, it would be considered onerous to require individual landowners to carry out Social Impact Assessments. However Shire officers will consider take potential social impacts into consideration when making recommendations to Council on Scheme Amendments.	
f			<p>Open Space:</p> <p>There is a lack of open space throughout the precinct – this is well documented</p> <p>Further work is required to enhance and beautify the foreshore area south of the Women of Pearling Statue to Catalinas. This would provide extra POS and access to Roebuck Bay views.</p>	<p>Noted. Element 2 on the Concept Plan is described as ‘Conti Foreshore to Town Beach’ and states:</p> <p><i>Enhancement of the foreshore area between Moonlight Bay Apartments and Town Beach will be undertaken to establish a linear foreshore park, incorporating paths, furniture, shade structures, shade tree and other planting, public art and interpretation of the many and varied stories and historic sites associated with this historic area (eg: McDaniels’ Camp).</i></p> <p>This element encompasses the foreshore south of the Women in Pearling Statue to Catalina’s.</p>	Note submission.
g			<p>Community Facilities:</p> <p>4.3.4 Actions</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It may well be that a boat launching ramp at its current location may prove to be inappropriate given the public use facilities that are planned for the immediate Town Beach area. Relocation to another area within the caravan park may offer a solution. 	<p>The Concept Plan is intended to serve as a non-statutory tool to identify potential project ideas and orientate them spatially. It does not provide the level of detail of a Master Plan and should not be used as such. The elements on the Concept Plan are indicative and will be subject to future investigations (including an assessment of feasibility) and detailed design.</p> <p>it is noted, however, that the Shire has already prepared a plan (Town Beach Boat Ramp Plan) and is undertaking detailed design for the boat ramp upgrades, which have been budgeted for construction in 14/15.</p> <p>Relocation of an existing boat ramp to other coastal area requires a detailed assessment of such matters as accessibility, water depth, siltation rates and adequate provision of on land facilities. The Council continues to rigorously pursue with the State Government the issue of improved boat launching facilities.</p>	Note submission.
h			<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. The existing Water Park extensions should be done westwards towards Robinson Street The area to the East (Bay) has extensive shade trees and facilities and is extremely well patronised by the local community, particularly young mothers and their young children. 	<p>The Concept Plan is intended to serve as a non-statutory tool to identify potential project ideas and orientate them spatially. It does not provide the level of detail of a true Master Plan and should not be used as such. The elements on the Concept Plan are indicative and will be subject to future investigations (including an assessment of feasibility) and detailed design. Consideration of the most appropriate</p>	Note submission.

SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS

				location for the water park extension can be undertaken during these investigations.	
i			3. I do not see the necessity for a safe swimming area at this time	<p>The Concept Plan is intended to serve as a non-statutory tool to identify potential project ideas and orientate them spatially. It does not provide the level of detail of a true Master Plan and should not be used as such. The elements on the Concept Plan are indicative and will be subject to future investigations (including an assessment of feasibility) and detailed design.</p> <p>The concept for the safe swimming area originated from the historic use of shark cages at Town Beach when the DEMCO Meatworks was in operation. The modern interpretation of this feature has not been determined and it is acknowledged that future design considerations will need to address:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The large tidal range experienced at Town Beach; • Potential environmental impacts, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The possibility of long shore drift which may lead to erosion or sediment redistribution along the main beach; and ○ The preservation of the mangroves; • Environmental health considerations regarding maintenance of public aquatic facilities and limits to the amount of time standing water can be accommodated; and • Interaction between beach users and users of the boat ramp. <p>The integration of these design considerations outside of the scope of this project as the OBDS is principally intended to function as a land use policy. However to acknowledge the above considerations it is recommended that the description of Element 22 be amended.</p>	<p>Support in part. Recommend amending Element 22 in Section 5.2 to include the following sentence:</p> <p><i>The design of the safe swimming area will need to carefully consider Broome's large tidal range, potential environmental impacts on the beach and mangroves, and the interaction between beach users and users of the boat ramp.</i></p>
j			4. I do agree to the construction of a new jetty provided it meets community requirements and needs and is not just a token effort.	As per submission 15(h) above.	Note submission.
k			5. I do not agree to the relocation of the library to Male Oval The Oval is a core part of the visual introduction to Broome and needs to be maintained without extra buildings destroying the ambience of this valuable community asset.	The relocation of the Library to Chinatown was first identified in the Chinatown Development Strategy which was adopted by Council in February 2013. A specific site was not identified, although it was mentioned that a site which addressed Short Street as one of the principal entries into Chinatown may be appropriate. Nothing in the Chinatown Development Strategy or OBDS suggests it will be on Male Oval.	Note submission.
l			6. Perhaps the shire should undertake an austerity check to ensure that ratepayers are getting value for money. Any increase in administration offices should be subject to	Element 5 in Section 5.2 of the OBDS states that the potential incorporation of the Library building into	Note submission.

SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS

			a vigorous audit of current personnel needs and productivity.	the Administration office will be to 'allow all office staff to be accommodated in the same building.' This is because some technical staff are currently located at the former Shire office on the corner of Weld and Barker Streets. It does not provide any indication that staff numbers will be increased.	
m			7. I oppose any plan to redevelop the Baker Street office site. This site should be held for future expansion of civic services.	<p>The Concept Plan is intended to serve as a non-statutory tool to identify potential project ideas and spatially locate them. It does not provide the level of detail of a Master Plan and should not be used as such. The elements on the Concept Plan are indicative and will be subject to future investigations (including an assessment of feasibility) and detailed design.</p> <p>The Barker Street office is also known as Reserve 2909 with a Management Order in favour of the Shire of Broome for the purpose of 'Municipal Office Site.' Under LPS6 it will be classified as a 'Public Purpose' Local Scheme Reserve for the purpose of 'Civic and Cultural.' A Scheme Amendment and cancellation of the Reserve will be required to utilise the site for another purpose, and both of these processes will be subject to a period of public advertising.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the above, it is considered relevant to leave the proposed redevelopment on the Concept Plan. Should the Shire be able to successfully accommodate all its administrative functions into the primary office the Barker Street site could be rationalised to fund other civic improvements or Council priorities.</p>	Note submission.
n			8. I oppose any infill development of the Court House site. This site has significant historic and heritage importance and must be preserved.	<p>The Concept Plan is intended to serve as a non-statutory tool to identify potential project ideas and orientate them spatially. It does not provide the level of detail of a true Master Plan and should not be used as such. The elements on the Concept Plan are indicative and will be subject to future investigations (including an assessment of feasibility) and detailed design.</p> <p>The Court House is listed on the State Register of Heritage Places and any future development proposals would require mandatory referral to the State Heritage Office for assessment.</p>	Note submission.
o			9. Any expansion of the hospital should be by adding additional stories. The hospital already has a large footprint and any extensions should not be at the expense of surrounding residential areas. The Southern area of the hospital would offer opportunities for multi storey construction. Given the growth and need for expansion, I would propose that a serious study should be undertaken to review relocating the hospital to an area such as Cable	<p>The hospital site is also known as Reserve 3596 with a Management Order in favour of the Minister for Health for the purpose of 'Hospital and Allied Purposes.' Future development or redevelopment of the hospital would be considered a 'Public Work' under the <i>Public Works Act 1902</i> and hence be</p>	Support in part. Recommend 1. Amending Figure 4 – Concept Plan to remove Element 7 – Hospital Expansion from the legend and the number 7 from the map;

SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS

			Beach road which I understand was where the hospital was to be originally located.	<p>exempt from obtaining Planning Approval under the <i>Planning and Development Act 2005</i>. However, the Hospital is required to refer future development proposals to the Shire for comment.</p> <p>LPS6 will limit non-residential building height to a wall height of 10 metres and an overall height of 14 metres which is generally equivalent to three stories. This is the same requirement that is currently in place under TPS4. Should an application for additional stories at the hospital be proposed, during the referral process the Shire would advise that the requirements of LPS6 should be adhered to.</p> <p>Since the Strategy was advertised, Shire officers have met with the Broome Hospital and have been advised that the current site has the capacity to cater for demand until 2021, and potentially 2025. After this time, there is potential to relocate some components off-site. Hospital administrators have advised that they have no intention of expanding to the north, as it would require the acquisition of privately owned land. For this reason it is recommended that all reference to the hospital expansion be removed from the Strategy and Concept Plan.</p>	<p>2. Amending the corresponding text in Section 5.2 – Foreshore Concept Plan to remove Element 7 – Hospital Expansion;</p> <p>3. Remove Action 9 from Section 4.3.4 (Community Facilities).</p>
p			10. I support the plan for a new Town Beach Café/Restaurant location. I would suggest and support the refurbishment of the current site to enable a kiosk to be operated out of the same venue to provide an extended hours low key takeaway/milk bar type service.	Noted. The Concept Plan shows the expansion of the Water Park into the current cafe site however alternative configurations can be explored as part of the proposed Reserve Management Plan.	Note submission.
q			11. The PCYC site appears to be underutilised. It should be an avenue to channel the youth of Broome into healthy and positive activities. I would support whatever it takes to revitalise this venue and have it operating at peak efficiency. Failing that plans should be made to incorporate this venue into the BRACS development. If this were to happen the site could be developed into public open space and community meeting venues to support the Old Broome precinct.	The Strategy Plan locates the PCYC and surrounds in 'Precinct F - Recreation'. Preferred uses within Precinct F will include 'Community Purposes,' 'Recreation Indoor,' 'Recreation Outdoor,' 'Club Premises,' 'Health Club' and 'Private Recreation' all of which facilitate the development of recreational activities for all ages.	Support. No modifications required.
r			12. Any decision to relocate the DEC to make way for an expansion of the caravan park must be given far more community exposure than this planning document. I would recommend that the community, through the shire, require a trade off from the caravan park such as giving up the foreshore area immediately south of the Café for a boat ramp and more POS, to enhance the Town Beach foreshore plans.	<p>The land currently occupied by the Department of Parks and Wildlife / Department of Environment Regulation (formerly DEC) offices is owned in freehold by the Department of Conservation, and is also known as Reserve 1644 with a Management Order in favour of the Lands and Forests Commission for the purpose of 'Offices, Nursery, Education and Temporary Camping Ground.' Any proposed plans for relocation would need to be developed in collaboration with the landowners. It is recommended that the description of Element 25 in the Concept Plan be amended to reflect this.</p> <p>It is also considered that the name of the Element as 'Redevelop Caravan Park and Incorporate</p>	<p>Support in part. Recommend amending Element 25 in Section 5.2 to state:</p> <p><u>25. Redevelop and Expand Caravan Park</u></p> <p><i>It is proposed to liaise with the Department of Parks and Wildlife / Department of Environment Regulation (formerly Department of Environment and</i></p>

SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS

				Government Offices’ is confusing as it could be interpreted as incorporating new government offices within the existing caravan park, which is not the intention. It is further recommended that the name be changed to ‘Redevelop and Expand Caravan Park’ to better reflect the intention of the Element.	Conservation, or DEC) to investigate the feasibility and possibility of relocating the current offices and yard to create additional vacant land to cater for the expansion of the caravan park. Opportunities to enhance the caravan park facilities through strategic redevelopment will also be investigated.
s			13. I oppose the building of a skate park in proximity to the water park. The water park is predominantly used by young families. In addition there are a number of new mother’s groups that meet regularly under the shade trees next to the play area. Given the age profile of most skateboard users I do not believe it is a good idea to have a skate park in close proximity to the water park which is used by much younger children and young families.	As per submission 1(a) above it is recommended that the Skate Park be removed from the Concept Plan.	Support. As per submission 1(a) above.
t			<p>4.4 Movement</p> <p>4.4.2/4.4.3 These are all feel good statements that have no real meaning or actions and are more aspirational than realistic.</p> <p>Before we get carried away about facilities for cyclists a survey should be undertaken to establish cycle use in the Old Broome area.</p> <p>Footpaths at the moment appear to be haphazard throughout the area. It should be a priority to provide footpaths on every street.</p>	<p>The recommendations of the OBDS with respect to the provision of bicycle facilities are consistent with the WAPC’s <i>Development Control Policy 1.5 – Bicycle Planning</i>.</p> <p>The Officer’s response to submission 8 above recommends that footpaths be shown on every street.</p>	Support in part. As per submission 8 above.
u			<p>4.4.4</p> <p>9a. I am opposed to the extension of Hamersley Street towards Town Beach as far as an extension of Hopton Street. This section of Hamersley Street is bounded by high density developments and increased traffic flow is neither warranted nor welcome.</p> <p>This is unnecessary and may well be impossible due to the fact the area in question is a designated historic site.</p>	As per submission 11(c) above.	Note submission.
v			<p>9b. I object to the proposal to create a formal road link at the Seaview shopping centre.</p> <p>This would create enormous pressure on traffic use as well as parking for the customers and visitors to the shops, restaurant and museum.</p>	<p>Creating a formal road link at the Seaview Shopping Centre is one of a series of potential road works designed to increase connectivity in the Precinct. However, it is noted that before any of the proposed road works can be implemented a traffic and transport study is required to holistically consider the existing movement network. As outlined in Action 8 in Section 4.4.4:</p> <p><i>8. Undertake a traffic and transport study including an audit of road safety and stormwater management to provide information upon which to base detailed design for transport interventions in Old Broome.</i></p>	<p>Support in part.</p> <p>Recommend:</p> <p>1. Removing all ‘proposed new road connections,’ ‘existing and proposed pedestrian pathways,’ ‘proposed foreshore walks’ and possible tram route’ from the Strategy Plan.</p> <p>2. Amend Figure 3 –</p>

SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS

				<p>It is considered to be premature to designate road connections on the Strategy Plan prior to the traffic and transport study being completed as the Strategy Plan will fulfil a statutory function. Therefore it is recommended that the ‘proposed new road connections,’ including the formal road link at the Seaview Shopping Centre, be removed from the Strategy Plan. A more appropriate place to depict these proposals would be on a ‘Movement Options’ figure, which could also include existing and proposed pedestrian connections, public transport links such as the tram, and proposed parking areas as many of these elements will also be subject to further investigation. It is also considered appropriate to retain the proposed road connections on the Concept Plan as it is non-statutory and will be subject to further investigations and detailed design.</p> <p>It is noted that the provision of adequate parking for the existing shopping centre and museum will be a key consideration during further investigations for this proposal.</p>	Parking Configurations to be titled ‘Movement Options’ and incorporate the elements listed in Point 1 above.
w			<p>9c. Traffic flows seamlessly through the transition from Guy to Hamersley streets.</p> <p>The creation of a T-intersection will result in traffic bottlenecks and build-ups possibly compromising the safety of the Guy/Robinson street roundabout</p>	As per submission 15(v) above.	Support in part. As per submission 15(v) above.
x			9f. whilst this idea has some merit, I oppose reduced speed limits for this section as it will confuse drivers and is not needed. Speed can be regulated as and when required during times of special activity.	As per submission 15(v) above.	Support in part. As per submission 15(v) above.
y			9g. I strongly oppose the opening of Walcott Street at Frederick Street. This will result in heavy traffic use on this road that will compromise the amenity of the area. How do you reconcile the “special characteristic area” and turning one of its main streetscape into a major thoroughfare?	As per submission 3 above.	Support in part. As per submission 16(v) above.
z			9h. I oppose the creation of a roundabout at the Haas and Hamersley streets intersection. It is not necessary as traffic use does not warrant the disruption to the smooth flow of traffic in and out of the town centre.	As per submission 15(v) above.	Support in part. As per submission 15(v) above.
aa			19. How do you identify the end of trip locations? Bicycle racks in secure locations is possible but provision of shower facilities for staff is a decision best left to business based on actual demand and capacity to provide these benefits, not by regulation based on a whim and feel good policy.	<p>The WAPC has adopted a <i>Development Control Policy 1.5 – Bicycle Planning</i> (DCP1.5) The first policy objective of DCP1.5 is: ‘to make cycling safer and more convenient through the provision of end-of-trip facilities and by the provision of better cycle route networks.’</p> <p>Section 3.4 of the DCP1.5 states:</p> <p><i>The provision of appropriate bicycle facilities through the imposition of development conditions dealing with such matters as the type, number and location of bicycle parking facilities, and the installation of showers and change</i></p>	Support. Recommend replacing the word ‘Require’ in Action 19 in Section 4.4.4(Movement) with the word ‘Encourage.’

SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS

				<p>rooms is supported for locations such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • shopping centres • factories • offices • educational establishments • sport, leisure and entertainment centres • health centres and hospitals • libraries and other public buildings • rail and bus stations • major places of employment • parks • beaches and recreation venues • tourist attractions. <p>It is acknowledged that the DCP does not require showers and changing rooms for all non-residential development, but rather for developments that generate a high level of employment and use, as well as community facilities. To reflect this it is recommended that the action be re-worded.</p>	
bb			<p>21. The roads in Old Broome are not wide enough to have designated cycle lanes. Cycle routes should be by designated paths along the verges shared with pedestrian pathways.</p>	<p>Action 20 of Section 4.4.4 (Movement) states:</p> <p><i>Prepare a comprehensive Bicycle Strategy which will promote recommendations for a Broome-wide cycleway network.</i></p> <p>It is anticipated that the designation of suitable on-street cycle routes will be informed by the Bicycle Strategy.</p>	Note submission.
cc			<p>22. A full feasibility plan should be undertaken for this project. The amount of capital required to build the system would be substantial and the annual costs to maintain the system could be a financial nightmare. The tourist season may not be long enough to cover the annual running costs.</p> <p>Unless it is run by private enterprise, I would be against ratepayers or taxpayers fund this project.</p> <p>It could be beneficial to run a motorised tram service to ascertain the viability of this service prior to committing ratepayer funding to this project</p>	As per submission 11(b) above.	Note submission.
dd			<p>23. A full survey of usage of both ramps (Catalinas and Town Beach) should be undertaken prior to any relocation and/or provision of trailer parking. I have been a resident here for many years and at best I have only ever seen a maximum of 10 boat trailers at either ramp at any one time.</p>	As per submission 15(g) above.	Note submission.
ee			<p>4.6 Heritage</p> <p>4.6.2 Objectives and Principles</p> <p>If any new development in Old Broome is to build on the areas unique mix of Aboriginal, European and Asian Heritage and retain and preserve the heritage significance of Old Broome then there is no place for infill developments and higher density housing codes. There is also a need to restrict building heights and introduce building design and material guidelines to preserve the heritage significance of the area.</p>	As per submission 15(c) above. LPS6 will restrict building heights and contains development controls for building design and materials which are described in greater detail through the draft Old Broome Design Guidelines.	Support in part. No modifications required.

SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS

			.		
ff			4.6.4 Actions 1. The heritage train should be tied in with work being undertaken for the Chinatown heritage trail.	Noted.	Note submission.
gg			2. I would only support this If it is to be fully funded by the Yawuru.	The Concept Plan shows the proposed Yawuru Cultural Centre to be located on Lot 1219 Carnarvon Street which is in the ownership of Yawuru. It will not be the responsibility of the Shire to construct the Cultural Centre.	Note submission.
hh			3. Agree with the conversation and restoration of the former Bourne and Ingliss Store if at all possible. Failing this it should be removed.	Noted.	Note submission.
li			4. If the land use of this historic area is approved for this project, how will it be funded?	<p>The Concept Plan is intended to serve as a non-statutory tool to identify potential project ideas and orientate them spatially. It does not provide the level of detail of a true Master Plan and should not be used as such. The elements on the Concept Plan are indicative and will be subject to future investigations (including an assessment of feasibility) and detailed design.</p> <p>Depending on the cost of the element, grant funding may be sought.</p>	Note submission.
jj			5. Would a low fence deter anti-social behaviour?	A low fence is desirable in order to be historically appropriate and to not visually detract from the cemetery. There are no guarantees that anti-social behaviour will be deterred, however the fence will clearly demarcate the area of the cemetery from the remainder of the reserve.	Note submission.
kk			4.7 Urban Form 4.7.1 Introduction This introduction clearly illustrates the need to place substance over form. Had this been written in plain, logical, understandable English it could have been explained in one or two sentences. The questions need to be asked, however, that given the recognised historic and heritage importance of Old Broome, its unarguable setting as the essence of Broome and its importance of sense of place, why should urban planning be directed at transitioning and changing the area into a mixed use high density urban landscape.	As per submission 15(c) above.	Reject.
ll			4.7.2 Objectives and Principles 1. Broome style architecture: This needs to be defined and then enforced.	<p>The proposed draft Old Broome Design Guidelines define 'Broome- style' as:</p> <p><i>An urban design and housing typology based upon adaptation to climate and practicality of construction, which over time has come to represent our understanding of traditional Broome character.</i></p> <p>Clause 5.12 of LPS6 deals with Broome-style architecture through the following:</p> <p><i>5.12.1 The provision of this clause only apply to</i></p>	Support. No modifications required.

SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS

				<p><i>development within the Town Centre, Local Centre, Mixed Use, Tourist, Service Commercial and Residential zones.</i></p> <p><i>5.12.2 The building style of all buildings within the Scheme area are to be low scale of building bulk and have regard for local climatic conditions and traditional architecture features, including a pitched roof, single and multiple hipped roof, gables, colourbond roof, and predominant wall materials of colourbond or timber.</i></p> <p><i>5.12.3 Verandahs, shutters, and similar features should be included in development to reduce solar penetration and increase access to prevailing breezes.</i></p> <p><i>5.12.4 Materials of concrete, brick, zincalume or rendered walls must be painted and /or treated to reduce the impact of thermal heatload.</i></p>	
mm			<p>2. Fifty years ago we designed houses that were climate responsive – houses were elevated and had wide verandas to shield the interior of the home from the direct sunlight on windows and doors. Large blocks captured the natural air flow (breezes_ and were vegetated with trees and garden to provide elements of shade and cooling.</p> <p>That sums up the style of housing development in Old Broome.</p> <p>Compare that with Roebuck and Broome North – blocks so small that it is impossible to have buildings that offer any form of protection from the elements such as wide eaves etc. What we have is buildings that rely on high energy use to provide cooling and no garden area to provide for shade trees. To look at these developments all one sees is a sea of rooves.</p>	<p>The draft Old Broome Design Guidelines contain sections on solar design, ventilation, outdoor living and landscaping which taken together are intended to produce climate- responsive development. Many of the principles in these sections are based on historical development patterns.</p>	Note submission.
nn			<p>3. Perhaps someone could explain what this really means?</p>	<p>‘Active building frontages facing the public realm’ means when a building connects with a public place, like a street or an area of Public Open Space, it should be designed in such a way that it encourages interaction with, and surveillance of, that public place. This can be achieved by the inclusion of windows and door openings, clearly defined building entries, verandahs and balconies, etc. rather than blank walls and high fences.</p>	Note submission.
oo			<p>4.7.3 Strategies/Policy</p> <p>1. Agree with this but would like to have an explanation as to how this reconciles with medium density housing codes of R40 plus given what one sees around Broome with the encroachment of infill housing.</p> <p>Two examples are in Guy Street where Council strategies and Policy have been totally ignored.</p>	<p>A component of landscaping for grouped and multiple dwellings is required through <i>State Planning Policy 3.1 - Residential Design Codes (R-Codes)</i>. However, as discussed above when undertaking public works (including the construction of public housing) the State Government is not required to comply with the R-Codes or Council policy.</p> <p>The draft Old Broome Design Guidelines contain a section on landscaping which will apply throughout the Precinct and will help achieve the strategies in the OBDS.</p>	Note submission.

SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS

pp			<p>3. A consistent approach to the treatment of streets and verges and car parking is extremely important to both the protection and enhancement of Old Broome particularly in relation to the desired character and function of the local streetscape within the Old Broome area.</p> <p>Verges need to be maintained (rubbish free) and kept mown. Parking of vehicles and use of verges as vehicular shortcuts contribute to dust problems and must be addressed.</p> <p>Given the wide verges and the reluctance of Council to insist residents maintain their verges, Council must accept responsibility to keep verges mown and rubbish free to enhance the streetscape character.</p>	Noted.	Note submission.
qq			<p>5. There should be a restriction of building heights to two storeys throughout Old Broome precinct. A debate needs to be had about single storey height restrictions along the Roebuck Bay foreshore to preserve the open vistas and airflows.</p> <p>The only exception to this would be expansion of the hospital which should be multi storey construction rather than expansion into residential areas.</p>	<p>Building height restrictions are discussed in submission 16(o) above. The Strategy Plan seeks to limit building height along the Roebuck Bay Foreshore to two stories, which is considered appropriate.</p> <p>The draft Old Broome Design Guidelines ('Guidelines') will contain development controls to maintain views of Roebuck Bay. The Guidelines also contain a section on building height which will ensure that development maintains a 'human scale.'</p>	Reject.
16	D & T Hutchinson PO Box 9 BROOME, WA, 6725	84 Robinson St	Our objection is to the removal of any of the existing grassed and garden area between the water park and the Hopton Street drain for the construction of a vehicle and trailer parking area. We, along with many other local residents, have used this recreation area with our families for many years, and still do. The existing facilities now in place have worked extremely well in the past, and should be allowed to continue to do so in the future.	As per submission 10 above.	Support in part. As per submission 10 above.
17	B. Bunning PO Box 44, BROOME, WA, 6725	4 & 8 Walcott Street			
a			<p>Dear Sir. I, Robert George Bunning of 17 View St, Peppermint Grove WA6011 make the following submission regarding the Draft Old Broome Development Strategy (DOBDS) on behalf of, as Chairman, of family companies Aileendonan Investments Pty Ltd and Aileendonan Broome Holdings Pty Ltd which are the owners of Broome properties, 8 Walcott St and 4 Walcott St respectively.</p> <p>Sir we are most concerned with the policies and recommendations of the DOBDS as they apply to our area of immediate interest in Area G, B and D within the Old Broome Special Character Area I and Walcott St which bisects Area I. Our fundamental concern is that the whole thrust of the DOBDS is to pave the way for invasion of the old residential areas with Mixed Use commercial offices, shops, consulting rooms and other forms of non residential uses and the further expansion into Area I by the Hospital and other medical services.</p> <p>We contend that it is the people who live here, the residents and their residences and gardens who give the area its special character and charm. Unfortunately we expect that, if properties convert to Mixed Use, the population of residents will lower, the ambiance of the area will reduce and the desirability of the area as a place to live will be diminished. Once this trend starts a general exodus will be inevitable and the Old Broome Character will be lost. The recommendation to change the zoning of these areas to Mixed Use rather than maintaining them to be primarily Residential is quite counter productive to the Shires stated objective to maintain the character and charm of Old Broome. If the Shire is genuine in this objective it should develop policies which encourage more living accommodation for people</p>	These concerns are addressed in the responses below.	Note submission.

SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS

			<p>in this area, not less. It is, in our view, an issue of Populate Or Perish for Old Broome.</p> <p>Specifically, we are totally opposed to four recommendations of the DOBDS. These are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The recommendation to investigate the opening of Walcott St to Frederick St via a roundabout at that point. DOBDS Part 1 – 4.4.4. (g page 15 2. The recommendation to zone the East side of Walcott St in Area B as Mixed Use Commercial Civic. 3. To plan for the Northwards expansion of the hospital into Area B. DOBDS Pat 1. 4.3.4—9 4. To retain the density zoning for Area G as R10. <p>The reasons for our objections are as follows:</p>		
b			<p>Objection 1.</p> <p>Walcott St is the central thoroughfare which bisects the primarily residential areas of the Old Broome Special Character Area I as well as further residential areas south of Guy St and Area D. Walcott St, despite the regrettable intrusion of the hospital and some other development in Area D. epitomizes the special Residential Character of Old Broome as is glowingly described in section 1.2.2 of Part 2 of the DOBDS. It talks of “a feeling of spaciousness”, “a sense of openness”, “lush vegetation”, “an impression of wildness and secrecy”, bungalows of low height and large open verandas”, “a landscape dominated by vegetation and not buildings” and concludes by saying that “when walking the streets of the Old Broome residential areas you feel far away from the urban environment”.</p> <p>The Draft clearly acknowledges the special character and charm of this area. It seems incredible that in the same document it recommends the investigation of the opening of this sensitive key central thoroughfare to vastly increased traffic flow by opening the north end to Frederick St (the busiest road in Broome). It proposes a roundabout at this junction which will act as a funnel to catch more disruptive traffic. The quiet ambience of the street which makes the location so attractive to residents and visitors will be no more.</p> <p>While the DOBDS recommendation is for an investigation, it gives no data or rational or reason of justification for such a recommendation. Our grave fear is that somewhere in the Shire planning bureaucracy the decision has already been made (especially as the roundabout has already been constructed) and that residents will be confronted by a fait accompli.</p> <p>We reiterate that we are Totally opposed to this recommendation. It will seriously adversely impact on the desirability of Walcott St as a place to live and become a driver in the depopulation of Old Broome</p>	As per submission 3 above.	Support in part. As per submission 3 above.
c			<p>Objection 2.</p> <p>The second serious driver towards the depopulation of Old Broome is the recommendation to rezone the East side of Walcott in Area B to Mixed Use Commercial and Civic. Presumably it is envisaged that properties in this zone will progressively become offices and rooms and minor workshops for a wide range of businesses, professionals, consultants and service providers both private and government. A sort of Mini West Perth! Some of them may be allowed to have accommodation attached provided it is upstairs at the rear and out of sight!</p> <p>This is the bizarre and totally unreasonable prospect facing residents who live on the other side of the street. For those people who have chosen to live there because of the charm and character and sense of community of Old Broome, the desirability of remaining there will no longer apply. Not only will population be lost to offices but it will also be lost as old residents</p>	<p>The draft LPS (2013) identifies the entirety of Old Broome as ‘Mixed Use’ and at the same time makes clear that development should be in an ‘open form’ that ‘recognises the historic character of the area.’ The purpose of the OBDS is to further refine the recommendations of the LPS and seek to concentrate particular land uses in particular areas.</p> <p>Over time, Old Broome has already developed a ‘Mixed Use’ character as there are numerous non-residential uses located within it. The Precinct contains a number of civic buildings including the</p>	Reject.

SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS

		<p>vote with their feet. Properties will most likely become rental with resultant neglect of once attractive gardens and property values will be depressed.</p> <p>We believe this recommendation will significantly adversely affect the Old Broome Special Character Area I. as the positive features of the area as described in the DOBDS Part 2. Section 1.2.2 will be lost. This appears to be in contradiction to the Shires stated policy of maintaining the Character of Old Broome. This is a situation which we find very difficult to understand particularly in that an examination of the projections in the DOBDS for future demand for Mixed Use accommodation show that this can readily be satisfied into the foreseeable future from other more appropriate areas of Broome.</p> <p>We totally oppose this unreasonable and damaging recommendation.</p>	<p>hospital, court house, prison, police station and Shire administration offices, a primary school, churches, resorts and other tourist development, a local shopping centre, and a number of services (such as doctor and dental surgeries, government offices and non-profit organisations) that complement the civic buildings. The OBDS envisages that this diversification of uses will continue over time. However, it is considered that this can be done in a way that maintains the area’s existing character, as outlined below.</p> <p>Land that is shown in the ‘Old Broome Special Character Area’ (‘OBSCA’) will maintain a R10 density coding, regardless of whether it is zoned ‘Mixed Use’ or ‘Residential.’ This will limit the density of residential accommodation that can be constructed on site, and will prevent ‘high density’ forms of living such as grouped and multiple dwellings from being constructed.</p> <p>As discussed in previous submissions, the Shire is in the process of preparing ‘Old Broome Design Guidelines’ which will be adopted as a Local Planning Policy. Amongst other objectives, the Old Broome Design Guidelines seek to control the built form of ‘Mixed Use’ development within the Precinct, both generally and within the OBSCA. Within the OBSCA, development controls will be applied to matters such as setbacks, building height, building bulk, car parking, landscaping and building design. These controls have been designed after taking into account the current form of development and will seek to ensure that the appearance of new ‘Mixed Use’ development will closely resemble existing residential development.</p> <p>Furthermore, is important to note that transition to ‘Mixed Use’ within the precinct will not happen as-of-right as the OBDS does not change the zoning of any lots. Rather, it will be the responsibility of individual landowners to apply to Council to rezone their land through the form of a Scheme Amendment. The OBDS provides guidance to Shire officers and Council on how future requests for Scheme Amendments are to be considered. Scheme Amendments are subject to a lengthy administrative process, and as such it is envisaged that changes in use and /or increases in density will be incremental. It is also noted that the LPS requires rezoning requests within the ‘Mixed Use’ area to include a commercial needs analysis to justify</p>	
--	--	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS

				<p>the rezoning, so that redevelopment does not take place in advance of genuine demand.</p> <p>Ultimately, it is considered that a gradual transition to 'Mixed Use' development within portions of Old Broome can occur without compromising the historic character of the area.</p>	
d			<p>Objection 3.</p> <p>Obviously the hospital is an absolutely essential facility, not only for Broome, but also the greater Kimberley region. Regrettably it is located right in the middle of Old Broome and now, as it has expanded, abuts a significant section of Walcott St. The architects and Shire have made no effort to ameliorate the adverse impacts of the development on the streetscape and residences on the opposite side of the street. Quite unreasonably they have concentrated an ugly mass of service functions and air conditioners along the street boundary which situation is now being aggravated by staff street parking. Such a situation gives no confidence that any future growth will be handled any better.</p> <p>The recommendation is to "explore opportunities for the expansion of the hospital to the north". That is it invade further into Area B and the Old Broome Special Character Area I. If this recommendation were to be accepted then the whole concept of the Old Broome Special Character Area will become a very sick joke.</p> <p>We are totally opposed to this recommendation as it is in complete conflict with the concept of retaining the character of Old Broome as can be clearly demonstrated to any one who cares to drive down Walcott Street. Further expansion of the hospital should be planned for in non sensitive locations.</p>	As per submission 15(o) above.	Support in part. As per submission 15(o) above.
e			<p>Objection 4.</p> <p>DOBDS Part 1. Under the heading of Land Use item 4.1.3 – section 4 states the policy is to "Retain the R10 density coding (1000m2 per dwelling) in Areas G and I. We contend that this recommendation is ill considered and unreasonable, counter productive to the Shires policy to preserve the character of Old Broome, perpetuates a waste of scarce land resource, closes a readily available opportunity to alleviate a shortage of suitable dwellings in the close vicinity, and is clearly against the interests of the ratepayers of the area. The DOBDS has made recommendations to open Walcott St to vastly more traffic, convert zoning of half of area I to a commercial precinct, and also to provide for the extension of the worst eyesore in the street, the hospital, further into Area I.. If these recommendations were to be accepted by the Shire in whole or in part, the charm and character of Walcott Street and the Old Broome areas which it bisects will be destroyed. The inevitable result will be an exodus of current residents who have a pride in the area and the likely deterioration of the properties which give the area its charm.</p> <p>And now, without any serious consideration of the adverse results of its proposals nor any serious consideration of real need of the area to arrest the likely reduction of people living there they have bluntly announced that the remaining Area G will remain in limbo with an archaic R10 density zoning, without any review in the foreseeable future. This is presumably a sop to those who still believe in the fallacy that larger properties equates to more attractive suburban environment. This may be so when the land owners have the pride, interest and financial resources to properly maintain the buildings and grounds but there are many examples all around Broome and Old Broome where this is not the case.</p> <p>In our case, that is at 8 and 4 Walcott Streets, we are very conversant with the costs of</p>	<p>The existing character of Old Broome is largely because of the low density coding, as it directly correlates with large blocks, considerable front and rear setbacks, and a larger percentage of open space per lot. This is why it is considered important to maintain this coding in the OBSCA.</p> <p>As discussed above, the implementation of the Guidelines will lead to Mixed Use development that has a similar appearance to residential development at a density of R10.</p> <p>Increases in residential density to R40 will be supported in other parts of Old Broome that are not within the OBSCA as discussed in submission 16(c) above.</p>	Reject.

SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS

			<p>maintenance of large Broome properties. In our case, to date, we have been fortunate to have had the resources to ensure an attractive living environment. However, for most people, with ever increasing charges for rates, taxes, power, water, tradesmen and gardeners, the cost of holding large properties in good condition is not sustainable. If the property is rental, tenants simply can not, nor have the interest or time (except in rare cases) to maintain gardens or buildings. In time, unless Shire policy with regard to density in this area is changed, many of the Old Broome properties are likely to deteriorate through neglect due to cost pressure or lack of care and all of the proud objectives to preserve the character of Old Broome will fail.</p> <p>We believe that, rather than eroding the residential areas of Old Broome with more Mixed Use commercial precincts, (which the DOBDS statistics demonstrate are not required in the foreseeable future), the Shire should adopt policies to maintain these areas as long term viable Residential Areas as more dwellings are now urgently required because a major contributing factor to the high costs of labour and services in Broome is the very high cost to buy or to rent suitable accommodation.</p> <p>In Old Broome the Shire has the opportunity to help satisfy an obvious need for accommodation in the vicinity, by adopting policies which will be supportive to those landowners in the precinct who seek to utilize their holdings more efficiently by adding more residences. By adopting a more flexible approach to residential density and ensuring design criteria and plot ratios are appropriate to the location the Shire can achieve the benefits of ensuring the continuing viability of the Residential Area, meeting the needs for accommodation in the locality, and maintaining the charm and Character of Old Broome.</p> <p>The final paragraph of Part 2 of the DOBDS, section 1.2.2 states “ It is possible to design grouped and multiple dwelling in a way that is sympathetic to the traditional neighbourhood character of Old Broome and this will ultimately be addressed through the preparation of Design Guidelines”. Given the foregoing, and also bearing in mind the unusually wide road verges in Old Broome which lends itself to assisting appropriate design, it can be envisaged that the area could be revitalised with additional dwellings to suit a variety of needs. Dwellings might be single houses, villas or cottages or possibly single or multiple apartments on either subdivided title or strata title.</p> <p>With the foregoing in mind we believe the Shires policy should be to preserve the existing Residential zones in Old Broome including the whole of Area I. Having confirmed the residential status of the area it should adopt a proactive role in encouraging a greater population or permanent residents. This objective can readily be achieved by Increasing the zoning density from R10 to R20 or R30 and coincidentally ensure appropriate Design Guidelines to preserve Old Broome Character are available, as proposed in DOBDS Part 2 section 1.2.2. Such a policy is in the interests of all stakeholders, Government, Shire, Residents, The community, Employers and Employees especially in the near vicinity, and the Old Broome ratepayers.</p>		
f			<p>Conclusions.</p> <p>Sir, we are very concerned that the four DOBDS recommendations, if acted on by the Shire, will spell the end of the charm and character of Old Broome. The desirability of the area as a place to live, for those not displaced by Mixed Use occupation and the hospital, will be lost for many ratepayers who will probably sell up and leave. To avoid such a debacle we contend that the Shire should:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Leave Walcott Street closed to Frederick Street 2. Leave all existing areas zoned Residential as is, and in particular leave as Is, all areas 	Noted.	Note submission.

SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS

			<p>currently zoned Residential within the Old Broome Special Character Area I which is the area bounded by Herbert St to the west, Guy St to the south, Robinson St to the east, and Stewart St to the north.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Ensure no further expansion of the hospital into the adjoining Old Broome Residential Areas B, D, G and I and have the hospital take measures to screen and landscape its Western service areas facing Walcott St to meet Old Broome Character Design Criteria. 4. Adopt a proactive policy towards encouraging a greater population of permanent residents by increasing the dwelling density zoning in the Residential Areas of Old Broome from R10 to R20 or R30 while at the same time providing Design Guidelines to preserve the Old Broome Character. <p>Sir, we trust that this submission and our own objections and recommendations are given serious consideration by the Shire. We have given this matter much thought. There is much at stake for Old Broome and so we request that our submission be circulated to all decision makers including the Shire President and all councillors. An acknowledgment of our submission will be appreciated.</p>		
18	K. Garstone PO Box 192 BROOME, WA, 6725	55 Walcott St	<p>Under the Old Broome development strategy Plan – RE: 55 Walcott Street is shown as Mixed Use Tourist/Residential. I am seeking your support to change this to Mixed Use Commercial/Residential.</p> <p>When I spoke to the assistance Shire CEO end of last year, he advised me the property is zoned Residential/Special Use Service Station.</p> <p>I bought the property in 1975, it was then Zoned Commercial, it was used as a mechanical workshop and selling fuel. Some years after purchasing this property it was changed to a Service Station zoning. The property had its zoning changed to Special Use Service Station in the early 2000's. This current Special Use Zoning makes it unviable to conduct a business from the property as the fuel tanks and bowsers which were owned by BP were removed in 1999 and which under that zoning we were only allowed to do minor repairs to vehicles.</p> <p>I would like to point that at this stage, at no time I was ever informed about any Zoning changes to my property by the Shire of Broome. 55 Walcott Street is the only property to ever have a Service Station Zoning in Broome. I have always been charged Commercial Rates.</p> <p>As the property has good “Commercial premises” on it I would like to be able to use them to carry a Commercial business that would be able to generate an income.</p>	<p>The designation of the ‘Areas’ in the OBDS was largely based on the existing mixed uses which are already established. For instance, the current extent of ‘Area B – Civic / Commercial’ includes the major civic buildings in the Precinct, such as the court house, police station, prison, hospital, and Shire offices. ‘Area D - Tourist/Residential’ contains the existing resort developments, lots with frontage to Roebuck Bay and surrounds.</p> <p>As stated above, the OBDS will not automatically rezone land, and it is will be up to individual landowners to lodge a request with Council to do so. On the basis of the recommendations in the OBDS, officers will support rezoning requests to the ‘Mixed Use’ zone in Areas A-D, at a density of either R10 or R40 depending whether the subject land is within the OBSCA. 55 Walcott Street is within the OBSCA and hence future rezoning to ‘Mixed Use R10’ would likely receive support from officers.</p> <p>The zoning table in LPS6 will set out permitted, discretionary, and not permitted uses within the ‘Mixed Use’ zone. The OBDS in Action 1 of Section 4.1.4 (Land Use) provides further guidance as to which uses are preferred, not preferred, and inappropriate within the various Areas. The table does not adequately capture the full range of preferred discretionary uses with respect to Areas A through D. (Refer No 1 in Internal Submission for the applicable uses for Area D). The amended Action shows that a number of commercial uses may be supported in Area D that are not strictly ‘tourist’ in</p>	Support in part. No modifications required.

SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS

				<p>nature, but that complement tourist uses. This would provide the landowner with additional development opportunities.</p> <p>However, it is noted that 'Motor Vehicle Repair' is considered to be a 'Light Industrial' use which is prohibited in the 'Mixed Use' zone regardless of whether the subject land is located within Area B or Area D.</p>	
19	<p>K. Harris Mens Outreach Service PO Box 346 BROOME, WA, 6725</p>		<p>The new developmental plan for Town Beach is disconcerting, because it is primarily focused on those who are fortunate enough to own a boat. Whereby the current proxemics give the entire community access to enjoy the relaxing and pleasant recreational surroundings.</p> <p>Aesthetically I believe it will not aspire to the natural splendour of the area. There are other locations which could be developed, which would have less impact.</p> <p>It is another developmental project driven by economic gain to benefit prospective developers and key business associates.</p> <p>If this plan is approved I can assure you that it will open the way to similar projects going ahead in other locations in and around Broome.</p>	<p>The Concept Plan contains two elements which are specifically geared to boat users – the upgrade of the Town Beach boat ramp (which as discussed in submission 15(g) above is already budgeted for in the 2014/15 financial year) and the installation of boat trailer parking south of Catalina's. The latter element seeks to formalise what is already occurring as there is limited formal parking in proximity to the Catalina's boat ramp.</p> <p>The remainder of the elements are intended to provide a range of water and land based recreational opportunities to suit a diversity of ages and interests.</p> <p>The vision statement of the OBDS is to encourage 'development that is respectful of the rich cultural heritage and natural environment' and Section 4.5 outlines 'Objectives and Principles,' Strategies/Policy' and 'Actions' associated with Natural Resource and Environmental Management.</p>	Note submission.
20	<p>M. Ozies PO Box 5523 BROOME, WA, 6725</p>		<p>This is a formal objection to the proposed planned development of a large car park area as stated in Draft Attachment No2 – Old Broome Development Strategies and Concept Plan for Town Beach and Conti Foreshore Part 1.</p> <p>I am a Traditional Owner whose Djugun families have lived in Broome since dreamtime; our existence shaped by living along the coastline and managing food sources in the areas between Crab Creek and Willie Creek. My ancestors used natural fish traps which utilised rocks and the surrounding mangroves.</p> <p>They saw many changes throughout history, the inset of pearling from which many male and females members died diving for pearls, the bombing of Broome by the Japanese; they welcomed the return family members who were lost at sea during the cyclones of 1940s from this very beach, witnessed the opening and closing of the pastoral industry abattoir and countless other changes.</p> <p>No Djugun person has ever ceded their sovereign right to make decisions on their land. No Djugun person has ever signed away their rights to claimed Native Title Lands. It is the Right enjoyed by all Yawuru traditional owners on Djugun country.</p> <p>I therefore strongly object the proposed development plan on behalf of all Djugun families whom have never been heard in the past and continue not to be heard by the Shire or the Yawuru Native Title land holding body.</p>	<p>Car parking at Town Beach is addressed in the Officer's response to submission 10 above.</p> <p>The Shire recognises Yawuru as Native Title holders in the Broome townsite as formalised through the signing of the Yawuru Native Title Global Agreement in the form of two Indigenous Land Use Agreements in 2010. Concerns about the legality of this process fall outside the scope of the OBDS.</p>	Support in part. As per submission 10 above.
21	D. Robinson	31 Stewart St	Strongly object to intersection on corner of Frederick and Walcott Street being opened.	As per submission 3 above.	Support in part. As per

SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS

	PO Box 604 BROOME, WA, 6725		Completely residential area down Walcott – there are no benefits to be gained by opening this roundabout.		submission 3 above.
22	J. Lowe Broome CIRCLE PO Box 1034 BROOME, WA, 6725	27 Frederick St Broome Community House	<p>Following participation in the workshop conducted on 15/05/2014 I write to indicate Broome CIRCLE's in principle support of the Old Broome Strategy.</p> <p>I would, however like to request that the Shire give some consideration to the possibility of locating a purpose- built multi-functional community facility. This facility could include a licensed Child Care Centre which provided occasional care (which is not currently catered for in Broome). It could also include space for a range of difference sized meeting rooms, teaching classrooms, disability accessible 'sensory classrooms' and private consulting rooms. In addition it could include a range of outdoor rooms and outbuildings suitable for use as small social enterprise start up spaces eg. A community garden, a community café, a community gallery and an Electric Car Hire/Fleet Car Cleaning service. Such a facility could house a number of NfP organisations who could then share the lease and reception, office management and maintenance costs.</p> <p>As we have outgrown our current facility and our lease at Broome Community House (which is owned by the Department for Child Protection and Family Support) expires in August 2016 Broome CIRCLE are seeking to develop such a premises in partnership with other not-for-profit organisations.</p> <p>We have done a needs analysis and have an initial Concept Plan in development also.</p> <p>The location of this facility in this area is crucial to its viability, as many of the people who will use the facility will also need to attend the Government Departments located on Weld, Napier and Carnarvon streets. We anticipate that we need between 3000 – 5000m² of land to build such a facility and had wondered about the suitability of the current Prison site.</p> <p>As the Bull Pen is heritage listed we also thought that it might be possible to incorporate the Museum into this space, thus freeing up the waterfront land it currently occupies and giving it a legitimate place in a community hub.</p> <p>We would therefore be grateful if you could consider this submission as part of your community consultation.</p>	<p>The site of the Broome Prison is owned in freehold by the Department of Corrections and is also known as Reserve 2551 with a Management Order in favour of the Department of Corrections for the purpose of 'Gaol.' The Shire does not have any influence on the prison's operations, the Department of Corrective Services as a landowner was contacted however no advice has been recieved about any alternative use of the site, as such the Concept Plan shows it continuing to operate from the present location.</p> <p>The OBDS will provide opportunities for land in the Precinct to transition to a 'Mixed Use' zone. Many of the types of land uses described in the submission, such as 'child care centre,' 'office,' 'consulting rooms' 'educational establishment' 'restaurant' and 'community purposes' are able to be supported within the 'Mixed Use' zone. The development of a multi-functional community facility can only be realised with the support of a landowner. Expressions of interest in a suitable location for such a venture have been forwarded onto the Shire's Property Department for consideration.</p>	Note submission.
23	Department of Water		Thank you for the referral, received in our office on 10 April 2014, of the above development strategy. DoW has reviewed the document and has the following comments and advice.		
a			<p>Water Use</p> <p>The strategy mentions plans to expand and enhance public open space (POS) within Old Broome Development area, including irrigation of areas, and expanding such facilities as the water park at Town Beach. There is no explicit mention of water supply options. It is understood the shire of Broome (SoB) currently irrigates POS across the town from a range of sources including groundwater (shandied with scheme water), waste water from the wastewater treatment plant and some scheme water. Some of these sources have presented issues (such as potential nutrient enrichment of Roebuck Bay via wastewater application, and increasing salinisation of the localised groundwater resource).</p>	<p>The Concept Plan is intended to serve as a non-statutory tool to identify potential project ideas and orientate them spatially. It does not provide the level of detail of a Master Plan and should not be used as such. The elements on the Concept Plan are indicative and will be subject to future investigations (including an assessment of feasibility) and detailed design.</p> <p>Water use associated with the various elements proposed can be considered during these future investigations, however to acknowledge the</p>	<p>Support. Recommend an additional Action be added to Section 4.2.3 (Open Space) to state:</p> <p><i>Ensure that a fit-for-purpose water supply is provided to public open space.</i></p>

SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS

			Recent population projections published in the draft Kimberley Regional Planning and Infrastructure Framework and Kimberley Regional Profile indicate future pressure on the existing scheme water supply so careful consideration must be given to appropriate water use in Broome. The DoW recommends that the SoB carefully consider fit-for-purpose water supply options for POS at a strategic level across the whole of Broome, and more specifically within the precincts being development.	Department's suggestions it is recommended that a new strategy/policy be included in Section 4.2.3 (Open Space) to reference the need to consider fit-for-purpose water supply for public open space improvements.	
b			Water licensing The subject land is located in the Townsite subarea of the Broome groundwater area, which is proclaimed under the <i>Rights in Water and Irrigation Act 1914</i> . A 5C licence may be required for the use of groundwater and a 26D licence may be required for the construction of wells. Groundwater quality and availability in the area varies and may not be suitable or available for some uses. If additional groundwater is required by the SoB for any purpose they should contact the DoW's Kununurra office discuss water quality and licensing requirements.	Noted.	Note submission.
c			Foreshore development Foreshore enhancement is identified as a key aspiration through this strategy, as well as stabilisation of eroded banks and better formalised public access. The strategy strongly recognises the existing values of the Ramsar listed Roebuck Bay and a desire to maintain these values. All new infrastructure of enhancement work should be undertaken with best practice foreshore management principles (refer to <i>Operational Policy 4.3: Identifying and establishing waterways foreshore areas</i>).	Noted.	Note submission.
d			Stormwater Any new stormwater management infrastructure or upgrades should be designed in accordance with guidelines contained in: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The <i>Stormwater Management Manual for Western Australia</i> (Department of Water, 2004 – 2007) and the <i>Decision Process for Stormwater Management</i> (Department of Environment, 2005), which are available on the DoW's website at www.water.wa.gov.au > Managing Water > Urban Water > Stormwater The following DoW publications (Water Quality Protection Notes etc) provide guidance on best management practices: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Irrigation with nutrient rich waste water</i> [WQPN 22] <i>Vegetation buffers to sensitive water resources</i> [WQPN 6] <i>Environmental guidelines for the establishment and maintenance of turf of grassed areas</i> [WQPG] <i>Identifying and establishing waterways foreshore areas</i> [Operational Policy 4.3] Water quality protection notes are available on the DoW's website at: www.water.wa.gov.au >select Publications > Find a Publication > Series Browse > Water Quality Protection Notes or Water Quality Protection Guidelines, or use the general search function.	Noted. Section 4.5 – Natural Resource and Environmental Management contains the following strategy: 2. <i>Ensure that new drainage infrastructure is consistent with Better Urban Water Management principles and the Shire's Stormwater Management Policy.</i> Section 4.5 also contains the following actions which relate to stormwater management: 1. <i>Investigate retrofitting existing drains in Old Broome to reduce discharge of nutrient loads into Roebuck Bay.</i> 2. <i>Investigate opportunities for the retention of stormwater in existing landscaped areas of Public Open Space.</i>	Note submission.
24	F. Jordan 10 Jarrad St COTTESLOE, WA, 6011	2 properties in Walcott Street	I, Fiona Jordan of 10 Jarrad Street, Cottesloe WA 6011, make the following submission regarding the Draft Old Broome Development Strategy. I am a frequent visitor to Broome and a part owner of 2 properties in Walcott St.		
a			Walcott St has always been a fairly quiet street, often there are mothers and children walking up the middle of the road. This could all change when the road opens up and the	As per submission 3 above.	Support in part. As per submission 3 above.

SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS

			<p>families are skittled, and then the hospital may have to be extended even further.</p> <p>I am totally opposed to the opening of Walcott St to Frederick St via a roundabout. Living in this areas will become very busy with traffic and screaming ambulances racing through, it will take away the relaxed atmosphere of Broome. It will be stressful for residents and holiday makers and tourists coming to Broome (don't forget it is much cheaper to go to Bali)</p>		
b			<p>I am totally opposed to the east side of Walcott St being zoned for Mixed Use Commercial and Civic.</p> <p>It seems ridiculous when you have s gem like old Broome to smash it! Old Broome is where the history of Broome is. The unique styles of the houses with lovely old gardens, it is where the soul of Broome is. We need to keep this for future generations so they can get the feel of the history of the old pearling days, the hardship and challenges of what the earlier generation faced in those days. I cannot understand why anyone would want to make one side of the street commercial. It destroys it!</p> <p>Part of making Broome interesting for tourists is to preserve the atmosphere of Old Broome cause that is part of Broome's unique charm.</p>	As per submission 17(c) above.	Reject.
25	J. Mills 7 Dalry Rd DARLINGTON, WA, 6070	4 & 8 Walcott Street	<p>I am writing as a family member and Director of Aileendonan Investments Pty Ltd the owner of 8 and 4 Walcott Street Broome. I have been visiting Broome with my friends and large family for many years and as an artist and historian I have a great affinity and love for Broome and most of all old Broome in all its uniqueness.</p> <p>I am appalled that a large number of recommendations on the Draft Old Broome Strategy will have an enormous destructive impact on both the Old Broome Character Vicinity and indeed the whole of Broome. If these recommendations are acted upon they will undo much of the hard work that has been accomplished in the last 30 years in preserving the unique Broome nature and it will make meaningless much of the marvellous tourist promotion and love the lord MacAlpine in his great wisdom did to ensure that this wonderful small tropical town became a world wide tourist attraction.</p> <p>As a painter I am absolutely shocked that the quiet leafy Walcott Street lined with shadey trees and giving off an atmosphere of peace, warmth and serenity could become a commercial road. It will completely destroy the very heritage that makes Broome so special.</p>	As per submission 3 above.	Support in part. As per submission 3 above.
26	B. Lefroy		I strongly object to the planned development of town beach. There needs to be less parking bays and more greenery or leave it as is. People will not walk all that way with their boats in the water and it will clog up the boat launch.	As per submission 10 above.	Support in part. As per submission 10 above.
27	J. Mills 116 Golster Street SUBIACO, WA, 6008	8 Walcott St 4 Walcott St			
a			<p>I am writing as a family member and director of Aileendonan Investments Pty Ltd the owner of 8 and 4 Walcott Street Broome. Myself and my family have been long time visitors to Broome and have great affinity to the unique Broome location and lifestyle.</p> <p>I am greatly disturbed that a large number of recommendations on the Draft Old Broome Strategy ("Draft Strategy") will have enormous adverse impact on both the Old Broome Special Character vicinity and indeed greater Broome. If these far reaching recommendations are acted on this would undo much of the hard work that has been accomplished in the last 30 years in preserving the unique Broome nature and would have Lord MacAlpine turning in his grave to see the unique area that he fought to have preserved</p>	Noted.	Note submission.

SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS

			<p>changed into what I see as a mixed use melee.</p> <p>The Draft Strategy acknowledges the importance of the existing heritage and buildings but then turns a blind eye to this in making extremely adverse recommendation in the relation to the unique Old Broome special area.</p>		
b.			<p>Concerns over Recommendations</p> <p>Old Broome alongside the iconic Cable Beach and the China Town district is what makes Broome unique and has tremendous impact on the attractiveness of Broome as a tourist destination and place to live. I believe the change in zoning would permanently destroy this. I believe it would be a great mistake to adopt the Draft Strategy's recommendations, in particular:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The rezoning of large portions of existing residential zoning to mixed use in the Old Broome Special Character Area will create a confused mix of older style classic Broome properties on large sweeping streetscapes mingled with a "dog's breakfast" of newer development. • Once an area is designated commercial, notwithstanding any council planning policies and design guidelines seeking to require new buildings be sympathetic to the area and Broome heritage, the reality is that new commercial mixed use policies can never match that which is bulldozed in their path. The pressures arising from the cost of building in a remote location such as Broome and inevitable profit motivation of the commercial sector will see corners cut, and costs and functionality will dictate over any aesthetic values. • The "half and half" approach to the north end of Walcott Street will absolutely destroy the streetscape by mixing residential and mixed use commercial civic. 	As per submission 17(c) above.	Reject.
c			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If adopted, the Draft Strategy for this north end of Walcott Street area would see owners on the east side of the street in quick succession sell out to property developers who would then divide existing R10 zones into significantly higher density commercial blocks. Property owners, such as ourselves, on the West side will face the double impact through the destruction in value of their property due to the greatly downgraded streetscape and environment and the loss of the unique Broome attributes whilst then unfairly having the R10 zone for their properties maintained and denying them the same opportunity as their neighbours on the other side of the street. This will result in gross inequity. 	Both sides of Walcott Street are contained within the OBSCA where a density of R10 is required to be maintained regardless of whether the property is zoned 'Residential' or 'Mixed Use.' No additional subdivision opportunities will result.	Reject.
d			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The opening up of the quiet residential street, Walcott Street, to the busy Turner Street will see traffic directed and greatly impact amenity. 	As per submission 3 above.	Support in part. As per submission 3 above.
e			<p>Additional Concerns on Overall Strategy</p> <p>Principal concerns in the Draft Strategy include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The 2013 stakeholder consultation as set out in the Appendix A to the Draft Strategy is of very limited value in that it included only a very small sample of just 11 residents who were facilitated in the workshop by employees of Cardno, the firm that is responsible for developing the misguided Draft Strategy. Notwithstanding this, there is nothing in the summary outcomes from this workshop that went beyond the Conti Foreshore and Town Beach area and there was certainly no desire as far as I can see from the information provided that suggests in any way that Old Broome should be turned into the mixed use melee proposed by the Draft Strategy. Based on evidence available I cannot see any community and stakeholder support for any changes that go beyond the vicinity of the foreshore. 	<p>As stated above, the draft Local Planning Strategy 2013 identifies the entire Old Broome Precinct as 'Mixed Use.' This document was subject to a substantial public advertising period and has been adopted by Council. The aim of the OBDS is to provide more detailed guidance on how the LPS can be implemented.</p> <p>Whilst the 2013 stakeholder workshop did consider changes to the Town Beach and Conti Foreshores, the design session in particular also examined the entirety of the precinct.. Figures 4-7 in Appendix A show the ideas which were generated by the workshop tables during the design session, which</p>	Reject.

SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS

				encompass the whole of Old Broome.	
f			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Given the availability of property for commercial zoning in areas other than Old Broome, with uncertainty over future population growth and commercial requirements and the current heavy reliance on the tourism industry I do not see why there is a desire to fundamentally change 130 years of unique Broome heritage through rezoning prime Old Broome into commercial properties for which there is no near to medium term actual requirement 	<p>The OBDS proposes to continue a pattern of diversification of uses in Old Broome which has occurred since the 1980s. As stated above the OBDS does not change the zoning of any lots. It is a medium to longer term strategy with a lifespan of 10-15 years. Over this timeframe, it will be the responsibility of individual landowners to apply to Council to rezone their land through the form of a Scheme Amendment. The OBDS provides guidance to Shire officers and Council on how future requests for Scheme Amendments are to be considered. Scheme Amendments are subject to a lengthy administrative process, and as such it is envisaged that zoning changes will be incremental.</p>	Reject.
g			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In the extreme growth scenarios discussed in Section 4 of the Draft Strategy(Scenarios 3 & 4) the type of retail and commercial space likely to be required will be for mass residential population and not tourists. This assumed (and unproven) potential requirement is likely to include white collar office space, supermarket and bulky goods outlets. These types of premises will simply not fit inside the Old Broome district and the only possible culturally compatible businesses to the Old Broome area will be limited to the far lower growth tourism market. Large scale changes for I believe unlikely future demand is simply not required. 	<p>Scenarios 3 and 4 in Part 2 consider increases to both the permanent resident and tourist populations, with Scenario 4 accounting for a doubling of the expected growth of leisure tourism as well as an increase in business tourism.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that some forms of retail such as large-scale supermarkets and bulky goods stores are not compatible with the character of Old Broome. The LPS envisages that large format retail and bulky goods will be concentrated in the 'Service Commercial' area to the north of Frederick Street. However, the development of 'white collar office space,' particularly for government offices, is not considered to be inconsistent with the character of Old Broome as there is already a strong civic focus in the Precinct. The LPS clearly states that the 'Mixed Use' designation will accommodate office, residential, and tourist accommodation.</p> <p>The LPS requires rezoning requests within the 'Mixed Use' area to include a commercial needs analysis to justify the rezoning, so that redevelopment does not take place in advance of genuine demand.</p>	Reject.
h			<p>Key Focus Areas</p> <p>The Broome Council should focus on the main issue – that is getting more use from the seascape along Conti Foreshore to Old Town Beach and having this denuded area with large amounts of wasteland revitalised. This is an area that is in need of constructive redevelopment to remove lots like the old supermarket and connect the town with the sea.</p> <p>The council should leave the rest of the area to the West of Robinson Street as it is now and not seek to make value destructive decisions now that will see a rush to exit before there is any actual requirement for increased commercial properties in Broome, and in any event</p>	<p>The OBDS and particularly the Concept Plan does focus on the revitalisation of the Conti Foreshore and Town Beach with a variety of project ideas to improve these public spaces.</p> <p>As stated above, it is envisaged that rezoning changes in the remainder of Old Broome will occur incrementally and the built form of future development will be carefully controlled through the Old Broome Design Guidelines.</p>	Reject.

SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS

			which can be better located in areas that would not result in the permanent destruction of the unique Old Broome character.		
i			Concluding Comments I believe the Draft Strategy is fundamentally flawed, seeks to force a drastic adverse change in Old Broome for which there is no actual requirement. The council should focus its efforts on the real issue and the immediate requirement to improve the Conti Foreshore and Town Beach Area and restrict any development or change in use to East of Robinson Road.	As per submission 27(h) above.	Reject.
28	G. Morgan PO Box 3456 BROOME, WA, 6725	5B Saville St	I Georgina Marea Morgan from the Pearling Morgan Family of Broome who's grandfather Alfred Morgan was one of Broome's original Pearling Masters and my Grandmother are buried at the pioneer cemetery at Town Beach. The pioneers of this town where buried there to be honoured and remembered and to have an uninterrupted view of the Bay. My family and I strongly object to relocating the town beach café and feel there should not be ANY obstructions, buildings or anything placed in front or in close proximity to the cemetery and it should be left how it is.	The Concept Plan is intended to serve as a non-statutory tool to identify potential project ideas and orientate them spatially. It does not provide the level of detail of a true Master Plan and should not be used as such. The elements on the Concept Plan are indicative and will be subject to future investigations (including an assessment of feasibility) and detailed design. With respect to the relocation of the Town Beach Cafe, future design considerations will need to address: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The interface between the building and the Pioneer Cemetery to ensure that new development does not visually dominate the area; • The preservation of views of Roebuck Bay and the need to allow for continual access to views for all people, not only those who are patrons of the cafe; and • Sensitive integration of the back-of-house areas (bin storage, loading areas) into the design so not to detract from the amenity of the area. The integration of these design considerations is outside of the scope of this project as the OBDS is principally intended to function as a land use policy.	Support in part. No modifications required.
29	L. D'Alton				
a			After reading the "Old Broome Development Strategy" I saw in it things that I liked, things that I dislike and things I don't have an opinion either way. What particularly caught my eye was the proposal to relocate the trailer parking at town Beach, I feel this is not well thought out and potentially a waste of money. If you went down there on any given day during the week or any time during the wet season you would find it virtually empty, when the tide is well out there are no cars either. The council on occasion has shut this area for special events which I find acceptable, I believe if anything that trailer parking should be expanded, with cars without trailers required to park at the new area. I also do not support this as a safety issue, on occasion with a swell on the boat ramp I have had to get inexperienced crew members to hold the boat while I get the trailer and reverse down the ramp, the longer travel time to the proposed car park leaves inexperienced people to deal with the boat while I make the trek to the proposed car park.	As per submission 10 above.	Support in part. As per submission 10 above.
b			I also do not think that floating pontoons will be successful either, during extreme tides and	The Concept Plan is intended to serve as a non-	Note submission.

SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS

			rough weather (storms, cyclones) these structures will be at the mercy of the elements, another waste of money. They tried a similar set-up on the wharf and was eventually pulled out because of tide/weather issues.	<p>statutory tool to identify potential project ideas and orientate them spatially. It does not provide the level of detail of a true Master Plan and should not be used as such. The elements on the Concept Plan are indicative and will be subject to future investigations (including an assessment of feasibility) and detailed design.</p> <p>The Shire has engaged consultants to prepare a business case for the Jetty to Jetty Walk which includes potential designs for the jetty. It is was endorsed by Council in August 2014.</p>	
c			<p>While I dislike the car parking idea at town beach I support the walkway and tram line, I do however have issues with the amount of proposed commercial space, in particular cars and car parking in a residential area. It seemed no support was given to Dr Schwemmer opposite the court house for this reason (car parking issues), in the end a good Dr left town. I also have concerns about those less fortunate than ourselves and what's in it for them, particularly itinerant persons from outlying areas. I hope this will also be addressed not just glossed over. I fear this is all about visitors and the well healed.</p> <p>In conclusion I do not support the relocation of trailers away from the existing boat launch facilities and have concerns with car parking issues in residential areas.</p>	<p>The OBDS recognises that car parking within the Precinct is an important issue. Action 16 in Section 4.4.4 (Movement) states:</p> <p><i>16. Survey the current use of car parking in Old Broome to establish the nature of parking use, including duration of stay(turnover) and demand for parking, to inform preparation of a Parking Management Strategy which will consider parking within road reserves and during events.</i></p> <p>At present, the Shire's Local Planning Policy 8.16 does not allow off-site parking in the 'Residential' zone and any parking within a road reserve (including verges) within other zones requires a resolution of Council unless a parking plan has been adopted for that area. The Design Guidelines reiterate the need for a coordinated approach to off-site parking through the creation of parking plans. It is considered that the outcomes of the Parking Management Strategy will lead to the development of parking plans that can balance the need for car parking and the need to preserve the amenity of the area.</p> <p>Whilst Figure 3 in the OBDS shows indicative parking configurations for some streets which already experience a high level of parking demand, it is important to note that this will not happen as-of-right and a formalised parking plan will still be required.</p>	Note submission.
30	E. Rohr PO Box 1550 BROOME, WA, 6725	3 Hopton Street			
a			<p>I Emily Rohr of 3 Hopton Street Broome, would like to lodge a formal submission regarding the Draft Old Broome Development Strategy (DOBDS) on behalf of myself, as the owner of property at 3 Hopton St, and also in the Oaks, and as the director of Short St Gallery a long term business in Broome.</p> <p>I am deeply concerned about the proposed changes to Town Beach. This is an area that is</p>	As per submission 10 above.	Support in part. As per submission 10 above.

SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS

			<p>used daily, by most of the community. The idea of replacing the grass area with a car park, that does not allow access to the boat ramp, and denies people the right to drive in and park to check the tide, seems ludicrous. A large amount of money was spent on fixing the water park and Town Beach gardens. To then turn around and rip it all up for a car park and skate park that denies access for contemplation and tide checks on the beachfront, fails to acknowledge how Town Beach is utilised on a daily basis.</p> <p>I think every Yawuru man and woman drive down to the current park to check the tides, this is also a habit of many long-term residents of Broome. It is an integral part of Broome daily life and is necessary for fishing and swimming and other leisure activities. I think it is also a complete waste of money to move an excellent and functioning car park and would suggest that perhaps someone is just randomly seeking ways to spend money, as it doesn't seem to make any sense to turn Town Beach into a Camper Van parking lot.</p> <p>The narrow access road to the beachfront could potentially become an accident zone and lead to litigation. Old people, and people with disabilities often swim at Town Beach because of the car beach front access, and many people like to relax under the palm trees will no longer come – too far to walk, and too many teenagers at the skate park. Clearly the designer has no concept of the importance of tide watching in Broome life, and obviously does not fish or use Town Beach in any way. The jetty is like a clayton's jetty, not a real one, a kind of token, that is insulting and unusable, due to the tides. Or else it will need to be as long as the wharf. The more I look at this I am shocked by the lack of understanding of the Park and town and its meaning to the community.</p> <p>I think also it would be deeply offensive to long-term residents in the area. Most residents in Old Broome, are the old Aboriginal families of the town, and many generations of old Broome families, and this car park would see campervans, (after all they have caravan park next door) and teenagers take over Town Beach. The car park will be on the curb front, which is ugly for the local residents, not something any of us want. It may lead to potential damage to property values and a potential class action against the shire, should this plan go ahead.</p> <p>The whole plan seems to be of a benefit to the caravan park and potentially given the management of the park, may be perceived as a conflict of interest. It is curious that the shire would so unashamedly support temporary visitors needs ahead of the long term rate paying residents. Perhaps you can build the car park next to the caravan park, rather than directly in front of long-term rate paying residents.</p>		
b			<p>To remove mangroves is the most environmentally damaging and appalling suggestion ever and deserves to be questioned. This should not even be considered. Should this be attempted that you cannot net against irukandji, so ripping up mangroves to put a swimming pool in makes me think your town planner 101 graduate must be from Sydney and has clearly never been stung or has any comprehension of the local environment, tidal movement is too extreme for this madness.</p>	<p>The Officer's response to submission 15(i) above deals with the safe swimming area. It is noted that the OBDS does not propose the removal of any mangroves. The only reference to removing mangroves is in Appendix A – 'Stakeholder Workshop Outcomes May 2013' and reflects that some workshop attendees brought up the idea in the 'Opportunities and Challenges' brainstorming session.</p>	<p>Support in part. As per submission 15(i) above.</p>
c			<p>Next I would like to address the idea of moving the skate park to Town Beach, again, obviously no one bothered to see how Town Beach is used. It is a place of contemplation, family bbq's and young children playing, and fishing and swimming. A skate park generally attracts large numbers of teenagers that would be menacing to young children. Loud for the campers at the camp site, and is not in a central location to service all the broome kids. The current skate park location is perfect it is attached to recreation centre will not disturb</p>	<p>As per submission 1(a) above.</p>	<p>Support. As per submission 1(a) above.</p>

SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS

			campers and residents, and the families with young children. Who are you building this for, not the current users of Town Beach, maybe the planner like to make Bondi at Town Beach, but this is everywhere else and lose the Broome magic, please don't inflict town planning 101 on us.		
d			<p>Don't sanitize our environment it is clearly done by an out of town person, who doesn't understand that the soul of the place is connected to its evolution. The current car park with the shade, and mixed groups interacts with the foreshore in a real and immediate way. The German back packers playing guitar while the grey nomads are cooking bbq, families celebrating a birthdays, Fitzroy mob catching up, The current car park is the conduit that is the blood supply to Town Beach, what you want to turn us into is a park on the Swan River designed according to some graduate, leave our beach alone. Keep it Broome style and real.</p> <p>Town Beach is very much utilised by Aboriginal people, the car park going down to beach is integral to that, you want to inflict a white fella gentrified design attractive to city planners, but denying the reality and importance of this place to the locals. I cannot help but wonder if you are not trying to take this institution away from the black community, and whiteifying it. I will certainly be pointing this out to the Yawuru.</p> <p>I can only hope you take these issues on board and re-consider how soul destroying your designs are, is Town beach turning into an extension of the Caravan Park, at the cost of the local community, this design would imply that the shire is funding its expansion. One cannot help but question the real motivation behind this proposal.</p>	As per submission 10 above.	Support in part. As per submission 10 above.
31	M. Hutchinson	3 Hopton St		As per submission 10 above.	Support in part. As per submission 10 above.
a			<p>I would like to register my strong objection to the town beach plan. Firstly on the shifting of the carpark, I think making a large square carpark the entrance to Town beach makes an ugly first impression, not to mention the detrimental effects it would have on nearby ratepayers. It would probably deter people from using the area as you would be forced to run the gauntlet of a large bitumised area through which camper vans, cars towing boats buses ect are supposed to manoeuvre. At the moment you drive down Robinson St past a park and slowly the beach is revealed with quite few shady welcoming areas to stop, relax and do what ever, to spend a lot of money to wreck this lovely ambience seems absurd and to lobb all the cars together in a boring rectangle to me seems lazy and passé, you need to break it up to reduce their impact.</p> <p>The carpark, as it is, has shape, is organic and reacts to the topography of the site. It has always been utilitarian, a place that is a response to the activities of the people rather than the grand vision of a planner from afar. You can go there and see John and Betty talking on channel 40 in their RV, European tourists enjoying a bit of sun, people from Balgo of One Arm Point sitting in the shade enjoying the view, parents playing with their children, Dugong Hunters setting off or checking the tide, disabled people lunching next to their bus people from one mile fishing, the sometimes comedic boat ramp activities ... its fantastic, interesting. I have been watching it for 40 years and wonder why you would institute a plan that will turn this unique place into something that will be identical to any other foreshore area anywhere in Australia.</p>		
b			As for the rest of it, the skate park... why?	As per submission 1(a) above.	Support. As per submission 1(a) above.
c			Moving the Café would be expensive for not much gain and would impact the pioneer cemetery,	As per submission 28 above.	Support in part. As per submission 28 above.
d			a new old jetty wouldn't work very well with the tide and would have safety issues,	As per submission 29(b) above.	Note submission.
e			a Croc free swimming area could be an attraction maybe with a few fake Crocs on it but	As per submission 15(i) above.	Support in part. As per

SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS

			would obviously be no good against Irrakangi box jellyfish.		submission 15(i) above.
f			Launching your Boat is already difficult this will only make it more so, there would be more than a little chaos under the new plan.	As per submission 15(g) above.	Note submission.
g			I am not even going to mention the ridiculous idea of removing any Mangroves, in fact I would not be surprise if the Yawuru people took this plan as a personal insult and more than a little racist, it seems almost a response to the way local people like to use the area.	It is noted that the OBDS does not propose the removal of any mangroves.	Note submission.
32	J & L Pritchard 3 Elm Pl HELENA VALLEY, WA, 6056 G. Gregson 24 Brooke Rd DARLINGTON, WA,		As annual visitors to Broome, we have been made aware of a proposal to rezone “Old Broome” into a “mixed use” area. Part 1 of the Draft asserts that the aim is to introduce “offices, retail, community services and hotels” while maintaining the “historic character” of the area. These objectives are flatly contradictory in the cases where entire side sides of streets are given over to commercial development. You cannot create rows of commercial buildings without creating wide tracts of concreted sidewalks and parking facilities, concomitant street furniture and obtrusive signage, to say nothing of greatly increased traffic. No doubt you will claim to guard against all this, but you cannot succeed. Businesses will create their own imperatives. Broome is lovely, unique town, and what makes it different is not merely China Town and Cable Beach. A very great part of its charm is the ambience of “Old Broome”. It is not only a few scattered old buildings and wide streets which create “historic character”, but the totality of the street scapes. It is surely up to the shire Council to identify the unique charm of Old Broome, and to preserve this ambience. As tourists, we deeply appreciate the privilege of enjoying it all.	As per submission 17(c) above.	Reject.
33	J. Costigan Kimberley Aboriginal Medical Services Council Inc	14 Napier Terrace	I am re-emailing in response to the Broome Development Plan. I am a long term resident of the Kimberley and Broome raising children and grandchildren in the Broome area and I am opposed to the Town Beach reserve Park being used as a car park for cars-boast-trailers. It will become a danger zone for children who frequent that area to use the water park and play equipment. It has always remained an inviting place to picnic, hold children’s parties, meet up with friends and family or enjoy a community concert or market. Let’s look after the Broome community made up of many young families with children and keep this area “car park free”.	As per submission 10 above.	Support in part. As per submission 10 above.
34	P. Treleaven				
a			I am delighted to see that the Shire of Broome is developing a strategy for Old Broome. However, I am concerned that this strategy has come to my notice and other key players i.e. absentee landowners in the effected areas purely by chance and word of mouth. I would have thought that notice could have been given by other means and a more considered and relevant response could have been given by such persons (your rate payers). I principally purchased my property at 41 WALCOTT St in Old Broome because it epitomised the history and character of Broome. So much of the history of Western Australia has given away to knee jerk development decisions and I urge you to go slow and broaden the consultation process. Do not make the heart of Old Broome a commercial precinct.	The draft OBDS will be adopted by Council as a Local Planning Policy. Under TPS4, the required period of public consultation for new local planning policies is 21 days. The OBDS was publicly advertised for a period of 42 days – double the minimum required. Actions undertaken during the public advertising period included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Public notices in the Broome Advertiser and on the Shire website Static displays in the Shire Administration 	Reject.

SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS

				<p>Office and Library</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mail out to all landowners in the Precinct • Workshops with key stakeholders and the general public • Displays at the Court House Markets and the Broome Boulevard • Preparation of an online community survey <p>These actions are in line with the Community Engagement Plan for the project which was endorsed by Council at the March 2014 Ordinary Meeting of Council.</p> <p>Attachment 3 to the Council report is a Community Engagement Report which outlines the community engagement process and outcomes. It is considered that this level of engagement is appropriate and well exceeds statutory requirements.</p> <p>Concerns about the character of Old Broome and the mixed use designation are discussed in the officer's response to submission 17(c) above.</p>	
b			Further, it begs the question as to why/where the recommendation for the changes to Walcott St have been generated. It should never be a major thoroughfare.	As per submission 3 above.	Support in part. As per submission 3 above.
C			<p>There are many a good recommendation in the Strategy document with respect to the perimeters of the residential area that would not impinge the ambience and the attractiveness of this very special area of Broome, dotted with traditional homes and the Pearling Master Cottages.</p> <p>My family has spent a lot of money in development of Tourist and other accommodation in Broome, so strategies such as the one your are developing I am in full agreement, however I must reiterate that this area of special character must be left alone.</p>	Noted.	Note submission.
35	I & L Davie PO Box 7400 BROOME, WA, 6725	90 Robinson St			
a			<p>General Comments:</p> <p>Is the Shire so flush with funds that it wishes to change a proven successful community friendly precinct into an area that will undoubtedly cause additional conflict between current users?</p> <p>Major conflict already exists at this location between pedestrians and motorised traffic including but not limited to, vehicles towing boats. The Shire has received letters from me previously regarding traffic matters and I have been able to meet with the Shire Engineer and Rangers on occasions regarding this topic.</p> <p>The number of times we have witnessed children, taking no heed of traffic, running across the road from the Lions Park area over to the Water playground side (formerly Apex Park). We know and say "where are the supervising adults – parents or other" but the reality still</p>	As per submission 10 above.	Support in part. As per submission 10 above.

SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS

			<p>exists.</p> <p>Strategies to limit vehicular traffic have been implemented for some of the major functions that have taken place on the Reserve and in this area and when in force, this has been excellent. However, on other public occasions when vehicular traffic has not been restricted, these are the occasions when most danger arises to other vehicles but more importantly to pedestrians. A number of near misses have been witnessed and it becomes only a matter of time before a disaster occurs and the Coroner then demands an explanation from the authorities who should have been in control of the situation.</p> <p>The Town Beach Reserve and beach area ideally should e a pedestrian precinct. It is not that difficult to implement as ca be witnessed by the many other locations both in and around Australia and internationally who manage to keep vehicular traffic and pedestrians safely separated. Pedestrians are not impeded and numbers certainly are not reduced as can be verified with many coastal locations, not only in Australia but particularly in Europe and England.</p> <p>The Shire, over time, could benefit considerable by providing parking away from the foreshore and introduce metered parking. The proposed tram or an additional “shuttle tram” could extend to Town Beach using retired/volunteer drivers from community groups and thereby provide a novel and popular means of transportation for those who chose to use that facility.</p> <p>The Shire has recently created a walled area and planted trees and low vegetation on the Lions Park side of Robinson Street – is this just going to be demolished and pulled out? Again – a waste of our rates!!</p>		
b			<p>Objection and Points Against:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Town Beach Reserve is an area used almost every weekend by various and other groups to celebrate birthdays or other significant events with picnics, bouncy castle, games and other activities. 2. Areas most used are between the existing Water Park and the current beach access road and also the area referred to as Broome Lion’s Park where shelters with BBQs are provided. This is in direct conflict with some of the area proposed to be developed for parking as shown in maps within the Strategy Plan. 3. I have never in the life of the existing infrastructure at Town Beach seen the car park at capacity expect during major events. At all other times both midweek and at weekends car parking space remains available. The fact the car park area has never been at capacity raises the issue of why build additional parking when existing parking already meets the needs of the community? 4. Additional parking, when required, is already available on otherwise vacant land behind and adjacent to Water Authority installations directly opposite the end of Hopton Street. This is easily upgraded to meet current and future needs which only occur during major events. 5. To lose beautiful parkland in favour of grey bitumen would be a disgrace. 6. Bituminised surfaces create additional issues in regard to water drainage in the wet 	As per submission 10 above.	Support in part. As per submission 10 above.

SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS

			<p>season. It would be necessary to utilise existing land fall and contours to channel and direct the extra water flow towards the Town Beach. This in itself would carry pollutants (oils etc from vehicles) into Roebuck Bay.</p> <p>7. The Strategy Plan states that the area provides an historic link to significant events in Broome and Roebuck Bay during World War II. To remove or reduce a usable and often frequented parkland that provides a peaceful family oriented tranquillity flies in the face of this ethos.</p> <p>8. A significant link to the above is also provided by Town Beach Reserve to the many larger groups during Shinju Opening and dragon boat races, NAIDOC, Australia Day celebrations, Staircase to the Moon and the night markets (eight full tourist months of the year), other significant concert days and meaningful events to the many groups and families of Broome. Any reduction in size or removal of this Reserve would render the area no longer viable, available or of usable size to these groups.</p> <p>9. The Town Beach Reserve and environs is also one of the few remaining areas affording disabled access.</p>		
c			<p>10. Is the boat ramp as it exists in the best location? The boat ramp is currently and frequently unusable due to degradation and undermining by the wave action and tidal movement. The ramp is incorrectly located and should be moved to a site where more weather and wave protection can be afforded during the launching and retrieval of vessels. That being the case then there would no longer be a need for additional vehicle and boat trailer parking at Town Beach and as a result the problem is resolved.</p>	As per submission 15(g) above.	Note submission.
d			<p>11. The original swimming enclosure was located where the current boat ramp is now. To develop a “safer swimming area” at Town Beach is commendable and supported. If the boat ramps was to stay, it could bring dangers from boats to those in the water and any development, i.e safety net installed in that area. If the swimming enclosure was to become a reality it should be located in its original position where the current boat ramp now is. Such a move would then be historically correct and permit shoreline fishing further along the beach as currently exists.</p>	<p>As per submission 15(i) above.</p> <p>It is envisaged that this will also be considered in the preparation of a Reserve Management Plan as discussed in submission 10 above.</p>	Support in part. As per submission 15(i) above.
e			<p>12. In the event that the “old jetty” was redeveloped, boats using the ramp could cause issues with those fishing from the jetty thereby creating further conflict.</p>	It is envisaged that this will also be considered in the preparation of a Reserve Management Plan as discussed in submission 10 above.	Note submission.
f			<p>13. The Strategy Plan states to make the area family & community friendly. The introduction of additional parking space in lieu of parkland contradicts this. It does increased the risk of incompatibility between traffic and pedestrians. From our vantage point we regularly see smaller children dart across the access road in front of moving vehicles. With the Strategy Plan focussing on attracting more people including families and children to the area it will in fact create further conflict with traffic between young users of proposed development of this area. Witnessing children darting across the access road with no heed or regard for traffic is a major concern. Additional development of this area creates further potential for an accident to occur.</p> <p>The Town Beach area has always been a favourite cultural and significant part of Broome and holds a strong <i>feeling of place</i> for the local community. This is recognised as being a special place valued by locals and probably one of the remaining real parts “of old Broome”. This should be kept as a family friendly precinct.</p>	<p>The configuration of the car parking is discussed in submission 10 above.</p> <p>The Concept Plan seeks to retain the ‘family friendly’ nature of Town Beach. Expansion the water playground, construction of a safe swimming area, construction of a jetty and enhancement of the green space around the foreshore area will assist in achieving this objective.</p>	Support in part. As per submission 10 above.
g			Relocation of Town Beach Boat Ramp	<p>As per submission 15(g) above.</p> <p>The Concept Plan does not propose an upgrade to the</p>	Note submission.

SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS

			<p>This matter was strongly discussed in the affirmative by our syndicate table during the public meeting held at the Shire offices on 29th April 2014. There was a strong feeling that the proposed site near the Catalinas would be most beneficial as it is a protected launching area with existing ramp access. A double width access way already exists permitting easy vehicle and boat trailer access to and from a launching area.</p> <p>The issue of parking was discussed and the Shire as already identified a suitable location in the Strategy Plan for vehicle and boat trailer parking diagonally opposite the old “Seaview” shopping area on vacant land fronting the foreshore. It is also closer to an existing launching area, than the proposed parking area along Robinson Street in relation to the Town Beach boat ramp and as such would be more attractive to users.</p> <p>Discussion during the public forum indicated that this vacant site was also favoured for an area where the public could access as a viewing point out over the bay. This would link in beautifully with the car/trailer parking while providing a sealed bitumised surface. Water drainage could be easily managed given the contours of the land whereby all rain water would naturally funnel into and towards existing drainage at the shopping area and the new road proposal for that area.</p>	Catalina’s boat ramp at this time.	
h			<p>Summary and Recommendations</p> <p>Although there were 33 items listed in the Strategic Plan, we are concerned with the Town Beach area generally. Our concerns are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • From a traffic perspective • Changing a proven successful community friendly precinct • Removal and relocation of the boat ramp <p>We offer the following suggestions/recommendations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. All existing parkland, garden, BBQ areas and current parking to remain as is. 	<p>It is not likely that all car parking will be retained in its current location, as the existing situation is not optimal. Moving some of the existing car parking back from the foreshore will allow for more parkland and green space closer to the water.</p> <p>Element 2 in Section 5.2 describes proposed enhancements to the Roebuck Bay foreshore, including Town Beach:</p> <p><i>2. Enhancement of the foreshore area between Moonlight Bay Apartments and Town Beach will be undertaken to establish a linear foreshore park, incorporating paths, furniture, shade structures, shade tree and other plantings, public art and interpretation of the many and varied stories and historic sites associated with this historic area (i.e. McDaniels’ Camp).</i></p> <p>These improvements will lead to additional recreational facilities being developed in the Precinct.</p>	Note submission.
i			2. No addition to structural development of any kind in this area.	As per submission 15(g) above.	Note submission
j			3. Remove the existing boat ramp and upgrade the proposed locations identified as <i>12 Catalina vehicle and boat trailer parking</i>	As per submission 15(g) above.	Note submission.
k			4. Upgrade the existing boat ramp at the Catalinas	This is not proposed under the Concept Plan.	Note submission.
l			5. Develop a “safe swimming are” at the site of the original swimming enclosure keeping in line with local history.	As per submission 15(i) above.	Support in part. As per submission 15(i) above.
m			6. Upgrade the Town Beach Café in its current location. Leave the relocation site proposed (<i>19 on the Strategy Plan Legend</i>) to allow easier access to the proposed extension of the “old jetty”. There already exists an “eye sore” at the back of the Town Beach Café in relation to rubbish dump bins etc, but as its current location, this is screened by the Caravan Park	As per submission 28 above.	Support in part. As per submission 28 above.

SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS

			fence and other existing structures. To move the Café to the proposed new site would create an even bigger “eye sore” and detract from the beautiful views that already exist. A similarly scenario already exists at Zanders (Cable Beach).		
n			7. Place speed humps to control traffic speed within the Town Beach area. One on Robinson Street between the Hopton Street corner and the Access road to the Town Beach car park. The second hump on the Access Road from the Town Beach car park before the junction with Robinson Street. This would not only cause traffic to slow down but hopefully, make traffic users think about other users. Currently, pedestrians are jeopardised and traffic out of the Access Road onto Robinson assume they have right of way, causing conflict to other traffic going to the end of Robinson Street (to the Café, Caravan Park and our residence – again , an accident waiting to happen).	As discussed above, the OBDs recommends that a transport and transport study including a road safety audit be conducted prior to individual transport improvements taking place within the Precinct.	Note submission.
o			8. Preservation of the Pioneer Cemetery.	Noted.	Note submission.
p			9. Rebuild Town Beach jetty (“old jetty”).	As per submission 29(b) above.	Note submission.
36	E. Rabbitt Broome Historical Society & Museum		<p>The executive committee and members of the Broome Historical Society (BHS) & Museum, the custodians of Broome’s history for the Shire of Broome would like the town planners to note:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BHS & museum members request that as a major stake holder for the proposed historic precinct that BHS is consulted and our views be heard, listened to and taken into account. • BHS does not agree with the proposed road changes/parking between the museum entrance and shops • BHS does not agree with the proposed extension of Hamersley St along the eastern side of the museum. This area is of great historic significance and was the commercial centre of the town. We understand a gazetted road was previously in the vicinity but it was a narrow track. 21st Century roads are much wider. This historic area should not become a public thorough fare. 	<p>As per submission 11(c) and 15(v) above.</p> <p>Representatives from the Broome Historical Society attended the community workshop in May 2013 and were invited by letter to attend both the government and community organisations workshop and the public workshop that were held in April 2014.</p>	Support in part. As per submissions 11(c) and 15(v) above.
37	State Heritage Office		Thank you for your correspondence received on 9 April 2014 regarding the proposed draft Local Planning Policy – Old Broome Development Strategy. The following comments are made on behalf of the State Heritage Office:		
a			1. It is encouraging to see a strong consideration of heritage within the draft Old Broome Development Strategy, such as inclusion of cultural heritage in the ‘vision’ for Old Broome, and the dedicated objectives, principles, strategies, policies and actions for heritage. This will assist in ensuring that future development does not adversely affect the significance of heritage places and areas.	Noted.	Note submission.
b			<p>2. The subject area, ‘Old Broome,’ contains 17 places of State Heritage Significance which are identified in Part 2 of the draft Strategy. In general, the draft Strategy does address and emphasise the importance of the character and heritage within Old Broome. However it should be noted that future development affecting these sites will need to demonstrate that the heritage significance of the places are retained.</p> <p>The comments made in this letter are not statutory advice and are provided only to assist in determining authority in its decision.</p>	<p>The draft Old Broome Design Guidelines will contain provisions relating to heritage. Among other provisions, the Guidelines will require the preparation of a Heritage Impact Statement for applications for alterations and/or additions to places of heritage value. The Guidelines will also require that development adjacent to buildings on the Shire’s Heritage List conserve the existing streetscape and exhibit built form that is compatible with adjacent heritage buildings.</p> <p>As the Guidelines will be adopted as a Local Planning Policy, they will be publicly advertised and referred to the State Heritage Office for comment.</p>	Support. No modifications required.

SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS

38	J, P & J Tilbrook 42 Landsdale Road LANDSDALE, WA, 6065	Lot 203 (No. 6) Louis Street Lot 451 (No. 33) Hamersley Street	<p>Rowe Group on behalf of the owners of Lot 203 (No. 6) Louis Street and Lot 451 (No. 33) Hamersley Street, Broome. Our Clients have reviewed the Draft Old Broome Development Strategy ('Draft Strategy') and proposed Local Planning Policy ('Draft LPP') and instructed our Office to provide the following submission on their behalf. A completed 'Local Planning Policy Submission Form' is enclosed.</p> <p>A number of comment and provisions included in the draft Strategy are of concern to our Clients. These comments and provisions are set out below.</p>	Noted.	Note submission.
a			<p>Land Use – Action No. 7 (Clause 4.1.4) Action No. 7 at Clause 4.1.4 of the draft Strategy reads as follows:</p> <p><i>“Development of Lot 451 and Lot 601 Hamersley Street shall allow for a high level of general public access on the ground floor and ensure vistas to Roebuck Bay are retained. Any buildings on this site should be sensitively designed, have a ‘light’ construction and address all four side. The development should not be ‘privatised’ nor dominate the location visually.”</i></p> <p>Our Clients object to this provision and request that it be deleted from the draft Strategy.</p> <p>It must be remembered that Lot 451 is a private landholding that is held in green title (freehold) ownership. It is not public land and is not zoned for public purposes.</p> <p>Lot 451 is zoned 'Mixed Use' under Town Planning Scheme No. 4 (TPS4) and is proposed to be zoned 'Mixed Use' under draft Local Planning Scheme No 6 (LPS6). Any development on the property is to accord with the provisions of TPS4. These provisions do not include a requirement for a <i>“high level of public access on the ground floor”</i>. In this respect, the draft Strategy is inconsistent with TPS4 and draft LPS6 and is therefore in conflict with clause 2.3.2 of TPS4 which requires that any “Local Planning Policy <u>must</u> be consistent with the Scheme (underline is our emphasis).</p> <p>The requirement under this Action that any development on Lot 451 is to be “sensitively designed” and have a “light construction” is ambiguous and unhelpful. The provisions of TPS4 contain requirements in relation to an adherence to 'Broomestyle Architecture'. The addition of what could be interpreted as conflicting provisions I confusing and unnecessary.</p> <p>Having regard to the above, it is requested that Action No. 7 at clause 4.1.4 of the draft Strategy is deleted.</p>	<p>The OBDS is written to accord with the provisions of LPS6, which is considered to be a seriously entertained planning proposal.</p> <p>Clause 5.13 of LPS6 deals with 'Inappropriate or Incongruous Development,' and states:</p> <p><i>Where, in the opinion of the local government, any proposed development, would not be in harmony with existing buildings or the landscape of the locality in which the proposed development is to be located by virtue of the use, design or appearance of the development, the colour or type of materials to be used on exposed surfaces, the height, bulk and mass of any building, the local government may:</i></p> <p><i>(a) refuse its approval for the development notwithstanding that it otherwise complies with the provisions of the Scheme; or</i></p> <p><i>(b) impose conditions on any planning approval granted for the proposed development to ensure that it will be in harmony with existing buildings and the landscape quality of the locality in which the development is to be located.</i></p> <p>This provision gives the Shire the ability to either refuse or specify conditions for a development to ensure that it is in harmony with adjacent development or the natural landscape. Lots 451 and 601 Hamersley Street are located along a stretch of the Conti Foreshore reserve, across from Bedford Memorial Park, with uninterrupted views of Roebuck Bay. Given the highly visible position of the lots and their location adjacent one the most significant areas of Public Open Space in the Shire, the Shire considers it appropriate to establish standards for the design and construction of development on these lots beyond what would be expected for other development in the 'Mixed Use' zone that does not occupy such a prominent location. This is consistent with Clause 5.13 of LPS6. No modifications are recommended.</p>	Reject.

SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS

b			<p><u>Movement - Action No. 22 (Clause 4.4.4)</u> Action No. 22 at Clause 4.4.4 of the draft Strategy reads as follows:</p> <p><i>“Reinstate a tram line with transit point at key locations along the eastern side of Hamersley Street”</i></p> <p>We understand the reinstatement of a tram line along Hamersley Street has previously been considered by the Shire but we deemed to be unachievable as a result of public liability issues. If this is the case, we suggest the Action be removed from the draft Strategy.</p>	As per submission 11(b) above.	Note submission.
c			<p><u>Foreshore Concept Plan Element No. 9 – Strategic Mixed Use Development Sites</u> Our comments in relation to Action No. 7 under clause 4.1.4 above are repeated. We therefore request that the provisions at Element No. 9 of the Foreshore Concept Plan are similarly deleted.</p>	As per submission 38(a) above.	Reject.
d			<p><u>Strategy Plan</u> It is unclear from the Strategy Plan (Figure 2) which Policy Area Lot 451 (No. 33) Hamersley Street is located within. We have since been advised that Lot 451 is located within Policy Area D. We suggest the thickness of the line work used in the Strategy Plan is adjusted to ensure the plan is legible.</p>	Noted. It will be recommended that the Strategy Plan be updated to reflect that Lots 451 and 601 Hamersley Street are intended to be part of ‘Area D – Tourist / Residential.’	Support. Recommend amending the Strategy Plan to show Lots 451 and 601 Hamersley Street as part of ‘Area D – Tourist / Residential.’
e			<p><u>Dual Policy Area Designation</u> Lot 203 (No. 6) Louis Street is located within the proposed “Mixed Use Tourism/Residential Land Use Area” (Area D) and also forms part of the area known as the “Old Broome Special Character Area” (Area I). It is unclear from the draft Strategy which land use area provisions apply if a site falls within two Policy Areas.</p> <p>The draft Strategy is confusing and unhelpful in this regard and does not provide any meaningful guidance as to what type of development can occur within the Old Broome Policy Area. We request the draft Strategy be amended to include clarification on this issue, and the amendments re-advertised for public comment. Alternatively, if we have misinterpreted this provision, please advise.</p>	<p>The ‘Old Broome Special Character Area’ (OBSCA) is an overlay which has been applied to the Strategy Plan in addition to the land use designations. It does not specify what type of land uses are to be supported; rather it is a mechanism to control density and built form to ensure that the historic character of the area is maintained. The draft Old Broome Design Guidelines will contain development controls for the OBSCA.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that this may appear confusing. As a result, it is recommended that the legend of the Strategy Plan be amended to remove the ‘Area I’ designation from the OBSCA. This will also lead to the updating of Section 4.1 (Land Use).</p>	<p>Support in part. Recommend:</p> <p>1. Amending the Strategy Plan by removing the words ‘Area I’ from the legend so it reads ‘Old Broome Special Character Area’ only.</p> <p>2. Amending Strategy 1 in Section 4.1.3 (Land Use) to remove ‘i. – Area I – Old Broome Special Character Area.’</p> <p>3. Amending Action 4 in Section 4.1.4 (Land Use) to state ‘Retain the R10 density coding in the Old Broome Special Character Area.’</p>
f			<p><u>Old Broome Special Character Area</u> The draft Strategy lacks guidance as to how the Old Broome Special Character Area may be redeveloped. The lack of information suggests redevelopment is not encouraged. This will lead to tired building stock and the re-direction of investment away from the area.</p> <p>Land Use – Action No. 4 (Clause 4.1.4) Action No. 4 at Clause 4.1.4 of the draft Strategy reads as follows:</p> <p><i>“Retain the R10 density coding in areas G and I”.</i></p>	<p>The continuance of the existing character of parts of Old Broome is largely because of the low density (R10) coding, as it directly correlates with large blocks, considerable front and rear setbacks, and a larger percentage of open space per lot. This is why it is considered important to maintain this coding in the OBSCA.</p> <p>The OBDS does not seek to prevent redevelopment, however it acknowledges that the OBSCA has a</p>	Reject.

SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS

			<p>The retention of the R10 density coding across Policy Areas G and I is not supported. The draft Strategy provides no explanation as to why an R10 density coding is necessary. Limiting the density to R10 will discourage redevelopment and re-direct investment away from these areas.</p> <p>In our view, the Shire cannot reasonably determine that an R10 density coding is the most appropriate density coding for the area until it has undertaken the assessment required to prepare its Design Guidelines for the area.</p> <p>We therefore request that Action No 4. Be deleted and Action No. 3 be re-worded to remove the final sentence which reads:</p> <p><i>“This does not apply to land..... within the ‘Old Broome Special Character Area’.</i></p>	<p>unique character worthy of preservation and as such redevelopment needs to be in keeping with the low density form of current buildings. To ensure that this occurs, residential development will be limited to a density of R10, and as discussed above, the implementation of the Design Guidelines will lead to Mixed Use development that has a similar appearance to residential development at a density of R10. It will be the decision of individual landowners whether they wish to redevelop within these parameters.</p>	
g			<p><u>Mixed Use Areas</u></p> <p>Within the Mixed Use Tourism/Residential :Land Use Area, “priority land uses include ‘Tourist Development’ and ‘Restaurants’ at Ground Level and ‘Tourist Development’ and ‘Residential Uses’ at the Upper Levels. The list of “secondary” land uses are largely the same.</p> <p>The limited number of priority land uses is restrictive and will generate an oversupply of such uses in this area. We therefore request that the list of priority and secondary land uses be expanded and re-advertised for comment.</p> <p>There is also a concern as to whether the tourist and commercial land uses are economically viable within all of the Mixed Use Zones areas. Has an economic assessment been undertaken to confirm that the extent of additional commercial floorspace can be sustained?</p>	<p>As discussed in the officer’s response to submission 19 above, the zoning table in LPS6 will set out permitted, discretionary, and not permitted uses within the ‘Mixed Use’ zone. The OBDS in Action 1 of Section 4.1.4 (Land Use) will provide further guidance as to which uses are preferred, not preferred, and inappropriate within the various Areas. With respect to this action, it is noted that the Internal Submission seeks to vary what was originally set out in the draft OBDS as officers considered the table did not adequately capture the full range of discretionary uses under the zoning table under the zoning table with respect to Areas A through D. (Refer No. 1 in Internal submission for the applicable uses for Area D. The amended Action shows that a number of commercial uses may be supported in Area D that are not strictly ‘tourist’ in nature, but that complement tourist uses. This would provide landowners within this Area with additional development opportunities.</p> <p>As stated above, the OBDS does not re-zone any land and it will be the responsibility of individual landowners to apply for Scheme Amendments. This means that changes of use within the precinct will happen incrementally. Section 3.2.11 of the LPS states that requests for Scheme Amendments will be accompanied by a commercial needs analysis.</p>	Support in part. Refer to Internal submission 1.
h			<p>Preparation of Design Guidelines</p> <p>The preparation of Design Guidelines for the Mixed Use and Old Broome Special Character Areas are generally supported. Given the lack of guidance provided by current planning framework as to how the ‘Old Broome’ area may be developed, it is requested that these Design Guidelines be prepared as a matter of priority.</p>	<p>It is anticipated that the Design Guidelines will be brought to Council in draft format in December 2014. Under TPS4, Local Planning Policies are required to be publicly advertised for a minimum period of 21 days, and a longer period can be requested by Council at its discretion.</p>	Support. No modifications required.
i			<p><u>Draft Local Planning Policy</u></p> <p>We note the Shire’s intention to incorporate the old Broome Development Strategy into a Local Planning Policy (LPP). The draft LPP states as follows:</p> <p><i>“All land use and development proposals within Precinct 2 – Old Broome, under the Local Planning Strategy, shall comply with the Old Broome Development Strategy adopted by</i></p>	<p>As stated above the OBDS has been written to reflect the provisions of LPS6 rather than TPS4. It is noted that LPS6 contains a similar provision in Clause 2.3.2.</p> <p>The wording in the Local Planning Policy is not</p>	Reject.

SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS

			<p><i>Council X.”</i></p> <p>Clause 2.4 of TPS4 states that a LPP is not part of the Scheme and shall not bind the Council in respect of any application for planning approval but the Council shall have due regard to the provisions of any such Policy and the objectives which the Policy is designed to achieve before making its decision. Use of the words “shall comply with” are therefore redundant in the sense that Council cannot be compelled to make a decisions in accordance with a LPP.</p> <p>We request that this provision be removed from the draft LPP.</p>	<p>considered to be redundant as the intent of the Policy is that all development within Old Broome shall comply with the OBDS. This does not prohibit Council from resolving to vary the policy, and by extension the OBDS, if it sees fit as is its ability under Clause 2.3.2. No modifications are therefore recommended.</p>	
39	Broome Uniting Church PO Box 40 BROOME, WA, 6725	11 & 13 Anne Street 40 Robinson Street	<p>While in agreement with the general intent of the Old Broome Development Strategy, there is a need for fine tuning of the area use zoning boundaries. In the current strategy proposal there is one type of zoning on one side of a street of and different zoning on the other side of street where the area boundaries meet. Conventionally, zoning boundaries would follow the property boundaries rather than the street line. This convention has been used where Area A meets Areas B and C in the development strategy.</p> <p>Under the proposed development strategy the Broome Uniting Church and it associated buildings at 11 & 13 Anne St and 40 Robinson St will be zoned Mixed Use Tourist/Residential while the other side of Anne St will be zoned Commercial/Civic.</p> <p>In the view of the Broome Uniting Church, the Commercial/Civic zoning is a more appropriate rating for the southern side of Anne St adjacent to the hospital, as it will accurately reflect the current use of the Church and associated buildings. It will also address potential future usage as the Church responds to the mission and ministry needs within the Broome community. =</p> <p>The adoption of the Commercial/Civic zoning for the Uniting Church area of Anne St will also ensure the Uniting Church and the other Churches within the Old Broome area will be contained within the same zoning and guidelines which will allow for equitable planning.</p>	<p>It is acknowledged that the current use and proposed use of the subject land is more consistent with the designation of ‘Area B – Civic Commercial’ than ‘Area D – Tourist / Residential,’ and that the other churches within Old Broome have been included within Area B. The subject land is also adjacent to the Broome hospital so extending the boundary of Area B across the street is not out of keeping with the character of the area.</p> <p>However it is noted that Lot 17 (No. 197) Anne Street currently has approval for a Bed and Breakfast and as such it is more appropriate for this lot to remain in ‘Area D – Tourist Residential.’</p>	<p>Support. Recommend amending the Strategy Plan to change Lot 198 (No. 13) Anne St, Lot 199 (No. 11) Anne Street and Lot 651 (No. 40) Robinson Street from ‘Area D – Tourist / Residential’ to ‘Area B – Civic / Commercial.’</p>
40	M. Robinson		<p>I object to the whole plan due to the “Consultants” who the Broome shire dealt with in relation to the “Indigenous Land Use Agreement”.</p> <p>The “ILUA”; Indigenous Land Use Agreement.... Was rushed through by these so called Aboriginal consultants who did not inform the rest of the community about this business of ... acquiring tribal land off clans and tribal owners of the land in and around Broome.</p> <p>The State Government and the Broome Shire went along with these dictators or consultants who took it upon themselves to rearrange history and do very important business without the permission of the people of Broome.</p> <p>These consultants do not have the backing of the majority. They were never voted in to their very powerful positions and for many years, they have help so much power and persuasion with the Shire and Government, and it seems cannot be voted out. So therefore, this is the platform of “Dictatorship”!!!</p> <p>I am speaking of my real experience, when these “consultants” dictated the removal of the Yawuru corporation entitlement to Wattle Downs at Crab Creek only 4 years ago!! There was no mention to us, the tribal owners of that area of any plans associated with the Indigenous Land Use Agreement???? As these “consultants” parade around this town like they own it and have the audacity to say they are our “leaders”!!</p>	<p>The consultant used to prepare the OBDS was Cardno (WA) Pty Ltd. This company was not involved in negotiations for the Indigenous Land Use Agreements.</p> <p>Concerns about how previous Native Title claims have been resolved are not relevant to consideration of the OBDS.</p>	<p>Reject.</p>

SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS

			<p>I strongly disapprove of any Shire plans that has any association with the ILUA. Out of the principal that the whole planning system from these dictator consultants was begat by a very “undemocratic” and injurious corrupt misleading method.</p> <p>Therefore, what ever evolves fro their scams and schemes will not be representative of the “true people’s of Broome” and will therefore fall short of any amicable agreement ... A classic example being....””The Gas Hub””!!!</p> <p>I am aware of the “divide and conquer” methodology!! I am noting that these consultants who devised the Indigenous Land Use Agreement with the powers to be are mere puppets in the bigger scheme of things..... I believe that corruption can not exist for too long in this wonderful town.... The cracks are starting to show now!!!!</p>		
41	P. Mitchell PO Box 346 BROME, WA, 6725				
a			<p>As a former Councillor for this Shire, and a proponent and supporter of a previous attempt at a holistic planning approach to this area, in the early 2000s, (first Town Beach Concept Plan?) I commend the Shire for again taking a pro-active approach to the preservation and (appropriate) development of the Town Beach and Conti Foreshore areas.</p> <p>Given that Broome has so many attractions, particularly a world-class beach on the ocean side of the Broome peninsula, we as a community have been too complacent about making the most of some of our other less obvious assets, for both our residents and our visitors.</p> <p>I have only two objections to the plan as it stands, and generally I am in support of the bulk of the concept.</p> <p>Please see my comments below, both positive and negative, and queries</p>	Noted.	Note submission.
b			<p>1. Objection: 5.2.17 The large car park area proposed for the west side of the Town Beach grassed area – (S end of Robinson St) will damage the amenity of the area for the many families who use the area, and reduce its attractiveness and functionality for the regular Staircase markets which are a significant tourism asset to the town. In this old built up area it is impossible to provide sufficient car parking for the busy times (staircase markets, dragon boats regattas, other events). We have to look at innovative solutions such as special bus services, encouraging people to walk or ride, etc before we sacrifice yet more POS to a bitumen desert that will be empty most of the time. Also, the current water playground has already taken a lot of the passive recreational area that was formerly available; it is expanded, as recommended in the Plan, the proposed car park would be part of a piecemeal reduction of one of the key attractions of the reserve, its user-friendly open space.</p>	As per submission 10 above.	Support in part. As per submission 10 above.
c			<p>2. Objection. Extension of Hamersley St south to Hopton St. This reduces the amount of passive or recreational space in the whole area, and makes the expansion of the usable Town Beach POS towards to museum unattractive and unlikely.</p>	As per submission 11(c) above.	Support in part. As per submission 11(c) above.
d			<p>3. Question: Regarding the intent that the majority of Old Broome be zoned Mixed Use, one of the attractive aspects of Old Broome is the wide and spacious streetscapes, usually enhanced with mature shady trees. Planning and development decisions should value these streetscapes and not allow cumulative erosion, via “a death of a thousand cuts” (eg. Verge car parks) of an important part of our built heritage. See 4.4.4 points 10-13 what protection is there afforded to the streetscapes of Old Broome in this plan?</p>	<p>Points 10 to 13 in Section 4.4.4 (Movement) state:</p> <p><i>10. Car Parking shall be in accordance with the relevant Design Guidelines.</i></p> <p><i>11. Develop a Local Planning Policy outlining the circumstances in which cash in lieu of car parking will</i></p>	<p>Support. Recommend:</p> <p>1. Deleting Action 12 in Section 4.4.4 (Movement).</p> <p>2. Deleting Action 13 in</p>

				<p><i>be permitted in Old Broome.</i></p> <p><i>12. Any car parking removed in order to achieve a proposal in the Concept Plan is to be replaced elsewhere within the precinct.</i></p> <p><i>13. New or redeveloped car parking along the streets indicated in Figure 3 shall be in accordance with the configurations proposed within the figure.</i></p> <p>With respect to Point 10, the draft Old Broome Design Guidelines state that verge parking will only be supported if it in accordance with an adopted parking plan. Additionally, the proposal must be accompanied by a site plan that demonstrates optimal building layout and a landscaping plan that demonstrates appropriate landscaping in the remainder of the verge and within the development site. The verge parking provisions will only apply to non-residential development as parking for residential developments is required to be provided on site. This will help preserve the verges and ensure they are not dominated by car parking.</p> <p>With respect to Point 11, it is considered that such a policy will not be developed until the Parking Management Strategy described in Action 16 of Section 4.4.4 is completed.</p> <p>With respect to Point 12, it is considered that this Action is premature as the parking survey has not yet been undertaken. The survey, which will inform the preparation of the Parking Management Strategy, will help determine whether there is currently an over supply or shortfall of parking. The Action as currently worded seems to prioritise car parking over other uses and as such it is recommended it be deleted.</p> <p>With respect to Point 13, the parking configurations in Figure 3 are preliminary and will be further refined through the Parking Management Strategy. Therefore it will be recommended that this action be deleted and a footnote be included in Figure 3 – Movement Options to show that the parking configurations are indicative.</p>	<p>Section 4.4.4 (Movement).</p> <p>3. Amending Figure 3 – Movement Options by including a footnote stating:</p> <p><i>Parking configurations are indicative and verge parking for new development along the streets where configurations are shown will require referral to Council until a detailed parking plan is prepared as per Local Planning Policy 8.16.</i></p>
--	--	--	--	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS

e			<p>4. Comment/Query: That the Shire takes steps to ensure that we do not experience a repeat of the situation at the Seaview site i.e. where a development application is approved, without resource to enforcing either a commencement of the project, or if development takes over a certain period of time to commence, requiring remedial action by the developer to preserve the amenity of the local streetscape cf. the Esplanade site in Albany. It has been a disgrace that this key site (Seaview) was left in that terrible state for so long, while plenty of money was made by the liquor store that was part of the same approval (I feel personally aggrieved by this, as I was part of Council that approved the original development). What protections de we have against a similar situation at the proposed development on the Conti foreshore freehold lots?</p>	<p>Clause 10.5 of LPS6 limits the term of planning approval to 2 years, after which it is considered to have lapsed if development on the site is not substantially commenced. The <i>Planning and Development Act 2005</i> does not contain any provisions to compel a developer to act on a planning approval.</p> <p>LPS6 under Clause 11.1.1 does allow for the local government to:</p> <p><i>(a) enter into an agreement with any owner, occupier or other person having an interest in land affected by the provisions of the Scheme in respect of any matter pertaining to the Scheme;</i></p> <p>This option could potentially be used to enter into an agreement with a landowner regarding development timeframes.</p>	Note submission.
f			<p>5. Comment: I support the inclusion of the Tramway plan, and the Jetty to Jetty walk/boardwalk idea; with appropriate cultural and heritage approvals from Yawuru. Any structures that impact on the mangroves need to minimise disturbance to the roosting bats. Any new structures and activities on the stretch of beach need to be low impact, in order to preserve its current cultural atmosphere e.g. local indigenous families often go fishing there.</p>	<p>As stated above, the Concept Plan is intended to serve as a non-statutory tool to identify potential project ideas and orientate them spatially. It does not provide the level of detail of a true Master Plan and should not be used as such. The elements on the Concept Plan are indicative and will be subject to future investigations (including an assessment of feasibility) and detailed design. Where relevant these investigations will also include obtaining relevant heritage clearances.</p>	Note submission.
g			<p>6. Comment: I support the recommendations regarding a Bicycle Plan for Broome; we have a problem with traffic and parking (also environmental/carbon impact) yet we do not do enough to encourage alternative modes of transport. I believe we should be addressing the rapid increase of scooters and other non-car modes of transport; as the options (gophers, trikes, motorised bicycles) seem to be proliferating, and will only keep increasing, along with fuel prices.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	Note submission.
h			<p>7. Comment: Development of Lot 451 and Lot 601 Hamersley Street. Unfortunately Council and the community has so far missed the opportunity to acquire those strategic lots and convert them into public purposes. If they are to be developed by the current owner I support the recommendations in the report regarding any developments being accessible to the public, not visually dominant etc. If no development proceeds and the lots are put on the market again, Shire should make every effort to take control of these lots.</p>	<p>Council's position on the appropriateness of development on Lot 451 Hamersley Street was made clear when the lot was zoned 'Mixed Use' under Town Planning Scheme No. 4. The 'Mixed Use' zoning has been maintained in the draft Local Planning Scheme No. 6.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the above, Action 7 in Section 4.1.4 (Land Use) recognises the prominent location of the lots and recommends that any development on the ground floor allow for a high level of public access which maintains vistas to Roebuck Bay. Action 7 also states:</p> <p><i>Any building on these sites should be sensitively</i></p>	Note submission.

SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS

				<p><i>designed, have a light construction and address all four sides. The development should not be privatised nor dominate the location visually.</i></p> <p>Should future development on the site be designed in accordance with the recommendations above, it is considered that amenity impacts could be minimised.</p> <p>It is noted that a development approval was issued by Council in April 2014 for a 'Tourist Development' at Lot 451 Hamersley Street subject to a number of conditions. The OBDS was not considered to be seriously entertained at this point as the public advertising period was ongoing. Therefore the decision was made on the basis of the development standards of TPS4. The Development Approval has yet to be implemented.</p>	
i			<p>8. Comment: 4.4.3 point 9. Movement and minimising conflict. As the number of pedestrians, bicycles and other non-road-using vehicles proliferate, we need to improve the existing and future bike path network. The paths needs to be wider, and (being a regular bike user of these paths) I suggest that a median line be painted at strategic parts of the paths to help guide traffic ("keep left") and decrease risk of accidents between path users.</p>	<p>Minimum standards for footpath construction in WA are outlined in the Institute of Public Works Engineering Australia (IPWEA) <i>Local Government Guidelines for Subdivisional Development</i> (Edition 2.1 -2011). The Shire has adopted an Addendum to these Guideline which states that all paths should be a minimum 2.0m wide in situ concrete. This allows for shared use. It is unlikely that the Shire will retrofit existing paths to be in excess of this standard.</p>	Note submission.
j			<p>9. Comment. Bedford Park 5.2.10 b) Minimise any "entry statements!" to or around this park, there are enough structures already, and the current entrance statement does not enhance anything, in my opinion.</p>	<p>The Concept Plan is intended to serve as a non-statutory tool to identify potential project ideas and orientate them spatially. It does not provide the level of detail of a true Master Plan and should not be used as such. The elements on the Concept Plan are indicative and will be subject to future investigations (including an assessment of feasibility) and detailed design.</p>	Note submission.
42	R. Wells PO Box 1792 BROOME, WA, 6725				
a			<p>I particularly support the following aspects of the strategy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A bicycle pathway, and increased footpaths and shade trees. • Historical precinct near the Museum • Yawuru Cultural Centre • Stabilisation of cliffs and protection of the mangroves and environment of the Roebuck Bay. • Historical information at Demco Park • Foreshore walkpath to connect Town Beach with Demco Beach • Facilities at Demco Beach • Rebuilding of the jetty • The conservation of the Bouke and Ingliss Store 	<p>Noted. The Concept Plan is intended to serve as a non-statutory tool to identify potential project ideas and orientate them spatially. It does not provide the level of detail of a Master Plan and should not be used as such. The elements on the Concept Plan are indicative and will be subject to future investigations (including an assessment of feasibility) and detailed design.</p>	Note submission.

SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS

			The following are comments and suggestions about aspects of the Strategy that concern me:		
b			Seating at Demco Park/connection to the beach I support the provision of seating at Demco Park, but suggest this happens not just in the existing park, but in the areas near the carpark, on the cliff top directly overlooking to Bay. The existing park currently has the appearance of not being open to the public, as if it is part of the Demco housing estate. I would suggest creating a stronger connection between the park and the clifftops to encourage more public access from the beach to the park.	It is noted that in addition to the proposed enhancements to Demco Park, the Concept Plan also shows the creation of a Demco Beach Foreshore Path which will include formalised beach access from the park.	Note submission.
c			Car parking near Women of Pearling Statue I would not like to see car parking encouraged on this part of the foreshore. It would be far better to encourage pedestrians and bike users in these areas. It would be great to use this area as a sitting/picnic area, possibly with bower shelters to provide shade and seating.	Element 2 on the Concept Plan details a range of improvements in the area extending from the Conti Foreshore to Town Beach. These include paths, furniture, shade structures, shade trees and other plantings, public art and historical interpretation. The small area of car parking proposed in Element 33 is designed to formalise what currently occurs as vehicles often pull off Hamersley Street to take in the views. However, given the visual sensitivity of the area, Element 33 states that proposed car parking will not be sealed.	Note submission.
d			Car parking at southern end of Robinson Street. Item 17 I do not support the removal of a large area of parkland to be used for carparking and boat trailers. Again, the Shire could be encouraging more bikes, and more public transport, rather than trying to find room for more cars. An alternative would be to relocate the current car park and boat ramp to the strip of land adjacent to the caravan park boundary, an area which is currently marked on the concept plan as a skate park and water park. This would put all the parking in one area and allow for the parkland and recreation areas not to be interrupted by cars or boat trailers. It would give greater safety for families and create continuous access across the park to the relocated café. It may be possible to allow for more parking in the area near the Museum and create walkways to Town Beach. Perhaps a section of the caravan park could be absorbed to use for some carparking. <i>It is a priority to have a large, safe recreational area, uninterrupted by vehicles, in this area.</i>	As per submission 10 above.	Support in part. As per submission 10 above.
e			Re-zoning of large areas of old Broome to mixed use. While I appreciate that this area could be revitalised into a more dynamic area, I do not believe there are currently enough safety measures in place to ensure that development will be in keeping with Broome's character until Design Guidelines are in place. It seems that there are already applications in process, ready for approval or under discussion. I suggest that design guidelines be established as soon as possible, with public consultation, prior to mixed use applications being approved.	The draft Old Broome Design Guidelines are in preparation it is anticipated these will be presented for Council's consideration as a draft Local Planning Policy in December 2014. Under TPS4, Local Planning Policies are required to be publicly advertised for a minimum period of 21 days, and a longer period can be requested by Council at its discretion. The OBDS does not rezone any land and Scheme Amendments generally take between nine months and a year to complete. Therefore it is highly likely that the Design Guidelines will have been adopted after public advertising prior to any land being rezoned to 'Mixed Use.'	Support. No modifications required.
f			Development of Lot 451 and Lot 601 Hamersley Street I would prefer that no development take place on the foreshore. Roebuck Bay is one of the delights of Broome, and steps should be taken to ensure that the foreshore remains undeveloped.	As per submission 41(h) above.	Note submission.

SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS

			It may be that the effects of climate change on the coastal environment will impact on dwellings built on the foreshore. The Bay should be preserved and enhanced, not built up.		
g			Re-wording for Caravan Park item The Concept Plan (Figure 4) Item # 25 states: 'Redevelop Caravan Park and Incorporate Government Offices.' This labelling suggests that the caravan will be redeveloped and that it may include the incorporation of office buildings. Although the situation becomes clearer when reading the text, I suggest this item be re-worded in any future maps, so as to avoid any confusion. Section 5.2 – Concept Plan Elements also states: <i>“Opportunities to enhance the caravan park facilities through strategic redevelopment will also be investigated.”</i> I would hope that any 'redevelopment' of the caravan park continues to support affordable accommodation and camping facilities.	As per submission 15(r) above.	Support. As per submission 15(r) above.
43	L. Weatherhead	15 Walcott Street			
a			I object to this proposal because it strikes at the heart of what Broome is about and threatens to remove the character of Broome and make it like any other small coastal town on the eastern seaboard. Broome is about the vast expanse of Cable Beach, and the tranquil environs of Old Broome, where Chinatown is the hub and the wide tree lined streets home to the old pearling houses and gardens of mangoes and custard apples. Merging commercial and residential in the streets about the market take away this character and impact on the environment and families that live in Broome. Are we going to attract tourists with insurance offices along Walcott and Robinson St? Will anyone want to continue to live in an area that is no longer family friendly?	As per submission 17(c) above.	Reject.
b			In particular I object to opening up Walcott Street at the junction with Frederick Street. There is no case made for why this should happen and it just makes an alternative thoroughfare to the main road that is not needed and impacts on those living in the area. The length of Frederick Street between Hamersley Street and the Boulevard shopping centre is already a dangerous traffic area and the addition of another intersection will add to the problem. As well , the opening of Anne Street to Hamersley Street is proposed without any demonstration of need or an impact assessment. I live on Walcott Street in Area B, now declared as “mixed use commercial/civic and administration” in the plan. This appears a long step from the current use, which is mainly residential. I am not “movement challenged”. At the moment I am able to walk, ride or drive to work without any problems. The opening up of Walcott and Anne St will create through traffic that will be dangerous to those living in the area, and create more noise and pollution.	As per submission 3 above.	Support in part. As per submission 3 above
c			The strategy mentions the promotion of pedestrian and bicycle usage through improvement to lighting and paths and it is part of the strategy that needs to be developed and improved. Encouraging alternatives to motor vehicle use, particularly for areas close to town, provide benefits to both residents and to councils and government in terms of reduced expenditure.	Noted.	Support. No modifications required.
d			I also object to the plans for the Town Beach reserve. This reserve is a well utilised family reserve and the knock it down and develop attitude that seems to be driving the plan seems to be counter to the role of a council in providing public amenities and an appropriate environment for its residents.	The Concept Plan is intended to serve as a non-statutory tool to identify potential project ideas and orientate them spatially. It does not provide the level of detail of a true Master Plan and should not be used as such. The elements on the Concept Plan are indicative and will be subject to future investigations (including an assessment of feasibility) and detailed design.	Note submission.

SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS

				<p>It is noted that the vision statement in the OBDS for Town Beach and the Conti Foreshore is:</p> <p><i>Town Beach will continue to be an inclusive place that brings people of all ages, cultures and abilities together; that uses the land and sea so as to preserve Broome's history, culture, and environment; and that provides an array of recreational opportunities at a low-key scale, retaining the open vistas to Roebuck Bay.</i></p> <p>Element 2 of the Concept Plan considers 'Conti Foreshore to Town Beach' and recommends:</p> <p><i>Enhancement of the foreshore area between Moonlight Bay Apartments and Town Beach will be undertaken to establish a linear foreshore park, incorporating paths, furniture, shade structures, shade tree and other planting, public art and interpretation of the many and varied stories and historic sites associated with this historic area (eg: McDaniels' Camp).</i></p> <p>Other elements proposed in the Concept Plan also detail the installation of infrastructure that is intended for public and recreational use.</p>	
44	C. Phillips PO Box 5060 BROOME, WA, 6725				
a			As a resident of Broome since 1994 I believe Broome has developed well over these years and we have a town to be proud of. We have a good balance of community minded people, strong Indigenous leaders, progressive business managers and a rich arts and multi cultural society. However, we are at another important crossroad which could see the nature of Broome change for the worse with parts of old Broome's open spaces being deleted to the history books. The feeling of space and freedom in old Broome with its majestic views of the Bay makes Broome unique. We must not lose Broome's unique environmental values in our quest for commercial development.	Noted.	Note submission.
b			Objection: 5.2.17 The large car park area proposed for the west side of the Town Beach grassed area – (S end of Robinson St) will damage the amenity of the area for the many families who use the area, and reduce its attractiveness and functionality for the regular Staircase markets which are a significant tourism asset to the town. In this old built up area it is impossible to provide sufficient car parking for the busy times (staircase markets, dragon boats regattas, other events). We have to look at innovative solutions such as special bus services, encouraging people to walk or ride, etc before we sacrifice yet more POS to a bitumen desert that will be empty most of the time. Also, the current water playground has already taken a lot of the passive recreational area that was formerly available; it is expanded, as recommended in the Plan, the proposed car park would be part of a piecemeal reduction of one of the key attractions of the reserve, its user-friendly open space.	As per submission 10 above.	Support in part. As per submission 10 above.
c			Will the Shire takes steps to ensure that we do not experience a repeat of the situation at	As per submission 41(e) above.	Note submission.

SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS

			the Seaview site i.e. where a development application is approved, without resource to enforcing either a commencement of the project, or if development takes over a certain period of time to commence, requiring remedial action by the developer to preserve the amenity of the local streetscape. It has been a disgrace that this key site (Seaview) was left in that terrible state for so long, while plenty of money was made by the liquor store that was part of the same approval. What protections de we have against a similar situation at the proposed development on the Conti foreshore freehold lots?		
d			Development of Lot 451 and Lot 601 Hamersley Street. Unfortunately Council and the community has so far missed the opportunity to acquire those strategic lots and convert them to public purposes. If they are to be developed by the current owner I support the recommendations in the report regarding any developments being made accessible to the public, not visually dominant etc. If no development proceeds and the lots are put on the market again, Shire should make every effort to take control of these lots.	As per submission 41(h) above.	Note submission.
e			The extension of Hamersley Street south to Hopton St. will reduce the amount of passive or recreational space in the whole area, and makes the expansion of the usable Town Beach POS unattractive and unlikely.	As per submission 11(c) above.	Support in part. As per submission 11(c) above.
f			I support the inclusion of the Tramway plan, the Jetty to Jetty boardwalk idea and the recommendations regarding a Bicycle Plan for Broome.	Noted.	Note submission.
45	J. Jones 11 Mounts Bay Road PERTH, WA, 6000		Although I don't currently live in Broome (I did for 10 years), I do have family in Broome, and I spend at least 2 holidays a year there. On my recent trip in April, I didn't even go to Cable Beach, but in 6 days went swimming 3 times at Town Beach. As a tourist I would hate to see Town Beach disappear, or reduced in size. I am led to believe that the plan is to turn the current area into a car park from the water park to the Hopton St Drain and most of the way across to the Pioneer Cemetery. This will mean the loss of all the grassed area. The Town Beach reserve is an integral part of the community, the local culture and the history of Broome. It is also a very pretty site. Why does Broome have to look like every other commercialised town in Australia? Please leave this area alone.	As per submission 10 above. It is reiterated that the Concept Plan proposed relocating the existing car parking to an area further away from the foreshore and turning the existing parking into green space, with the exception of a narrow access road and turn around area for vehicles accessing the Town Beach boat ramp. The intention was to increase the amount of green space provided, rather than reduce it.	Support in part. As per submission 10 above.
46	L. Morris PO Box 432 BROOME, WA, 6725	19 Barker Street			
a			1. I am currently the owner of 19 Barker Street, Old Broome in proposed Area I in the above Strategy.	Noted.	Note submission.
b			2. I was unable to participate in the consultation workshop held on Tuesday 28 May 2013 as when I rang to book I was advised that the workshop was full and there were no available spots left. As an owner of property directly affected by this Strategy, there should not have been a limitation placed on attendance. As I could not get into the workshop, I requested that I be provided with any information handed out at the workshop. No information was sent to me which is disappointing in light of the direct impact this Strategy has on our property and the reason why we purchased in Old Broome.	The Shire adopted a Community Engagement Policy in November 2012. The policy states that in conducting community engagement, emphasis will be on ensuring the appropriate groups of stakeholders are engaged at the appropriate level so that Shire resources and service are inline with community needs, aspirations and strengths. The Shire does not condone the prohibition of interested residents from attending engagement activities, and apologises. Residents were also informed about the OBDS and proposed engagement events through a direct mail out to all landowners. The public workshop and displays were open to all interested parties.	Note submission.
c			3. We purchased our property privately as the previous owners wanted to ensure the property was purchased by someone who was not going to demolish or subdivide to	As per submissions 2 and 11(d) above.	Support in part. As per submissions 2 and 11(d)

SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS

			ensure the character of Old Broome was maintained. That is why we purchased it – to enhance, not destroy. I realise there are a number of properties on Old Broome that have been purchased and subdivided but the Shire has the opportunity to stop this from happening and protect what is left of Old Broome, not only in Area I, but in the whole of Old Broome. There are large residential properties in each of these areas and it would be devastating for those living on one of these large properties in each of these areas to have a large multi-unit resort or complex built next to them. R10 zoning needs to be the zoning for these areas to retain the character that makes Old Broome “Old Broome”.		above.
d			4. In 4.1.3 on page 8 there appears to be an error. Area E and Area F have been listed the wrong way around. Area E should be listed as Tourism and Area F should be listed as Recreation.	Noted. This will be corrected in the text to match the maps.	Support. Recommend: 1. Strategy 1 in Section 4.1.3 (Land Use) be amended to change ‘e – Area E’ to –‘Tourism’ and ‘f- Area F’ to ‘Recreation’ 2. Amend the land use tables in Action 1 in Section 4.1.4 (Land Use) to switch the designations of Area E and Area F .
e			5. On page 10 and 11, Residential Land Uses should be listed under Priority Land Uses in all Areas, not only in some. The Shire should not be trying to discourage residential in these areas.	<p>Noted. As discussed above, the Internal Submission seeks to vary what was originally set out in the draft OBDS as officers considered the table did not adequately capture the full range of discretionary uses under the zoning table with respect to Areas A through D. (Refer No. 1 in Internal submission for the applicable uses).</p> <p>‘Single Dwelling’ will now be a preferred use in Areas B, C, and D, which in addition to areas G and H encompass the majority of the Precinct. It will be not be a preferred use in ‘Area A – Mixed Use Retail / Commercial’ as this area fronts an arterial road (Frederick Street), faces land that will be zoned ‘Town Centre’ under LPS6, and is intended to be the one area in the Precinct where generalised retail would be supported. This does not mean that applications for a single house would be refused in Area A as ultimately it is a discretionary decision under LPS6, however in pre-lodgement discussions with the Shire applicants will be encouraged to consider a design which incorporates one or more preferred uses.</p> <p>Additionally, a single house will not be a preferred use in ‘Area E – Tourist’ as this designation applies only to the Roebuck Bay Caravan Park , or in ‘Area F- Recreation’ as this designation applies to the PCYC and surrounds where the use of the land for housing</p>	Support in part. No modifications required.

SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS

				is not supported.	
f			6. Item 4.1.4.3. There should be no increase to R40 of properties in Old Broome. Area D is a prime example. This is unfair to neighbouring property owners as any increase in density will destroy even more of the open space character of Old Broome. As previously stated, this is the opportunity to stop the destruction of Old Broome and retain a nurture what is left.	As per submission 15(c) above.	Reject.
g			7. Item 4.1.4.4. It should not only be Areas G and I that retain the R10 density coding. All areas/properties that currently have this zoning should retain it.	As per submission 15(c) above.	Reject.
h			8. With respect to 4.3 – Community Facilities, the fact that the consultants that prepared the Strategy have stated that “the use of existing facilities by tourists was not accounted for in the benchmarks as they only consider permanent residents” is a flawed way of thinking when it comes to Broome. For many months of the year our population swells overwhelmingly as tourists come to town. Unlike many tourist towns where the tourists are passing through or only here for a few days, a large number of our tourists are retirees who come up here for the dry so they should be accounted for in any benchmarks. One of the examples they used was the museum. To say that the museum has been provided slightly in advance of demand is ridiculous. There are many towns much smaller than Broome that have museums.	<p>The purpose of referencing the LPS benchmarks was to demonstrate that ‘the supply of community facilities was commensurate with current demand.’ Stating that is museum is not required until the permanent population reaches 20,000 does mean one cannot be provided before that time, rather, it demonstrates, using standard benchmarks Broome is well serviced with the current museum.</p> <p>The OBDS recognises that tourists use community facilities. It is important to note that new community facilities incur maintenance costs all year round, not only in the tourist season, so it is desirable, unless there is some sort of ‘full cost recovery fees’ imposed to prioritise the development of new Shire- owned facilities based on permanent resident needs.</p>	Reject.
i			9. With respect to the suggestion of low scale infill development on the Courthouse street block, I strongly disagree. The courthouse is a landmark building synonymous with Broome. The open space surrounding it adds to its character. To add more buildings to the site would do nothing to enhance it and would detract from the Courthouse building itself.	As per submission 15(n) above.	Note submission.
j			10. Item 4.4 on page 14 reads “As Old Broome transitions into an area predominantly suitable for Mixed Use development” is a very negative statement. Old Broome does not have to transition into an area predominantly suitable for Mixed Use development. As mentioned by many people, when they first came to Broome and when they have visitors, they often drive around Old Broome because it is “Old Broome” and is full of history, character homes, and an unstructured, uncluttered, rustic area.	<p>As stated above, the draft LPS (2013) identifies the entirety of Old Broome as ‘Mixed Use.’ The LPS has been adopted by Council and the Western Australian Planning Commission, therefore from a planning perspective the area is already considered ‘suitable for Mixed Use development.’</p> <p>At the same time the LPS makes clear that development should be in an ‘open form’ that ‘recognises the historic character of the area.’ The purpose of the OBDS is to further refine the recommendations of the LPS and seek to concentrate particular land uses in particular areas. Along with the OBDS, the Old Broome Design Guidelines will control the built form of future development to ensure that the open and historic character of Old Broome can be preserved.</p> <p>Old Broome already contains numerous non-residential uses including the hospital, court house, prison, police station and Shire administration offices, a primary school, churches, resorts and other tourist</p>	Support in part. Recommend replacing ‘As Old Broome transitions into an area predominantly suitable for Mixed Use development’ in paragraph 2 of Section 4.4.1 (Movement) with ‘As a mixture of uses continue to develop in Old Broome over time,’

SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS

				development, a local shopping centre, and a number of services (such as doctor and dental surgeries, government offices and non-profit organisations) that complement the civic buildings. It is recommended that the phase in question be re-worded slightly to better reflect the existing situation.	
k			11. Figure 3 Parking Configurations indicates new parking areas. If it is these are bitumen and concrete parking areas, I believe this will detract from the feeling of Old Broome and make it more like a concrete/bitumen jungle. The current wide rustic road verges are part of what makes Old Broome, not a lot of concrete/bitumen car parks.	As per submission 41(d) above.	Support in part. As per submission 41(d) above.
l			12. I believe Old Broome needs to be treated differently to new subdivisions. The size of blocks needs to be retained, wide rustic road verges need to be retained. Don't let development take over Old Broome. It is possible to have a large block with a character building used as a commercial premises without detracting from the character of Old Broome. It can be protected and maintained. It just needs to Shire to accept that.	As discussed above, the R10 density coding will be retained within the 'Old Broome Special Character Area' (OBSCA) which is recommended to expand as per submissions 2 and 11(d) above. The Old Broome Design Guidelines will ensure that the built form of non-residential development in the OBSCA is complementary to residential development at a density of R10. The wide road verges will be maintained and verge parking will be carefully controlled through the Design Guidelines.	Support. No modifications required.
m			13. If design guidelines are prepared for the 'Old Broome Special Character Area' as a Local Planning Policy, do we get to comment?	The Design Guidelines will brought to Council for consideration as a draft Local Planning Policy, anticipated in December 2014. Under TPS4, Local Planning Policies are required to be publicly advertised for a minimum period of 21 days, and a longer period can be requested by Council at its discretion.	Support. No modifications required.
n			14. It appears that under 4.7 Urban Form, the consultants are applying ideas that would work in a new urban suburb. Old Broome. Old Broome deserves to be considered differently. It is an old suburb that needs to be preserved, not urbanised. Their reference to "optimal massing of buildings" is a frightening statement in itself.	Strategy 2 of Section 4.7.3 (Urban Form) states: <i>2. Ensure that setbacks allow for optimal massing of buildings to achieve climate sensitive design outcomes, whilst remaining compatible with the spacious character of Old Broome.</i> 'Optimal massing of buildings' in this context means that buildings should be set back from boundaries to allow, amongst other things, for breezes to flow through the area. The strategy also recognises that building design should be compatible with Old Broome's character which includes generous boundary setbacks. It is considered that the wording of Strategy 2 can be amended to reflect its true intent.	Support. Recommend amending Strategy 2 of Section 4.7.3 (Urban Form) to state: <i>2. Ensure that setbacks are used to achieve climate sensitive design outcomes and maintain the spacious character of Old Broome.</i>
o			15. Page 30 – Provision of Space for Events. This just sounds like a plan for another bitumen and concrete jungle. There are some people that may dislike the informal parking and inconvenience of finding parking during a few peak times, but I believe part of the adventure of attending these events is the fact that the structure isn't regimental like in the towns or cities they come from. They get to experience the	The Concept Plan is intended to serve as a non-statutory tool to identify potential project ideas and orientate them spatially. It does not provide the level of detail of a true Master Plan and should not be used as such. The elements on the Concept Plan are	Support. Recommend deleting the last sentence of Element 30 in Section 5.2 and replacing with:

SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS

			rustic nature of our town.	<p>indicative and will be subject to future investigations (including an assessment of feasibility) and detailed design.</p> <p>Provision of more bitumen and concrete is not the intention of Element 30. Rather, it is intended to encourage events to expand into areas of Town Beach which are not currently utilised due to a lack of facilities and amenity. The mention of ‘hardstand’ is to acknowledge that in developing the foreshore park (as per Element 2), consideration should be given to a suitable area for pop-up traders, with necessary power, lighting and waste connections. If such an area is created, there would likely be a need for some dedicated parking in proximity, however the Element acknowledges that this will be different in nature than parking for one-off events.</p> <p>It is considered that the last sentence of the description can be amended to more accurately reflect the intent.</p>	<i>‘Future investigations should consider the provision of dedicated parking in proximity to areas designed to accommodate pop-up traders. It is acknowledged that one-off events will require more car parking that can be permanently supplied, so investigations should also consider the optimal location and design of informal overflow parking for events.’</i>
p			16. Item 2.1.6 in Part 2 of the Strategy contains a statement that should be a strong enough message in itself to let the Shire know what people want. It reads “community sentiment was overwhelmingly in favour of retaining the low density R10 coding”. The use of the word “underdeveloped” further down in that same paragraph is also only the consultants interpretation. Old Broome doesn’t look “underdeveloped” now so if the density R10 coding doesn’t change and is the same as it is now, then why should it look underdeveloped in the future.	<p>The R10 coding is being maintained in the OBSCA which is recommended to be expanded.</p> <p>The word ‘underdeveloped’ was included in quotation marks in Item 2.1.6 of Part 2 for a reason. The intent of the paragraph was to state that the building form of R10 development will appear underdeveloped only when it is considered alongside grouped or multiple dwelling developments which have already been constructed in Old Broome at densities of up to R50.</p> <p>It is considered that the sentence in question can be amended to more accurately reflect the intent.</p>	<p>Note submission. Recommend deleting the third sentence of paragraph 4 in Section 2.1.6 Land Use (Part 2) and replacing with:</p> <p><i>As there have already been several grouped and multiple dwelling developments constructed at higher densities in Old Broome over the years, new development at a R10 density may appear ‘underdeveloped’ in comparison.</i></p>
q			17. Figure 3 with respect to Heritage. Our property at 19 Barker Street is noted as a Shire of Broome Municipal Inventory Heritage Place. Several years ago letters were sent out by the Shire to owners of properties listed on the Shire’s Heritage Inventory. The paperwork with a picture of our property was sent to Mr Tom Johnson, our neighbour who owns 17 Barker Street. He handed the paperwork to us as it was definitely for our property but had the incorrect address of 17 Barker Street listed, hence why it was sent to him. I contacted the Shire both by phone and in writing advising that the property had been identified incorrectly and providing the correct information. The property marked as a place of heritage significance indicated in Figure 3 is 17 Barker not 19 Barker Street. This needs to be corrected and raises concerns that if this is wrong, how many others are wrong or missing. I believe that Figure 3 is not a true indication of Places of Heritage Significance and	<p>The Municipal Inventory 2014 was endorsed by Council in August 2014. On the basis of this submission the address for Place 06 – Residence (former) was updated to Lot 240 (No.19) Barker Street. Consistent with this it recommended that Figure 3 – Places of Heritage Significance in Part 2 of the OBDS be updated accordingly.</p>	<p>Support. Recommend amending Figure 3 – Places of Heritage Significance in Part 2 of the OBDS to remove the ‘Shire of Broome Municipal Inventory Heritage Place’ overlay on Lot 241 (No. 17) Barker Street and include it on Lot 240 (No. 19) Barker Street.</p>

SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS

			needs to have more research done in identifying all of the properties prior to accepting the Strategy.		
r			I strongly request you consider the above comments and make sure Old Broome remains the great areas it is. It is possible to have commercial properties amongst residential without destroying the amenity of the area. We have done so much with our property so know it can be done.	Noted.	Note submission.
47	B. Bowles PO Box 2616 BROOME, WA, 6725	28 Walcott St	I specially object to the exploration expansion of the hospital which would impact on my family residential home located at 28 Walcott Street, as set out on Page 22 of Town Beach & Conti Foreshore Precinct Concept Plan, and identified as Legend 7, drawing No P13005-001 Issue E dated 14/03/14: Precinct 2. My family have resided at this address for over 50 years.	As per submission 15(o) above.	Support in part. As per submission 15(o) above.
48	Environs Kimberley PO Box 2281 BROOME, WA, 6725				
a			<p>While we welcome some very positive ideas in the Strategy we advise that further consultation would be beneficial on some of the proposals which are contentious according to feedback from Environs Kimberley members and the general public.</p> <p>1. Relocation of Town Beach vehicle and boat trailer parking We have had significant feedback that this is not supported by many in the community. There is a perception that this will reduce the public open space area at Town Beach and turn what is currently a popular part of the park into bitumen.</p> <p>EK Recommendation We recommend that the Shire holds a public workshop on this proposal prior to any development plans being developed. EK does not support this proposal until this happens.</p>	As per submission 10 above.	Support in part. As per submission 10 above.
b			<p>2. Old Broome rezoned to Mixed Use This has the potential to significantly impact on streetscapes e.g removal of trees and filling of verges with cracker dust.</p> <p>EK Recommendation We recommend that development approvals ensure the retention of trees and encourage the use of native plants on verges.</p>	The draft Old Broome Design Guidelines state that the Shire will only consider verge parking if a proponent submits a landscaping plan that demonstrates acceptable and appropriate landscaping within the development site and within the remaining verge area. This can include retention of mature trees and landscaping with native plants. Permeable paving will also be recommended for car parking areas . The Shire's current Engineering Policy 3.1.16 sets out the requirements for verge treatment and includes a street planting guide with endemic species	Support. No modifications required.
c			<p>3. A plan for a Tramway and the Jetty to Jetty walk/boardwalk idea These can be a positive development for Broome but need to be developed sensitively.</p> <p>EK Recommendation That the tramway and Jetty to Jetty project be developed with significant community consultation prior to the design phase.</p>	<p>The Shire has engaged consultants to prepare a business case for the Jetty to Jetty Walk which includes potential designs for the jetty. This was endorsed by Council in July 2014.</p> <p>Community engagement for the business case for the Jetty to Jetty walk to date has included a series of stakeholder workshops and one-on-one interviews.</p>	Note submission.
d			4. Recommendations for a Bicycle Plan for Broome	Noted. Action 20 of Section 4.4.4 (Movement) states:	Support. No modifications

SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS

			<p>This would be a very positive initiative for Broome.</p> <p>EK Recommendation We recommend that a Bicycle Plan be developed which would include bicycle hiring programmes and signed bicycle trails developed through streets and laneways.</p>	<p><i>20. Prepare a comprehensive Bicycle Strategy which will provide recommendations for a Broome-wide cycleway network.</i></p> <p>Design of the cycleway network can include appropriate locations for signed bicycle trails through streets and laneways and the Strategy can also consider hiring programmes and other opportunities to increase participation in cycling.</p>	required.
e			<p>5. Development of Lot 451 and Lot 601 Hamersley Street These lots are extremely environmentally sensitive and in our view should be public open space.</p> <p>EK Recommendation That the Shire rezones these sites as public open space.</p>	As per submission 41(h) above. Changing the zoning of these lots to a reserve could trigger claims for injurious affection and compensation under Clause 11.5 of LPS6.	Reject.
f			<p>6. Protection of mangroves Some reference to the removal of mangroves has been made</p> <p>EK Recommendation Mangroves should not be removed due to their biological and aesthetic values.</p>	The OBDS does not propose the removal of any mangroves. The only reference to removing mangroves is in Appendix A – ‘Stakeholder Workshop Outcomes May 2013’ and reflects that some workshop attendees brought up the idea in the ‘Opportunities and Challenges’ brainstorming session.	Support. No modifications required.
g			<p>7. Roebuck Bay Marine Park We have the opportunity for a world class marine park in Roebuck Bay.</p> <p>EK Recommendation That the Shire support the Roebuck Bay Marine Park boundary to be to the high tide mark along the Town Beach foreshore in order to capitalise on the tourism and marketing opportunities that it would be bring.</p>	Boundaries for Marine Parks are established under the <i>Conservation and Land Management Act 1984</i> and as such this is beyond the scope of the OBDS.	Note submission.
49	Yawuru Native Title Holders Aboriginal Corporation RNTBC ICN 7033 PO Box 425, BROOME, WA, 6725				
a			<p>The Yawuru PBC resolved at its meeting on 7 May, 2014 to oppose the draft Old Broome Development Strategy (‘Strategy’) and to seek a dialogue with the Shire of Broome aimed at incorporating Yawuru values in the Shire’s planning responsibilities.</p> <p>Background The Yawuru PBC represents the Yawuru community of native title holders who hold native title rights and interests to lands in and surrounding Broome. Regardless of whether Yawuru native title rights have been extinguished or impaired by western law, all land and waters within Yawuru country are important to Yawuru people under customary tradition.</p> <p>The recognition of Yawuru native title in Australian law has changed the relationship between the Shire of Broome and Yawuru people. The initial formalisation of the new relationship of recognition and inclusion of Yawuru people as native tile holders by the Shire of Broome commenced with the signing of the Yawuru Native Title Global Agreement in the form of two Indigenous Land Use Agreements in 2010.</p>	Section 1.3 of Part 2 of the OBDS is titled ‘Yawuru Indigenous Land Use Agreement.’ This section outlines the importance of the ILUA in ‘recognising the primary and principal rights of the Yawuru community in protecting and preserving heritage values.’ This section recognises ‘the entire foreshore is significant to the Yawuru’ and states that ‘Heritage consultations and agreements (where necessary) with the Yawuru are required to ensure the management of affected land within the precinct is aligned with the Yawuru management plans and practices.’	Note submission.

SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS

			<p>Yawuru are concerned that the Shire has limited its recognition of Yawuru native title holders to the legal technical scope of the Global Agreement. In this regard Yawuru believe that we are treated as just another stakeholder or interest group and not accorded genuine respect as native title holders and traditional owners by the Shire of Broome with respect to planning Broome's future.</p>		
b			<p>Yawuru argue that the building of a new relationship between the Shire and Yawuru must incorporate Yawuru values within Broome's social, economic and civic fabric. This includes managing and protecting the natural environment and built heritage and infusing the statutory planning processes with Broome's rich and complex cultural and social heritage. Yawuru have articulated these values in submissions to the Shire of Broome on the Chinatown Development Strategy and the Local Planning Strategy and Scheme.</p> <p>Conventional use of statutory planning guidelines by the Shire does not incorporate Yawuru values: extended family life, use and occupancy of the land and seas, recreation and entertainment, social and economic enterprise and protocols that govern relationships between us and other cultural groups. Yawuru values go hand in hand with practical matters of liveability for Yawuru people, such as a space to live and access to the natural environment. These matters should also be incorporated in the Shire's plans.</p> <p>In a post native title determination environment Yawuru is seeking a dialogue with the Shire of Broome to explore how best Yawuru values should be incorporated into Broome's regional planning processes.</p>	<p>Yawuru was invited by the Shire to participate in a number of forums during the preparation of the Old Broome Development Strategy. An initial meeting was held between Cardno, the Shire and Nyamba Buru Yawuru staff prior to the preparation of the Strategy, and Yawuru staff also attended the public workshop in May 2013. Further to the adoption of the draft Strategy for advertising purposes, the Shire held a workshop with Yawuru on 16 April 2014.</p> <p>The vision of the Strategy is:</p> <p><i>Old Broome will be a vibrant, accessible and equitable mixed use precinct meeting the needs of residents and visitors through development that is respectful of the rich cultural heritage and natural environment.</i></p> <p>This is not considered to be inconsistent with the Yawuru values described.</p>	Note submission.
c			<p>Yawuru Concern with Draft Old Broome Development Strategy</p> <p>Whilst Yawuru recognise that the draft Strategy contains some positive initiatives, our concern is about the framework and philosophical underpinnings of the draft Strategy and the way it is incorporated in Broome's planning strategies.</p> <p>Yawuru believe that the Strategy does not reflect adequately Broome's heritage and values as a unique multicultural Australian town and a place where Yawuru native title rights have been recognised and celebrated. Despite references in the draft Strategy about the importance of protecting and enhancing Old Broome's heritage, Yawuru believe that the strategy will, in fact, do the opposite and undermine Broome's capacity to protect its heritage as a vibrant continuing feature of Broome's social and economic character.</p> <p>Yawuru argue that the Strategy represents a settler society vision of Broome's future with planning zones that will facilitate investment with little safeguards for the protection of Old Broome values or for the revitalisations of those values as an economic and social force.</p>	<p>See also the response to submissions 15(c) and 17(c) above.</p> <p>The Old Broome Values are articulated in the draft Local Planning Strategy 'Cultural heritage' section and provide over arching direction to development within the Shire.</p>	Reject
d			<p>Over the past three decades or more, Broome has been transformed by significant population and investment expansion. This transformation has eroded Yawuru and old Broome facilities' sense of ownership and connection to their community and natural environmental. Yawuru are concerned that this Strategy will intensify Old Broome's residential and commercial development without acknowledging the negative impact of Broome's development on Yawuru and Old Broome families.</p> <p>Yawuru is particularly concerned that the draft Strategy will promote further commercial and residential development along the foreshore which will have a negative impact on the cultural, environmental and social integrity of Yawuru and old Broome families and also</p>	<p>The majority of freehold land along the foreshore north of Louis Street is currently zoned 'Mixed Use' under TPS4. LPS6 will extend the 'Mixed Use' zoning south of Louis Street along the western side of Hamersley Street. The Old Broome Development Strategy will not in itself rezone any land, but will provide additional guidance for how land can be developed. The land described above is owned in freehold title and the Shire cannot prevent development from taking place. However, as</p>	Note submission.

SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS

			diminish an important long term economic asset for Broome.	<p>discussed above through the implementation of the draft Old Broome Design Guidelines the Shire will seek to control the built form of new development to ensure, as much as is possible, that it is respectful of the foreshore's cultural heritage and natural environment.</p> <p>With respect to public land along the foreshore, the Concept Plan identifies the potential for up to two buildings to be constructed– the relocated Town Beach Cafe and a 'Catalina Plane Hangar and Museum,' which is shown to the east of the museum. The exact location, size, and design of these buildings is yet to be determined.</p> <p>If these buildings are constructed, they will be in the ownership of the Shire and may be leased to a private operator as is the case currently with the Town Beach Cafe. This will allow for a high level of public access and usage and will prevent privatisation of the foreshore.</p> <p>It is noted that The Concept Plan is intended to serve as a non-statutory tool to identify potential project ideas and orientate them spatially. It does not provide the level of detail of a Master Plan and should not be used as such. The elements on the Concept Plan are indicative and will be subject to future investigations (including an assessment of feasibility) and detailed design.</p>	
e			There is no economic justification or policy document which supports dispersing Broome's commercial footprint further into the Old Broome area. Broadening the mixed use precinct is likely to have a detrimental impact on the commercial viability of Chinatown as Broome's commercial heart and also create an economic environment which erodes the Old Broome character by encouraging redevelopment in a highly urbanised manner.	<p>As discussed above the LPS shows the entirety of Old Broome as 'Mixed Use.'</p> <p>Section 4 of Part 2 of the Old Broome Development Strategy is an Analysis of Commercial Demand, which was undertaken using population projections prepared by AEC Group in 2012 to assist with the preparation of the LPS. Section 4 considers that under the medium growth scenarios 2 and 3, there is likely to be a approximate shortfall of between 18,000m² and 22,000m² of retail floor space and between 3,000 and 5,000m² of commercial office floor space by 2031.</p> <p>Objective 1 of Section 4.1.2 (Land Use) states:</p> <p><i>1. For Old Broome to evolve over time into a mixed use area that complements but does not detract from the town centre functions of Chinatown.</i></p> <p>The Strategy is clear that the bulk of new retail</p>	Reject.

SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS

				<p>development should take place in Chinatown, but there is scope for some of the office, tourist and service-orientated commercial uses to locate in Old Broome as is currently the case.</p> <p>The introduction of the OBSCA will limit the density of development in much of Old Broome to R10 which is not 'highly urbanised' built form.</p>	
f			<p>Yawuru argue that the Shire of Broome will fail to capitalise on long-term economic and social development opportunities if it pursues planning strategies for Broome's development that does not include Yawuru and Old Broome families as strategic partners. The draft Strategy fails to encompass a range of living heritage values which makes Broome a fascinating and unique Australian town.</p> <p>Broome's remarkable multicultural heritage is an important aspect of tourism, Broome's biggest industry, but this is not incorporated in a meaningful tangible form in the draft Strategy.</p> <p>The draft Strategy is further evidence of the Shire's segmented and uncoordinated approach to planning in Broome. It does not link or incorporate other strategies and initiatives such as the Chinatown Development Strategy, the Jetty to Jetty Project. The Broome Heritage Interpretation Project and the Yawuru Conservation Estate into a cohesive planning vision or narrative for Broome's future.</p>	<p>The Old Broome Development Strategy is consistent with what is recommended in the Chinatown Development Strategy. Elements on the Concept Plan, such as the tram line, the jetty to jetty walk, and the relocation of the municipal library follow on from what was proposed in the Chinatown Development Strategy Concept Plan. Section 4 of Part 2 (Analysis of Commercial Demand) draws heavily on the methodology and conclusions from the Chinatown Development Strategy.</p> <p>In July 2014 Council endorsed the business case for the Jetty to Jetty Project and at the same time received and formally acknowledged the comprehensive work undertaken by Nyamba Buru Yawuru (NBY) for the identification and development of interpretive signage material and locations between Town Beach and Chinatown. Council further invited NBY to enter into an Accord with the Shire to incorporate the interpretive signage material into Stage 1 of the Jetty to Jetty Roebuck Bay Coastal Walk.</p>	Reject.
g			<p>Although the Strategy's vision statement refers to "development that is respectful of the rich cultural heritage and natural environment", the Strategy's treatment of Yawuru and Aboriginal and Asian cultural heritage is tokenistic. The proposal for a Yawuru Cultural centre to be part of the Jetty to Jetty walk does not begin to demonstrate the significance of Yawuru people's connection to the country where Broome is located. The Strategy confines Yawuru to museum relic status. Nowhere is mentioned the song lines that intersect Broome, places where Yawuru have used for thousands of years, sites that tell stories of early Yawuru and settler encounters, or the institutional colonial practices that controlled the lives of Yawuru, other Aboriginal groups and Asian people. The story of the Common Gate which is vitally important to Yawuru and old Broome families is not referred to in the Strategy.</p> <p>The failure of the Strategy to incorporate these aspects of Broome's living tradition means that history is silenced and the explanation about much of Broome's built heritage and the way the town has operated, as both a community and population centre, is not told.</p>	<p>The Old Broome Development Strategy is fundamentally a land use planning strategy and its purpose is not to describe in detail all elements of Broome's rich history.</p> <p>In August 2014 the Shire updated its Municipal Heritage Inventory, this contains a more detailed thematic history about the development of Broome.</p> <p>A business case for the Jetty-to-Jetty walkway was presented to Council in July 2014. Comprehensive work undertaken by Nyamba Buru Yawuru was recognised in Council's resolution. Also, as part of Council's resolution, Nyamba Buru Yawuru was invited to enter into an Accord with the Shire of Broome to incorporate the signage material it has developed into stage 1 of the Jetty-to-Jetty walk. The proactive work Nyamba Buru Yawuru undertakes is recognised by the Shire of Broome and similar</p>	Support. No modifications required.

SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS

				<p>Accords are encouraged in future development ventures initiated by the Shire.</p> <p>An email was sent (dated 14 August 2014) to Nyamba Buru Yawuru inviting it to provide input and/or prepare additional text to be included in Section 3 – Heritage in Part 2 of the OBDS. No response was received prior to the preparation of the final report for Council..</p>	
h			<p>Conclusion Yawuru request that the Shire of Broome do not proceed with the Old Broome Development Strategy and that a formal dialogue between Yawuru and the Shire is commenced so that Yawuru and Old Broome family values can be incorporated into Broome’s shire plans and development strategies.</p> <p>Yawuru believe that the time has come to develop a holistic and comprehensive vision for our town that weaves Yawuru culture and values, history or pearling and multiculturalism, Broome’s built heritage and our extraordinary natural environment into an interconnected narrative. Such a narrative will enhance Broome’s social cohesion and build our collective capacity to attract public and private investment to support a comprehensive Broome vision.</p> <p>This objective can only be achieved through a collaboration of Broome’s primary local institutional pillars; the Shire of Broome and the Yawuru Native Title Holders Corporation. Yawuru would welcome such collaboration.</p>	<p>The Old Broome Development Strategy will be adopted by the Shire as a Local Planning Policy to guide land use and development in the area identified as ‘Precinct 2 – Old Broome’ under the LPS. As discussed in submission 35(a) above, the public advertising period for the Strategy well exceeded what is required for a local planning policy. As discussed in submission 51(b) above, Yawuru participated in a number of forums during the design and advertising of the Strategy. Additional consultation is not considered necessary.</p>	Note submission.
50	M. Chi PO Box 141 BROOME, WA, 6725	22-24 Frederick Street			
a			<p>I do not support the creation of such a large boat trailer bitumen carpark in the proposed location. I may support a smaller car park. I do not support the loss of too much of the lawn area at town beach. I am not certain that I support the relocation of the town beach café and the relocation of the new building/restaurant to the proposed site as it will restrict the public from access to the view unless we are in the restaurant.</p>	As per submissions 10 and 28 above.	Support in part. As per submissions 10 and 28 above.
b			<p>I do not agree with fish cleaning facilities at Demco Beach area. Traditionally Aboriginal people clean their fish at the water’s edge and throw the guts etc for the sea gulls to eat and into the sea for the tide to take away and for the little fish or tiny crabs etc. to eat. Anything caught or killed is supposed to be left for the sea to take rather than left in rubbish bins or dumped elsewhere. There are rocks at that beach that people can clean their fish against. Not sure what fish cleaning facilities are being suggested but if you are thinking of having them at the car park, you have to provide water as well and bins. This will result in smells and increased ant activity and scavenging dogs. Unpleasant.</p>	<p>Element 32 in Section 5.2 discusses Demco Beach amenities. Fish cleaning facilities are not mentioned as part of this Element. The elements on the Concept Plan are indicative and will be subject to future investigations (including an assessment of feasibility) and detailed design. The provision of fish cleaning facilities requires responsible community use and ongoing regular maintenance by Shire crews. Whether such facilities are feasible will be tested when the master Plan is prepared.</p> <p>It is noted that fish cleaning is mentioned in Section 2.1.7 – Demco Beach Facilities in Part 2. Part 2 is intended to provide background information and analysis and will not have either a statutory or a visionary role.</p>	Note submission.

SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS

c			<p>Please do not interfere with the red pindan cliffs at the north of Town Beach or start growing more lawn or watering that area, you will cause the red cliffs to erode and fall into the sea even quicker. Please do not build structures around this fragile piece of dirt. I do not agree with the suggestion of an amphitheatre as it will mean more traffic, more lawn and more erosion. The area is arid, yet you keep wanting to make it tropical and pump more water in the area. Broome people need to accept the environment they live in rather than change it. Please don't ruin our town by wanting to change its environment for people who only visit.</p>	<p>Element 28 of the Concept Plan focuses on 'Coastline Stability and Revetment' and makes specific reference to the eroded pindan cliffs at Town Beach. Element 28 recommends erosion protection and control measures to be implemented at vulnerable locations along the length of the foreshore, including a revetment to help prevent further erosion of the pindan cliffs. The Shire has already prepared a plan (Town Beach Revetment Strategy / Plan) and undertaken detailed design to construct the revetment, and is currently sourcing funding to carry out the works. The amphitheatre is secondary to the primary purpose of limiting erosion.</p> <p>Whilst Element 2 in the Concept Plan talks about establishing a linear foreshore park, the landscaping of the park has not been determined. The Concept Plan does not provide the level of detail of a Master Plan and should not be used as such, as the elements on the Concept Plan are indicative and will be subject to future investigations (including an assessment of feasibility) and detailed design. Future investigations will need to consider the appropriateness of irrigated lawn areas.</p>	Note submission.
d			<p>I do not agree with a stone walled bathing pool which will retain water from high tides. That is the beauty of Broome tidal movement, it flushes things out. We are not in Sydney where this concept comes from and where there is limited movement. What happens when you get iriganji, jellyfish, sea snakes and crocodiles and other fish in that stone pool. How are you going to get them out and what is the insurance risk to the shire and danger to the public. We used to have a steel wire enclosure to swim in (ask the older Broome local people), we used to have wire and wood fish traps at Town Beach and when it was jelly fish season the jelly fish would get stuck in those wire structure. If people are so desperate to have somewhere to swim 24 hours a day they should go to Cable Beach or find a swimming pool. This pool will be an eyesore and interfere with the line of the coast.</p>	As per submission 15(i) above.	Support in part. As per submission 15 (i) above.
51	Uniting Church Northern Synod PO Box 38221 WINNELLIE, NT, 0821	11 & 13 Anne Street 40 Robinson Street	<p>While in agreement with the general intent of the Old Broome Development Strategy, there is a need for fine tuning of the area use zoning boundaries. In the current strategy proposal there is one type of zoning on one side of a street or and different zoning on the other side of street where the area boundaries meet. Conventionally, zoning boundaries would follow the property boundaries rather than the street line. This convention has been used where Area A meets Areas B and C in the development strategy.</p> <p>Under the proposed development strategy the Broome Uniting Church and its associated buildings at 11 & 13 Anne St and 40 Robinson St will be zoned Mixed Use Tourist/Residential while the other side of Anne At will be zoned Commercial/Civic.</p> <p>In the view of the Uniting Church the Commercial/Civic zoning is a more appropriate rating for the southern side of Anne St adjacent to the hospital, as it will accurately reflect the current use of the Church and associated buildings. It will also address potential future usage as the Church responds to the mission and ministry needs within the Broome community.</p>	The contents of this submission from the Northern Synod duplicates the submission from the Broome Uniting Church – Refer 39 above.	Support. As pr submission 39 above

SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS

			The adoption of the Commercial/Civic zoning for the Uniting Church area of Anne St will also ensure that the Uniting Church and the other Churches within the Old Broome area will be within the same zoning area and guidelines which will allow for equitable planning.		
52	Uniting Church Northern Synod		COMMERCIAL IN CONFIDENCE	As per submission 39 above.	Support. As per submission 39 above.
53	W. Freeman PO Box 1868 BROOME, WA, 6725	Robinson St			
a			<p>I would like to acknowledge many good aspects of this plan around the need to preserve the traditional aspects of Old Broome in its built design, inclusion of the natural environment and lifestyle. There are many specifics of this plan that I also agree with but due to constraints I will focus on point of concern.</p> <p>Mixed Use: The strategy talks of Old Broome purely as mixed use development and neglects to refer to it in terms of the residential area in which it is.</p>	<p>The LPS describes the objective for Precinct 2 (Old Broome) as:</p> <p><i>Establish Precinct 2 as a ‘Mixed Use’ area consisting of residential, tourist, and office uses in an open form of development that recognises the historic character of the area.</i></p> <p>Residential uses are a key part of the mix of uses for the area. However, it is noted that ‘residential’ uses are not specifically mentioned Section 1.1 – Background. This is an oversight and it is considered that this section should be amended to more accurately reflect the intent.</p>	<p>Support. Recommend amending the second sentence of paragraph 4 in Section 1.1 – Background to state:</p> <p><i>It is intended that there be diversity in the land uses provided within the precinct to include residential, offices, community services, tourist development and limited retail; and that the cultural heritage, recreational and tourism values of the area be maintained.</i></p>
b			<p>Hopton and Hamersley St Extension: <i>Extend Hamersley Street towards Town Beach as far as an extension of Hopton Street between the museum and the proposed tram line.</i></p> <p>This will erode the limited public open space available for public recreational use. Though the Strategy talks of the road being available for closure for special events the majority of the time it will add to the hard surface area in the precinct adding heat and taking away capacity for rain stormwater retention.</p>	As per submission 11(c) above.	Support in part. As per submission 11(c) above.
c			<p>Changing Road layouts Plans to extend Weld Street straight through to intersect with Louis Street and Hamersley Street at a new Roundabout and a new formal road link between Hamersley Street and Robinsons Street between the Seaview Shopping Centre and the Broome Museum will both result in the loss of public parking spaces.</p> <p>The Strategy mentions any car parking removed in order to achieve a proposal in the concept plan is to be replaced elsewhere within the precinct. Unfortunately this will be at the expense of more lost open public space and again create more heat sink hard surfaces and lost capacity for rain and stormwater retention.</p>	As per submissions 15(v) and 41(d) above. It is proposed that the action mandating replacement of car parking be deleted.	Support in part. As per submissions 15(v) and 41(d) above.
d			<p>Verge Parking: Old Broome’s wide verges are integral to its character and mustn’t be chopped up for parking spaces. In the Strategy <i>Figure 3 Parking Configurations</i> shows clear parking plan but <i>Figure 6 Concept Plan – Town Beach Foreshore Section</i> shows a conflicting plan and large sections of the Old Broome region are left undefined in relation to road side verge parking.</p>	As per submission 41(d) above.	Support. As per submission 41(d) above.

SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS

			<p>As above removing road verges not only takes away from the character of Old Broome but adds dramatically to the hard surfaces that create heat and reduce soil retention of rain and stormwater.</p> <p>The Strategy also acknowledges; <i>As Old Broome evolves into a more intensive residential and mixed use area, the requirements for car parking will increase. It will be important that car parking for development is sensitively sited so that does not visually dominate verges and street frontages. Apart from being very expensive to build and maintain; extensive car parking, not in use for extended periods of time, will increase the number of hard surfaces in and around Old Broome. Hard surfaces are not ideal in Broome's climate and have the potential to become visually and environmentally detrimental to the area.</i></p> <p>All this additional parking will mostly be for special events and mostly underutilised. Additional parking and road extensions will not be successful in assisting traffic flow at special event occasions as they will just encourage more vehicular use and exacerbate the problem. Limited parking will encourage better use of cycleways, walkways and the future tram and public transport. The exception to additional parking and road access will need to be for disabled and emergency services access.</p>		
e			<p>Town Beach boat parking I fully support the removal of parking bays from the Town Beach foreshore to help create a more safe and family friendly reserve. The extension of the Robinson St car and trailer parking needs to be reduced or redesigned to not encroach on any of the current limited reserve space.</p>	As per submission 10 above.	Support in part. As per submission 10 above.
f			<p>Relocate the Municipal Library Relocate the municipal library to Chinatown near the Visitor's Centre will result in loss of public open space in the Haynes oval and surrounds. This is also a well-used public special events area. If the library needs to be relocated the site of the old shire chambers could be explored.</p>	As per submission 15(k) above.	Note submission.
g			<p>Bourne and Ingliss store This heritage site has WA heritage protection but as yet not listed with the Shire. All avenues of protection need to be explored and implemented to secure the future preservation and restoration of this site. Too many Broome heritage buildings has been lost through neglect of demolition.</p>	The Bourne and Ingliss Store was listed in the Municipal Inventory 2004 and the recently reviewed and updated 2014 version. The store is listed as Place No. 18 with a grading of 'A' which is the highest level of significance.	Support. No modifications required.
h			<p>Drainage The strategy recognises the importance of drainage, especially in relation to the environmental protection of Roebuck Bay and environmental impacts such as Lyngbya algal blooms. Excessive and special use parking adds to this problem by creating more hard surfaces. Building density increases in Old Broome will also add to the problems of drainage and as such as much as possible of Old Broome's R10 zoning needs to be preserved.</p>	<p>Submissions 2 and 11(d) support expanding the extents of the Old Broome Special Character Area where the R10 density coding will be maintained.</p> <p>Submission 41(d) outlines controls to limit car parking in road verges and submission 48(o) outlines that parking for events is to be informal in nature.</p>	Support. No modifications required.
i			<p>Footpaths Many current footpaths have been laid next to busy roads and still create a hazard to users especially children. Footpaths needs to be separated from the road. Areas of verge parking have also created hazards with footpath safety.</p>	<p>Standards for footpath construction in WA are outlined in the Institute of Public Works Engineering Australia (IPWEA) <i>Local Government Guidelines for Subdivisional Development</i> (Edition 2.1 -2011). The IPWEA Guidelines state:</p> <p><i>Footpaths should be separated from the street pavement, and usually located against or close to the property boundary. Footpaths may only be located abutting kerbs where site constraints preclude</i></p>	Note submission.

SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS

				<p><i>alternative sites, and where vehicle volumes or road design speeds are low. If footpaths abut kerbs, verges may need to be widened to accommodate trees in locations clear of services.</i></p> <p>In new subdivisions, footpaths will be constructed away from the seal road edge, however the Shire is unlikely to retrofit existing paths.</p>	
54	S. Salmon	11 Robinson Street			
a			<p>Why is the Town Beach Concept Plan linked to the Old Broome Town Planning? These should be two different documents, with different workshops and submission periods. Town Planning and development in Old Broome should be treated with respect and sensitivity, not tacked on as an after thought to what was originally a plan to revitalise Town Beach. The submission period of 42 days was not adequate, nor the level of awareness raised in the community.</p>	<p>The officer's response to submission 35(a) discusses the consultation period which well exceeded the statutory requirements for advertising a local planning policy under TPS4.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that the function of the Concept Plan is different than the function of the land use planning sections of the Old Broome Development Strategy. This is discussed in the officer's response to submission 13(e) above which recommends that the 'Implementation' section of the Strategy be amended to clearly describe the role both components will play in future decision making.</p>	Support in part. As per submission 13(e) above.
b			<p>The original workshop was advertised as</p> <p><i>"A workshop to discuss the future of Broome's Town Beach will be held on Tuesday 28 May and interested community member are invited to nominate themselves to attend. Shire of Broome Director Development Services, Andre Schonfeldt, says the workshop is part of a project that will ultimately produce a development strategy that will become a local planning policy to guide land use and development in the Town Beach precinct."</i></p> <p>It is concerning that this advertising is somewhat misleading, especially when considering that the document that transpired from this singular workshop is proposing drastic changes to the land uses in much of Old Broome. Where is Town Beach Precinct?</p> <p>Did Town Beach Precinct exist in any formalised Broome Shire documents before the beginning of this consultation period? According to the attendance register of the workshop, there were less than ten members of the public present. Is this considered an acceptable level of community input to the development of the plan?</p>	<p>The draft Local Planning Strategy which was originally adopted as a draft by Council in December 2012 and was publicly advertised in May 2013 identified the area of Old Broome as part of 'Precinct 1: Chinatown – Town Beach.' (Section 3.3.1.1) This area was described as:</p> <p><i>Precinct 1 contains the early settlement of Broome along the shores of Roebuck Bay from the Roebuck Bay Caravan Park site in the south to Chinatown in the north. It also includes Broome Airport (eastern half). The western boundary south of Frederick Street is generally Herbert Street. North of Frederick Street, the precinct includes newer commercial and retail areas on the southern margin of the airport. The precinct also includes the Demco residential subdivision.</i></p> <p>The Guidelines for Precinct 1 included the following point:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Prepare Development Strategies which consider the integration of retail, mixed use development and tourism and recreational values of the precinct.</i> <p>As per the above, when the public workshop was held on 28 May 2013 the Old Broome area was described in the draft LPS as 'Town Beach.' The Old Broome Development Strategy was therefore originally called</p>	Note submission.

SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS

				<p>the 'Town Beach Development Strategy,' similar to the Chinatown Development Strategy which had already been prepared and adopted by Council.</p> <p>During the submission period on the LPS, submitters expressed concern over the terminology used in the LPS and stated that the area in question was known as 'Old Broome.' As a result officers recommended to Council that the Precinct boundaries and names be changed so that the area south of Frederick Street and east of Herbert Street became its own precinct, referred to as 'Old Broome.' This was supported by Council in November 2013. To be consistent, the working title of the 'Town Beach Development Strategy' was amended to the 'Old Broome Development Strategy.'</p> <p>With respect to the public workshop in May 2013, – this was scheduled for after work hours to encourage the widest possible participation. How many residents choose to attend community engagement activities is not something that the Shire can control or direct.</p>	
55	E. Adams 17 Keane St PEPPERMINT GROVE, WA, 6011	42 Walcott Street			
a			No reopening the Walcott/Frederick intersection	As per submission 3 above.	Support in part. As per submission 3 above.
b			No more hospital extensions in Old Broome	As per submission 15(o) above.	Support in part. As per submission 15(o) above.
c			Retain R10 zoning always in residential areas	As per submissions 2 and 11(d) above.	Support in part. As per submissions 2 and 11(d) above.
d			In the inevitability of Roebuck Bay caravan park increasing in size & traffic, Walcott Street will become a very busy & noisy thoroughfare if Walcott intersection is re-opened.	As per submission 3 above.	Support in part. As per submission 3 above.
e			<p>In 1981 my husband introduced Lord McAlpine to Broome. We would go on to place Broome on the world map with the ultimate competition of the Cable Beach Club. He also understood that Broome's unique character was what drove the town's success as a international destination. Indeed he spent many years involved in the restoration of many old buildings and frequently believed that no building should be taller than a palm tree (where possible) and all new buildings should reflect Broome's heritage.</p> <p>This outlook remains just as relevant today and I as a long time resident with a long involvement in Broome do not wish to see the Broome that I love extinguished by profit driven development.</p>	<p>Building heights are determined by the local planning scheme. Under TPS4, development in the 'Mixed Use' and 'Tourist' zones must not exceed a wall height of 10 metres and a building height of 14 metres (generally corresponding to three storeys). These limits have been carried across in LPS6 for all non-residential development.</p> <p>Residential development is restricted under both TPS4 and LPS6 to a wall height of 6.5 metres and a building height of 10.5 metres (generally corresponding to two stories).</p> <p>The 'Broome style Architecture' provisions in LPS6 as outlined in the officer's response to submission 15(II) above and the draft Old Broome Design Guidelines</p>	Note submission.

SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS

				will help control the form of new development and ensure it is compatible with Broome's character.	
56	Salten Pty Ltd "The Company" PO Box 753 SOUTH PERTH, WA, 6951	1 Robinson Street			
a			<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Company as Trustee for the CP Smartt Superannuation Fund is the owner of Lot 1 on Survey Strata Plan 42301 (1 Robinson Street Broome) "the Company's land" 2. The company generally supports the concept of a development strategy for the old Broome precinct – the proposal as put however to rezone the Company's land (and that adjoining it) from R20 to Mixed Use Residential/Tourist will, the Company believes, have a material adverse effect on the location generally and is not consistent with the proposed residential development the Company had planned and would like to see happen. 	During the submission period for the LPS and LPS6 owners of the subject land requested that the land be zoned 'Mixed Use' with a density of 'R40'. Council supported this submission. The classifications in the OBDS are intended to provide further guidance with respect to preferred and non-preferred uses. Within 'Area D – Tourist / Residential,' residential development such as single, grouped and multiple dwellings will be preferred uses.	Reject.
b			<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. The Company would like to see the Company's land rezoned from R20 to R50 to enable its development (making use of its dual Robinson Street and Hamersley Street frontages) into three residential units – thereby taking full advantage of the vary few oceanfront lots still available in Broome as a whole. 	As per above, subject to the Minister approving LPS6 the subject land will be zoned 'Mixed Use' with a density of 'R40.' This will allow for grouped dwelling development. It is noted, however, that the Hamersley Street frontage of the subject land is shown as a 'Priority Active Frontage'. New residential development will not be permitted along priority active frontages unless located above or behind a new or existing commercial development on site.	Support in part. No modifications required.
c			<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. The Company considers this type of development is much needed in the area and by retaining its residential zoning (and that of the adjoining land) the views and amenity of the location would be preserved. 	The draft Old Broome Design Guidelines contain development controls to ensure the views of Roebuck Bay are preserved. These controls will apply to both residential and non-residential forms of development.	Note submission.
d			<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. The Company considers that to commercialise this section of Hamersley Street with some tourist type of development or anything other than Residential development would be bad planning and a lost opportunity for Broome and the precinct. 	The subject land faces the Conti Foreshore which is proposed to be enhanced as a linear foreshore park as described in Element 2 on the Concept Plan. Commercial activation will complement these improvements to the public realm and increase the level of passive surveillance. Hamersley Street is a main thoroughfare with considerable pedestrian and vehicular traffic, and the Concept Plan proposes a tram line to run along the eastern side of the street. The section of Hamersley Street north of Bedford Park already has a mixed use character and it is envisaged that this will extend south as the area further develops. Locating 'Mixed Use' development in this area is consistent with the urban planning principles articulated in the WAPC's <i>Liveable Neighbourhoods</i> .	Reject.
e			<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 6. The Company also considers that the Company's land – being a 611m² – long (47m) and narrow (13.2m) lot does not individually lend itself to a Tourism type of development – because of its size/shape and the constraints that would apply. 	As stated above tourism development will not be compulsory. Some form of commercial development will be required along the Hamersley Street frontage which is suitable for the site. Tourism development could also take the form of a Bed and Breakfast or Holiday Home which resembles a dwelling.	Reject.

SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS

				The OBDS requires a nil setback along lots depicted as such on the Strategy Plan which will help maximise the developable area of the subject land.	
57	A. McInerney				
a			With regards to 5.2.17, I am opposed to the proposed car park.	As per submission 10 above.	Support in part. As per submission 10 above.
b			With regards to Old Broome being zoned Mixed Use, I am opposed.	As per submission 17(c) above.	Reject.
c			With regards to the development of Lot 451 and 601 on the foreshore of Roebuck Bay, I am opposed.	As per submission 41(h) above.	Note submission.
d			With rising sea levels a fact, more emphasis should be placed on protecting the mangroves and I am opposed to any clearing.	As per submission 48(f) above.	Support. As per submission 48(f) above.
e			More focus should be placed on creating community areas where people can relax without fear of cars and drunks, a beautiful tree lined boulevard perhaps.	As per submission 15(f) above.	Note submission.
58	Water Corporation				
a			<p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide comment regarding the Draft Old Broome Development Strategy.</p> <p>The Water Corporation does not object to this development in principle; however it is subject to the advice on the following pages.</p> <p>All the advice provided by the Corporation is subject to annual and ongoing reviews and may change depending on;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Timing of development • Water Corporation Wastewater and Water Planning Reviews • Annual project prioritization review of the Corporations Capital Investment Program (even projects that are well advanced are subject to the financial situation at the time and hence deferral if there is other state wide projects which have higher priorities.) <p>If development has not proceeded within the next 6 months, the proponent is required to contact the Corporation in writing to confirm if the information is still valid.</p>	Noted.	Note submission.
b			<p><u>Redevelopment and Rezoning of Existing Areas – General Advice</u></p> <p>Water and Wastewater Scheme Infrastructure Planning & Capacity The proposed changes to landuse, in particular in areas D and B, appear to be significant enough to review the existing water and wastewater scheme planning to confirm what may be required to serve the area including possible upgrades. The Corporation planners have been asked to consider and provide advice if there is any significant upgrades are likely to be required. When this is understood the Corporation shall provide further advice.</p>	Noted. As discussed above the Strategy does not rezone any land and it is envisaged that redevelopment in the Precinct will be incremental.	Note submission.
c			<p>Water Reticulation The area is currently serviced, however there will be upgrades to existing reticulation required where the existing pipe size is 100mm diameter, upgrade to 150mm. The majority of the road reserves are 40 m wide. As the area redevelops reticulation mains are likely to be required on both sides of the road reserve to serve properties.</p>	Noted.	Note submission.
d			<p>Wastewater Reticulation The area includes wastewater reticulation in lots. Lots which are proposed to be redeveloped with existing wastewater reticulation along the boundaries will be required to consider the mains zone of influence and the Corporations requirements. These can be</p>	Noted. The position of existing utility infrastructure will be considered when subdivision and development of individual lots is proposed.	Note submission.

SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS

			found on the Corporations website at the following link;		
e			<p>Broome No. 2 Wastewater Pump Station (WWPS) Robinson Street</p> <p>Confirmation that this pump station is classed as a type 180 and requires a 50m* buffer from the centre of the wetwell has been requested. Only compatible landuse shall be supported within the buffer. A compatible landuse table was provided in the recent scheme planning and strategy public submission. The Corporation shall provide confirmation on the buffer when it is available.</p> <p><i>*the Water Corporation subsequently advised by email that the correct buffer was 30m</i></p>	<p>Noted. Using aerial photography it is estimated that the 30m buffer will encroach slightly into Reserve 22705 which on the Concept Plan is shown as having the potential for infill development.</p> <p>It is noted that The Concept Plan is intended to serve as a non-statutory tool to identify potential project ideas and orientate them spatially. It does not provide the level of detail of a Master Plan and should not be used as such. The elements on the Concept Plan are indicative and will be subject to future investigations (including an assessment of feasibility) and detailed design. The detailed design for future infill development will need to consider the location of Water Corporation infrastructure and any required buffers.</p>	Note submission.
f			<p><u>Proposed Re-establishment of the Rail Line</u></p> <p><u>7m wide corridor from Hopton St along Robinson and Hamersley to Frederick St</u></p> <p>History</p> <p>The steam engines on the tram line required water. The bore tanks and pipe work may have been originally installed for the steam engines, which are record on the state heritage register.</p> <p>In those days the Public Works Dept. would have been involved with delivering, operating and maintaining the train and the water infrastructure. The old tram line closed in 1966 and the Public Works Department was divided into separate departments during the 1980's.</p> <p>Preliminary Summary of existing water & wastewater mains that needs to be considered, including the requirements for;</p> <p>Proposed rail crossing existing mains</p> <p>Proposed rail running parallel in close proximity to existing mains</p> <p>The Corporation has prepared a preliminary summary of existing services in order for the shire to gauge the items that shall need to be addressed in a 'detailed utility service investigation report'. The Corporation supports with the understanding that a 'detailed utility service investigation report' is prepared during the early stages of the project to identify requirement for all utilities. A report should include but not be limited to; cross sections, zone of influence of mains, separation distances between above and below ground infrastructure and service utility.</p> <p>Please find the attached marked plan giving an indication of where a proposed rail may cross existing mains and the route running parallel may be in close proximity to existing mains, and potentially require relocation in order to accommodate the rail. Below are some general comments in regard to crossing, separation distances and process to relocate or provide protection to existing mains.</p> <p>Treatment for rail crossing existing and planned future mains under pressure.</p> <p>The treatment of rail crossing Corporation assets shall meet Corporation requirements and meet AS 4799-200 and Owner/Operator requirements. AS4799-2000 is an important</p>	As per submission 11(b) above.	Note submission. As per submission 11(b) above.

SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS

			<p>standard to enable the management of risk to the rail, its users and the operation of our assets. It applies to any operating rail and one of its main objectives is to remove risk to the rail, rail cars, and particularly to all those people operating the train and being transported. The specifications within the standard make it such that any burst on a pressure main (water or sewer) below the rails will not risk the operation of the train.</p> <p>The general treatment is for pipes to be installed in sleeves. Design plan examples of sleeves can be provided on request. Consulting engineer is required to provide his own design in liaison with the Corporation's asset manager, and that each individual design may need to vary depending on the location, surroundings, risks, asset type, and other important factors.</p> <p>Treatment for rail running parallel and in close proximity to existing or future planned mains, and consideration of separation distances The treatment may be required to meet AS4799-200. The information on the Corporations website may assist when reviewing separation distances. There may sections of main where the only option may be to relocate. This should be considered along with the requirement for road reserves that are 40m wide to have water mains on both sides of the road, which may be delivered as the area develops and in combination with a proposed rail. Link to information regarding building near services.</p> <p>Future Planned Mains Sleeves under the rail shall be considered for future planned mains, if there is a good opportunity to install as part of the rail project / during the rail project in order to assist future construction / installation.</p> <p>Process to deliver protection and relocation of existing water/wastewater pipe work All crossings will be required to be designed to our standards and submitted in accordance with the requirement of the Developer's Manual for reticulation class assets. For headwork class mains that require relocation protection, contact should be made initially with the regions Asset Manager.</p> <p>Submissions will be by individual assets but can be lumped into one or a few submissions as agreed with the Assets Manager & Development Services Branch. Submissions are to be made by a suitable consulting engineer who may initially liaise with the Corporation's asset manager for advice prior to developing final proposals.</p> <p>All submissions shall include existing service detail and have taken into account the guidance in the 'Utility Providers Code of Conduct'.</p>		
59	J. O'Keeffe 92 Victoria St MOSMAN PARK, WA, 6012		<p>My brother, Julian Mills has written to you in length to oppose a large number of the recommendations of the Draft Old Broome Strategy. I would like to whole heartedly support all of his recommendations.</p> <p>Old Broome is unique in the setting that is represented in diagram outlined in green below. To change part of this to mixed use commercial and civic seems like madness to me. All ambience would be lost and I feel that property owners especially living north of Anne St along Walcott would be affected to the point where they might consider selling properties which could cause an aesthetic disaster that would be the beginning to the end of what is now cherished as Old Broome.</p> <p>Please consider this proposal with utmost care as it would be a terrible shame to see the ruining of a historical location that is so special to Broome. (Refer to Submission #28)</p>	As per submission 17(c) above.	Reject.

SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS

60	S. Blunt 81 Monument St WA, 6012		<p>My brother, Julian Mills has written to you in length to oppose a large number of the recommendations of the Draft Old Broome Strategy. I would like to whole heartedly support all of his recommendations. My family have been yearly visitors to Broome for last 18 years. This is a great family time that we cherish. This is largely due to Broome's uniqueness. We thoroughly enjoy staying in "Old Broome" at our family house. "Old Broome" is like China Town and Cable Beach, it is what makes Broome a place that people call special and mystifying. It is what creates "Broome Time" – a laid back atmosphere that you want to return to year after year. To bulldoze China Town would be seen as madness, to allow shops on Cable Beach would all be seen as ludicrous! So it astounds me why in a down turn in the economy for Broome (no gas hub, no major influx of workers) would the council even consider ruining the delightful streets of "Old Broome" by rezoning this area.</p> <p>Please consider this proposal with the utmost case as it would be a terrible burden to bare, the ruining of a historic location that is cherished and revered the world over. (Refer to Submission #28)</p>	As per submission 17(c) above.	Reject.
61	Hutchinson Real Estate				
a			I write to object to the above draft scheme as requested and submit my comments as follows. I think parts of the proposal are a disgrace and a very poor piece of planning and I wonder who is responsible for this atrocious piece of work which has caused much stress around the town.	Noted	Noted.
b			<p>Walcott St Opening</p> <p>I object and oppose the opening of Walcott St as this will have a negative effect on the character of the Old Broome area as a whole. The residential amenity of the area will be adversely affected due to the increased traffic flow resulting in an outflow of people living in the area. At present Walcott St epitomises the true character of Old Broome as referred to in the DOBCS as characterised with wide street verges and bungalows of low height and a sense of tranquillity with an impression of wildness and secrecy.</p> <p>It's amazing then that this document suggests investigation of the opening of Walcott St with the massive increase of traffic that would follow and destroy this historic character area for what gain? I have spoken to someone who said that the Shire engineer advised that it was the Shires intention to open Walcott St even through the review hasn't been completed which is concerning.</p>	As per submission 3 above.	Support in part. As per submission 3 above.
c			<p>Mixed Use Zoning proposal</p> <p>I believe the mixed use zone area proposal has gone too far.</p> <p>Old Broome is predominantly a residential area and should stay as such otherwise the whole character of the town could be diluted. It could also have a negative effect on Chinatown which is already struggling to attract customers. I believe the front row of properties along Hamersley and Robinson St and adjoining properties should be the only properties rezoned to mixed use. Instead the balance could have an increased density of R20 to allow more homes. I am a local real estate agent with 27 years' experience in business in Broome although you don't have to be qualified to see the vacant shops and struggling businesses in Chinatown and the Boulevard shopping centre.</p>	As per submissions 15(c) and 17(c) above.	Reject.
d			<p>Town Beach Precinct</p> <p>I am alarmed and concerned about the plan for town beach suggested in the DOBCS. This area has evolved into its current form over many years and it works well and is practical and respectful.</p> <p>We do not want the existing parkland turned into a car park with the existing area pulled up at great expense.</p>	As per submission 10 above.	Support in part. As per submission 10 above.

SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS

			<p>We do not want a large car park in front of the properties fronting Robinson St where my family has lived since 1978 (84 and 86 Robinson St and 3 Hopton St). This new huge bitumen car park will be a massive heat sink. This will impact us more than most. The car park, as it is, has shape, is organic and reacts to the topography of the site and is easy to park in with boats or cars. It is currently well treed and is spread out for minimal impact. It works well. These proposed changes will be less functional than the existing setup as people will have to walk a long way after launching their boats particularly when the tide is out. I am also the owner of Workline Dive and Tackle and have good experience in this field.</p> <p>Only last year I watched a brick retaining wall and garden bed being built across the road from 86 Robinson St. Is this to now be demolished to make way for a car park?</p>		
e			The moving of the café is a waste of money and would be disrespectful to the relatives of those that are buried in the pioneer cemetery as it would dominate the view from the cemetery.	As per submission 28 above.	Support in part. As per submission 28 above.
f			The skate park could be positioned elsewhere rather than removing lawns and gardens at more expense causing the loss of a great picnic area. Why not put it in an undeveloped area or closer to residential areas or leave it where it is on Cable Beach Rd. This may also affect the amenity of the area with large groups of teenagers potentially menacing young children and the elderly as they enjoy a quiet area.	As per submission 1(a) above.	Support. As per submission 1(a) above.
g			This area is also used by many local aboriginal families and other long term residents who I believe would see this as an extremely negative retrograde move. If you look at town beach you will see many locals driving down to the foreshore to eat their lunch or check the tide and beach conditions which have become a tradition in Broome. The elderly and the infirm could be denied reasonable access in your plan.	As per submission 10 above.	Support in part. As per submission 10 above.
h			I object to the removal of any mangroves for obvious reasons, the mangroves are the nursery for many fish, birds and aquatic species. Do we really need an enclosed swimming area which will still be subject to irukandji and box jelly fish. Broome is not Bondi or Cairns.	As per submissions 15(i) and 48(f) above.	Support in part. As per submissions 15(i) and 48(f) above.
i			<p>Conclusion</p> <p>Overall this plan is a retrograde step at expense and should not proceed in anyway near its current form. The funds should be spent to enhance what is already there or put towards the new tram track or walk way or anything else. Otherwise you may have a riot on your hands. I appreciate the opportunity to submit and look forward to a positive outcome for all.</p>	As per submission 13(e) above.	Support in part. As per submission 13(e) above.
62	V. Burgess & M. Owen	15 Walcott Street			
a			<p>We strongly object to the Old Broome are being turned into what would effectively be a theme park for tourists alongside commercial and civic offices.</p> <p>In particular we object to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The change to mixed use commercial/civic for area B • The opening up of Walcott St intersection with Frederick St to traffic • The increase in kerbage and introduction of pavements to Walcott St • The opening up of Anne St intersection with Hamersley St to traffic • The development of the hospital to the north • Increase in car parking in area B especially around the Broome Primary School • The increase in size of the caravan park. 	As outlined below.	Note submission.
b			<p><u>The change to mixed use commercial/civic for area B</u></p> <p>In your background statement you talk about ‘enhancing the sense of place’ you state that ‘there be diversity in the land uses provided within the precinct to include offices, retail,</p>	As per submission 53(a) above. Officers have recommended that ‘residential’ be added to the statement in question.	Support. As per submission 53(a) above.

SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS

			<p>community services and hotels, and that the cultural heritage, recreational and tourism values of the area be maintained.’ The fact that this is also a main residential area and has been for long time is not mentioned in this background statement. What does this say about your future plans?</p>		
			<p>Elsewhere (p19) you talk about the principle to ‘retain and preserve the heritage significance of Old Broome’.</p> <p>In Point 1.2.2 Residential Character you state: Old Broome was created in a grid road pattern, with wide road reserves (up to 40 metres) including generous verges which over time have been dotted with nature vegetation. Some roads such as Stewart Street and portions of Walcott Street are somewhat haphazard: lacking kerbing, formal paved crossovers, and footpaths. Older buildings are set back a considerable distance from the street as well as from side and rear boundaries, giving an impression of spaciousness. Front fencing is seldom provided, and when it is provided it is typically of a low height and does not appear visually dominant, enhancing a sense of openness. Most lots now contain lush vegetation which further adds to character and gives passers by the impression of wildness and secrecy. The oldest homes are low height with large open verandahs which ensures that the landscape is dominated by vegetation and not buildings. Although only a short distance from the heart of Chinatown, when walking the streets of the Old Broome residential areas you feel far away from the urban environment.</p> <p>While you appear to value these characteristics you plan is to turn the area into mixed used – ‘4.1.2 That Old Broome be a focus for business tourism and for tourist activity’. In particular, Area B, which currently has a high number of residential properties, would become mixed use, commercial civic. The strategy (see point 4.1.3) states: Supporting scheme amendments for lots of frontage to the streets Increasing density to R40 Not permitting new residential development unless located above or behind an existing commercial development on site.</p> <p>As residents of Walcott St of several years, we are currently surrounded by residential properties, which are lived in and/or owned by families with children. We chose to live here, precisely because it is a very quiet street, with little traffic, where the house has a large garden and frontage which give a sense of space and peace. We have spent time cultivating the leafy native vegetation which gives this area so much character. Many people have invested heavily in properties along this street precisely because they value very highly the attributes you pay lip service to in point 1.2.2 above. They do not want to live in cramped suburbs where the houses are built to the edge of the block, surrounded by Colorbond fencing, where there is little shade or breeze and no privacy. There is already enough development going on in Broome North, Roebuck, Cable Beach and Sunset Park estates that an increase in density is not required anywhere in Old Broome. Changing this area to mixed use, commercial/civic would detract from that value and irrevocably diminish the character of this area.</p>	<p>As per submissions 15(c) and 16(c) above.</p> <p>With reference to the comments in Section 4.1.3, up-coding to a density of R40 will only be considered in areas outside the OBSCA, and will require individual landowners to request that Council progress a Scheme Amendment. Whilst LPS6 contains the provision that new residential development in the ‘Mixed Use’ zone will not be permitted unless located above or behind new commercial development (as does TPS4), the Strategy will make clear that this is only mandatory for lots located along a ‘Priority Active Frontage.’ (Refer Internal submission).</p>	Reject.
c			<p><u>The opening up of Walcott St intersection with Frederick St to traffic</u> <u>And the increase in kerbage and introduction of pavements that would cause to Walcott St</u></p> <p>Opening the Walcott St intersection with Frederick St to traffic, with the necessary changes to the road, kerbage and pavement development that would entail, would totally change the character of the street.</p>	<p>The potential opening of Walcott Street is discussed in submission 3 above.</p>	Support. As per submission 3 above.

SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS

			<p>We ourselves have a young boy who attends the local school and walks or cycles to school every day often with other children walking or cycling with us. The road is quiet and safe and car drivers recognise that this is a residential area with no pavements and drive accordingly. There is little traffic. At 8am this morning I stood with a neighbour talking on the street for over half an hour and in that time 3 cars passed.</p> <p>Opening Walcott Street directly to Frederick Street has been proposed in the past in traffic control proposals for Frederick and Hamersley Streets but quite rightfully has not been progressed.</p> <p>By opening up the Walcott/Frederick St end of the road, you will turn this road into a rat run for commuters, as well as for tour buses, taxis and cars heading to and from the airport. It will increase the traffic noise, the amount of pollution and increase the possibility of accidents on what is currently a very calm road. It will be less safe for pedestrians and cyclists. It will necessitate the building of pavements and kerbs which are not part of the style of Old Broome streets and which will increase the amount of polluting rain water running into Roebuck Bay.</p>		
d			<p>The style of road in this area of Old Broome is such that the grading of the road allows stormwater run-off to flow into the nature strips, ensuring it does not end up in Roebuck Bay, and at the same time watering the vegetation, ensuring less need for watering by households at Wet Season time or year. Contrary to your statement that pindan soil has low stormwater retention, it is highly noticeable after heavy rain how much water is retained by this soil. The soil becomes softer, easier for digging up weeds and planting new vegetation. The introduction of kerbage on the east (hospital) side of Walcott St has already meant that more water flows down the street, picking up waste which then flows directly into the Bay, and households on the side of the street have to rely more on reticulation of their nature strips, increasing water usage.</p> <p><u>Best practice on managing stormwater states:</u> “Use no kerbs”... This allows stormwater to infiltrate within road verges, median strips and carpark garden beds. Soakwells and drainage should be installed in road drainage side entry pits and within carparks http://www.water.wa.au/Publication Store/first/89893.pdf</p> <p><u>and this from the Stormwater Management Manual for Western Australia</u> Rainfall, for the majority of events occurring each year, should be retained or detained on site (i.e. as high in the catchment and as close to the source as possible, subject to adequate site conditions). Runoff from constructed impervious areas (e.g roofs and paved areas) should be retained or detained through the use of soakwells, pervious paving, vegetated swales or gardens. For detention systems, the peak 1 year average recurrence interval (ARI) discharge from constructed impervious areas should be attenuated to the pre-development discharge rate. Events larger than 1 year ARI can overflow ‘off-site’. For larger rainfall events (i.e greater than 1 year ARI events), runoff from constructed impervious areas should be retained or detained to the required design storm event in landscaped retention or detention areas in public open space or linear multiple use corridors. Any overflow of runoff towards waterways and wetlands should be by overland flow paths across the vegetated surfaces. Further detention may be required to ensure that the pre-development hydrologic regime of the receiving water bodies is largely unaltered, particularly in relation to peak flow rates and, where practical, discharge volume. http://www.water.wa.gov.au/Publication Store/first/44217.pdf</p>	<p>Broome has vastly different soils, landscape and rainfall compared to southern areas, which requires a different approach to Water Sensitive Urban Design. Methods as often practiced in the southern part of the state will not be effective in Broome. Once pindan is saturated, it is relatively impermeable and stormwater then tends to evaporate faster than it will be expected to permeate within the soil. For this reason, soakwells are not used in Broome.</p> <p>Old Broome when subdivided was not designed to incorporate swales to accommodate the drainage requirements. The drainage strategy within the Old Broome area has attempted to maintain the flow of water into the verge areas by using depressed crossovers and gaps in the kerbs to maintain historic drainage. The previously completed Barker Street reconstruction project is an example of this practice</p> <p>Kerbs are typical of an urban road formation and protect the edge of the road from breaking. The recent Herbert Street subdivision used flush kerb, however this treatment is expensive to implement.</p> <p>The Old Broome Development Strategy in Section 4.5.4 (Natural Resource and Environmental Management) recommends additional measures to improve stormwater management within Old Broome, such as:</p> <p><i>1. Investigate retrofitting existing drains in Old Broome to reduce discharge of nutrient loads into</i></p>	Reject.

SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS

			The introduction of kerbage is completely contradictory to best practise of stormwater management in WA. Increasing traffic in this area is at odds with the stated intent of making it easier and safer for cyclists and pedestrians. The fact that the Shire has already started the process of developing these 'ideas' by introducing kerbage on one side of Walcott St and the roundabout at the end of the street makes one wonder if this draft plan is already in progress by stealth.	<i>Roebuck Bay.</i> <i>2. Investigate opportunities for the retention of stormwater in existing landscaped areas of Public Open Space, such as in portions of Bedford Park.</i>	
e			<u>The opening up of the Anne St intersection with Hamersley St to traffic</u> The opening of Anne Street to Hamersley Street is proposed without evidence of genuine need or benefit. Again it will only serve to increase the traffic in an otherwise very quiet street, near a park where families often gather. There is no need for this to go ahead.	Support in part. As outlined in Submission 3 above.	Support in part. As per submission 3 above.
f			<u>The development of the hospital to the north</u> Page 13 mentions the development of the existing hospital to the north. Given that this area includes not only our residential dwelling but several others, it is clear the intent is to destroy these dwellings to develop the hospital. These dwellings currently house several families, who either live in them or bought them at high cost for the quiet enjoyment of this area. There are also two Shire of Broome Municipal Inventory Places directly to the north of the hospital and it is part of the so-called 'Old Broome Special Character Area'. There is no need to develop the hospital in this way. We believe there is already an existing space laid aside for the building of a new hospital on Cable Beach Road West. If this is not the case, then, if the hospital does need to expand, it should build elsewhere, not in an area surrounded as it is at present on three sides by residential dwellings, and with a primary school on the remaining side.	Support in part. As per submission 15(o) above.	Support in part. As per submission 15(o) above.
g			<u>Increase in car parking in area B especially around the Broome Primary School</u> This area does not need more car parking which will merely encourage more traffic into the area, especially around the Primary school. If anything, the area needs to be decongested, as the increased movement of cars in the morning is an extra risk to child safety and discourages people from walking or cycling to school. The increased parking would also detract from the character of the area, especially in the so-called 'Old Broome Special Character Area'.	As per submission 41(d) above. The car parking survey will consider whether the current parking provision is sufficient, and the outcomes of this survey will inform the preparation of a Parking Management Strategy which will consider the appropriate location and design for additional car parking, if required.	Support in part. As per submission 41(d) above.
h			<u>The increase in size of the caravan park</u> We do not believe this park needs to be any larger. We wonder if there may be a conflict of interest between Shire members who have a stake in the Caravan Park and the development of this Park. Broome is unique. It is the reason people come here to live and make their homes. It is immensely stressful, to build a life and a home anywhere, to then see what attracted you and kept you in that place ripped apart by the town Shire. If it has a reputation as a 'too hard town' maybe that is for a good reason. If the residents do not fight for that uniqueness it will simply disappear or become a parody of itself as some tourist theme park, as seems to be the intention of the Shire. Old Broome and especially area B has to remain a strongly residential area, with quiet streets, leafy vegetation and secluded houses lived in primarily by residents, not tourists, to maintain the character.	Expansion of the caravan park is proposed into the area that is currently occupied by the Department of Parks and Wildlife / Department of Environment Regulation only. The officer's response to submission 15(r) above explains that this will not happen without the support of the Departments which would have to relocate.	As per submission 15(r) above.
63	M. Ozies PO Box 5523 BROOME, WA, 6725		This is a formal objection to the proposed planned development of a large car park area as stated in the Draft Attachment No2 – Old Broome Development Strategies and Concept Plan for Town Beach and Conti Foreshore Part 1. I am a Traditional Owner whose Djugun families have lived in Broome since dreamtime: our existence was shaped by living along the coastline and managing food sources in the areas between Crab Creek and Willie Creek. My ancestors used natural fish traps which utilised	As per submission 10 above.	Support in part. As per submission 10 above.

SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS

			<p>rocks and the surrounding mangroves.</p> <p>They saw many changes throughout history, the onset of pearling from which many male and females members dies diving for pearls, the bombing of Broome by the Japanese; they welcomed the return family members who were lost at sea during the cyclones of 1940s from this very beach, witnessed the opening and closing of the pastoral industry abattoir and countless other changes.</p> <p>No Djugun person has ever ceded their sovereign right to make decisions on their land. No Djugun person has ever signed away their rights to claimed Native Title Lands. It is the Right enjoyed by all Yawuru traditional owners on Djugun country.</p> <p>I therefore strongly object the proposed development plan on behalf of all Djugun families whom have never been heard in the past and continue not to be heard by the Shire or the Yawuru Native Title land holding body.</p>		
64	R. Meister PO Box 2411 BROOME, WA, 6725	7 Walcott Street			
a			<p>I would like my objection registered regarding your proposal for the Old Broome Development Strategy on the following grounds:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The opening up of Walcott Street at the northern end does nothing to preserve the heritage, biodiversity and cultural values of Old Broome as this would mean the widening of the street and therefore result in a diminished feel for what Old Broome is all about, quality of life. 2. The increased traffic caused by the funnelling of vehicular movements from the planned roundabout on Frederick Street to Walcott Street all the way to Town Beach jeopardises the safety of pedestrians. To avoid this the widened road would have to also accommodate foot/cycle paths which in turn further erodes the heritage values of Old Broome. 	As per submission 3 above.	Support in part. As per submission 3 above.
b			<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. The rezoning of existing blocks in to smaller R codes will create the need to remove heritage trees from blocks in question resulting in significant loss of flora and fauna from a presently healthy and thriving eco system. 4. Nowhere in your draft planning policy do you state why all this is necessary. 	<p>The draft Old Broome Design Guidelines will apply to such matters as setbacks, building bulk, car parking, landscaping, outdoor living and landscaping. Many of the principles in these sections are based on historical development patterns.</p> <p>Within the OBSCA, development controls will be applied to matters such as and building design. These controls have been designed after taking into account the current form of development and will seek to ensure that the appearance of new 'Mixed Use' development will closely resemble existing residential development.</p>	
c			<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. There was very little community consultation regarding your proposal. I would have thought it appropriate to inform Residents of the areas in questions personally. 	As per submission 35(a) above. Engagement activities included a mail out to all landowners in the precinct.	Reject. As per submission 35(a) above
d			<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 6. The Town Beach reserve boat ramp proposal on such a small beach would further erode the already scarce public space and cater for an interest group (Recreational Fisherman) only. I would, however, support the expansion of the waterpark and the 	The Town Beach boat ramp is discussed in submission 15(g) above. The skate park is discussed in submission 1 above. The potential expansion of the water park is	Note submission.

SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS

			establishment of a skate park to cater for the needs of children and their families.	proposed to remain on the Concept Plan, although it is noted that the elements on the Concept Plan are indicative and will be subject to future investigations (including an assessment of feasibility) and detailed design.	
e			7. You fail to explain as why there are government offices planned to be situated within the Roebuck Bay Caravan Park. Please inform my on why this is proposed.	As per submission 15(r) above.	Support in part. As per submission 15(r) above.
f			8. The proposed change of the eastern side of Walcott street mixed use would seriously jeopardise the residential values of this precinct as the establishment of this type of use would encourage subdivision of existing blocks to accommodate offices, tourism businesses etc resulting in diminished occupancy rates which in turn means a commercialisation of Old Broome. This is, in my view, contrary to your objective to preserve the heritage values of Old Broome.	As per submission 17(c) above.	Reject. As per submission 17(c) above.
g			9. Nowhere in your proposal do you explain what you deem as appropriate development apart from naming commercial use for the precinct and how you will preserve old trees from being chopped down in favour of development.	<p>Figure 3 – Strategy Plan separates the Old Broome Area into precincts. Action 1 in Section 4.1.4 (Land Use) sets out preferred and not preferred uses for each of the precincts. It is noted that this table has been amended from the draft version to provide greater clarity and is included as # 1 in the Internal Submission.</p> <p>As discussed above, the Shire is preparing draft Old Broome Design Guidelines which will provide additional development controls for the public realm, site design, and building form. The draft Old Broome Design Guidelines require retention of significant trees in the property verge, as well as a net gain of trees on individual development sites.</p>	Reject.
h			<p>10. Leave Old Broome as it is. Spend our rates on more sustainable and less radical proposals.</p> <p>11. Can you please explain the need for all of this?</p> <p>12. Have you considered that your changes if passed will open the floodgate to much development that needs policing? Has the Shire got the capacity to adequately enforce and control the stringent building requirements as outlined in your strategy?</p> <p>13. Can you please explain how your proposed amendments to the Town Planning Scheme would not impact negatively existing landowners within the Old Broome precinct who are happy with how things are at present?</p>	<p>Old Broome already has a considerable component of 'Mixed Use' development and the OBDS provides guidance as to how this can evolve over time. As discussed above the majority of the area will be included in the Old Broome Special Character Area which will maintain a density of R10.</p> <p>The draft Old Broome Design Guidelines will further control the form of development and are being brought to Council for consideration separately. All new development within Old Broome will be assessed using the Design Guidelines. It is considered that the Shire has the appropriate resources to undertake these assessments as part of its normal function to determine Planning Applications.</p> <p>As discussed above, the OBDS does not rezone any land and rather provides guidance as to how the provisions of the Local Planning Strategy are to be applied. It will be the responsibility of individual landowners to apply to rezone and /or develop their</p>	Reject.

SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS

				land.	
i			14. In my view there appears to be a conflicting message about reserving the heritage values of Old Broome while at the same time rezoning existing R listed blocks owned privately and by the Dept of Housing and how that contributes to retain the heritage values of Old Broome.	As per submission 15(c) above. Development undertaken by the Department of Housing is considered to be a 'Public Work' under the <i>Public Works Act 1902</i> . Section 6 of the <i>Planning and Development Act 2005</i> exempts state governments from requiring Planning Approval to undertake public works. Under the <i>Planning and Development Act 2005</i> , local governments are required to be consulted when a public work is proposed but they do not have the power to stop it from taking place or to issue and enforce conditions.	Reject.
65	C. Beausein	7 Walcott Street			
			SHIRE OF BROOME TOWN PLANNING SCHEME NO.4 (TPS4) – LOCAL PLANNING POLICIES I am writing to you regarding the proposed Town Planning Scheme no.4 and would like to take the opportunity to comment on your proposal. I bought a block of land in Walcott Street and built my house there twenty-three years ago. I have lived here ever since. During my time in Broome I have contributed to the Arts Community and like to think that I am a valued member of the wider Community. The proposals outlined for Old Broome I see as damaging to this most important and historic part of town. They are counterproductive in protecting the Jewel in Broome's crown that is Old Broome. The proposals of most concern to me are: 1. The proposed opening of Walcott Street to Frederick Street that would destroy the casual ambience of this part of town.	As per submission 3 above.	Support. As per submission 3 above.
			2. The rezoning of land to commercial would result in many of the unique and important houses in the area being lost for commercial buildings, threaten the large, old trees that help to create a shady and attractive streetscape and ultimately totally annihilate what we should be protecting; the character of Old Broome.	As per submission 17 (c) above.	Reject. As per submission 17(c) above.
			3. The development of Lot 451 and Lot 601 on Hamersley Street is not appropriate these blocks should be for public use as they are right on the foreshore.	As per submission 41(h) above.	Note submission.
			4. The car park at town beach development is also not appropriate as this area creates a cooling green belt, which is far better, than hot concrete or asphalt.	As per submission 10 above.	Support in part. As per submission 10 above.
			5. I am very concerned that the increase in traffic and higher density buildings would result in a loss of habitat for the rich ecosystem that function in the area.	As discussed above, it is considered that changes in Old Broome will occur incrementally. Large portions of Old Broome will be included in the Old Broome Special Character Area and will retain a low density of R10, as discussed in submissions 2 and 11(d) above.	Reject.
			6. I am extremely concerned that the rezoning may mean a rate hike for me, which as an artist with a low income would be unsustainable.	The OBDS does not rezone any land. This will be the responsibility of individual landowners. Rating implications are not a relevant consideration.	Reject.
			7. The change of use of the Roebuck Bay Caravan Park seems to me like a greedy land grab. The Caravan Park creates it's own holiday, casual ambience as well as supporting	As per submission 15(r) above.	As per submission 15(r) above.

SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS

			many large trees and wildlife.		
			I also have many other concerns in this badly thought out proposal. I suggest more time is allowed for public comment and suggestions in order to get this right rather than forging ahead with an unpopular and destructive proposal that threatens the only unique and historic part of town besides Chinatown (which is already commercial but has always been so).	As per submission 35(a) above.	Reject.
66	D. Dureau PO Box 114 BROOME, WA, 6725		<p>I disagree with the consultation and planning process that has gone into the creation of this draft strategy plan. There has not been any genuine consultation or involvement of the community throughout this process and it is not until the process is almost complete that community input is requested. Were it not for how strongly I felt I would refuse even to validate this inadequate and insincere process by even making a submission which I will do with enthusiasm when a sincere consultative process produces the plan.</p> <p>The community of Broome find itself in a similar position with proposed TPS4 in around 1988 when the Shire presented its Town Plan from internal sources without proper consultation from the community.</p> <p>The community exposed this lack of consultation and the then Government responded by temporarily transferring a skilled town planning officer to Broome with a brief to consult with the community patiently and to thoroughly develop the concept of a consulted community plan.</p> <p>It was that lengthy independent consulted process which achieved consensus within the Broome and allowed for the successful approval of the plan by the Planning Commission and has served the community of Broome well, is now overdue for replacement. (TPS5 been gone, 20 + years lapsed, recommended revised every 5-8 years).</p> <p>For this I would sincerely comment that this alternative consultative process replace the current proposals for TPS6 and that the Shire immediately seek the expertise of an independent officer to seek the support and opinion of the community before submitting the draft strategy plan to the Council for approval.</p> <p>The current “top down” approach suit the “big players” such as: the Port Authority, State Housing, Chamber of Commerce, Real Estate and Developers, including most likely Nyamba Buru Yawuru, Broome Airport and mining and oil/gas interests. See Page 3 of attached.</p>	The community engagement process for the OBDS is discussed in the officer’s response to submission 35(a) above and the Community Engagement Report which is Attachment 3 to the Council Agenda report. With respect to the draft Local Planning Scheme No. 6, an extensive community engagement process was also undertaken and this process was supported by the Department of Planning. Council adopted the final Local Planning Scheme No. 6 in November 2013 and it has now been supported by the Western Australian Planning Commission and Minister for Planning subject to modifications being carried out.	Reject.
67	Gidgegannup Nominees Pty Ltd PO Box 232 COTTESLOE, WA, 6011	21 Walcott Street			
a			1. We endorse the submission by Mr Bob Bunning (Refer to Submission No. 18).	Noted.	Note submission.
b			<p>2. Additional Submission from Gidgegannup Nominees Pty Ltd</p> <p>When John Adams, who was Lord Alistair McAlpine’s lawyer and Chairman of his company, Australian City Properties, invited us to Broome in 1988, we were extremely impressed by the ambience of the old buildings that were being restored, and the new ones being built in the Broome Style.</p> <p>In 1990 we purchased a block of land at 21 Walcott Street, and subsequently built a</p>	As per submission 15(o) above.	Support in part. As per submission 15(o) above.

SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS

			<p>home which was a modern interpretation of a Pearling Masters House.</p> <p>Walcott was a quiet street, and our kids could safely walk between the Adams home on the corner of Louis and Walcott Street, and our home. We were also advised that the Hospital was to be moved to a new area off Cable Beach Road. We believe that this land is still available to the Hospital. We, like many of the other residents are totally opposed to the expansion of the Hospital in Old Broome.</p>		
c			<p>3. We read in the papers constantly about the difficulty that Broome is having in positioning itself as a tourist destination. Surely a great tourist attraction would be promoting the history and unique architecture of Old Broome. In other cities and town around the world, they embrace and treasure their historic buildings, and we feel that the area of Old Broome should be given special status as an historical area. Guided walking tours of the area could be conducted. We feel that this would add greatly to the marketing of Broome as a unique and wonderful place to visit and something that tourists from around the world would be interested in.</p>	<p>Large portions of Old Broome will be included in the Old Broome Special Character Area (OBSCA) and will retain a low density of R10, as discussed in submissions 2 and 11(d) above. The draft Old Broome Design Guidelines seek to apply planning controls to the OBSCA to ensure the existing character is preserved.</p> <p>Action 1 in Section 4.6.4 (Heritage) of the OBDS states:</p> <p><i>1. Design a heritage trail with discrete signage reflecting significant buildings, features and places which reflect the history of Broome and are situated within the Old Broome Precinct.</i></p> <p>If implemented, the heritage trail could become a feature that attracts tourists to Old Broome.</p>	Support. No modifications required.
d			<p>Some of the issues raised in the OBDS are controversial so we need to talk more about what the resident of old Broome want.</p> <p>Consultation with residents in May 2013 was all about the Town Beach and Conti foreshore, and not about the heart of Old Broome. The majority of the residents who attended that meeting were from foreshore areas.</p>	<p>Appendix A to Part 2 of the OBDS is an Outcomes Report for the community workshop held in May 2013. Whilst some participants focussed on improvements to the Town Beach Foreshore, the wider area was also discussed and the design session considered future development across the entire precinct. The Shire cannot control which community members choose to attend public workshops.</p> <p>The Shire has also conducted an extensive community engagement process on the draft OBDS which is discussed in the officer's response to submission 35(a) above and the Community Engagement Report which is Attachment 3 to the Council Agenda Report.</p>	Reject.
e			<p>We are passionate about retaining the style of Old Broome, and feel that this can only happen by maintaining it as a largely residential area.</p>	As per submission 17(c) above.	Reject.
68	D. Oliver PO Box 7068 BROOME, WA, 6725		<p>Sorry guys, I like Broome the way it is now: red dirt, side walks, big green-scaped verges, low density, great views, breeze and open skies, relaxed and low key.</p> <p>Do we need more concrete, business, car parks, landscaping, development, think carefully and act moderately.</p> <p>I am very concerned for the health of Roebuck Bay (runoff & erosion) and for the "atmosphere" of Town Beach. DON'T MAKE IT A TOURIST PRECINCT! – Please.</p>	<p>The vision for Old Broome is for new development to be 'respectful of the rich cultural heritage and natural environment.' As discussed above, large portions of the precinct will be incorporated into the Old Broome Special Character Area, where a low density of R10 will be maintained. The draft Old Broome Design Guidelines which are currently in preparation will also seek to impose planning controls on development to, amongst other matters, preserve views and limit the use of verges for car parking.</p>	Note submission.

SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS

				<p>Section 4.4 (Movement) is heavily focused on improving the transport network for pedestrians and cyclists. Action 2 in Section 4.4.4 (Movement) proposes footpaths for one side of every street in Old Broome, and on both sides of all 'Priority Active Frontages'. Action 3 in Section 4.4.4 (Movement) states that pathways are to be illuminated and shaded to increase user safety and comfort.</p> <p>Section 4.5 (Natural Resource and Environmental Management) acknowledges that stormwater discharge into Roebuck Bay can lead to adverse environmental impacts such as lyngbya blooms. Subsequent sections recommend actions to minimise these impacts, such as retrofitting existing drainage infrastructure, ensuring new development is consistent with Better Urban Water Management Principles, and investigating opportunities to retain stormwater in existing landscaped areas of Public Open Space.</p> <p>Portions of Old Broome already have a tourist function and the Shire's Local Planning Strategy (2013) states that the area will continue to develop for business tourists. It is considered that future tourism development can be compatible with the existing character of Old Broome.</p>	
69	B. Long & S. Salmon PO Box 3071 BROOME, WA, 6725	11 Robinson Street			
a			<p><i>"What kills a place like Broome is... the building of high and ugly buildings along the coastline in an area where people live... Development ... has to be balanced. It has to be done with intelligence and sensitivity. If you wish to see, what Broome shouldn't look like, go to the Gold Coast."</i></p> <p>(Lord Alistair McAlpine, <i>The West Australian</i>, January 2011.)</p> <p>As owners and residents of 11 Robinson Street we object to our residential block and those in the vicinity of Weld, Stewart, Robinson and Barker Streets being rezoned from Residential R10 to Mixed Use R40 as proposed in the Old Broome Development Strategy. As the LPS6 endorses a change to Mixed Use from Residential, but maintains an R10 density coding, the submission will focus on maintaining the R10 coding, as opposed to the higher density coding of R40.</p> <p>We have resided in this house for the last 15 years and are raising our children who attend the local primary school. We were attracted to this area of Broome due to its character and amenity and the belief, consistently reinforced by Shire Policy in the intervening years that this area would retain its characteristic charm and uniqueness and R10 Residential zoning.</p>	As per submission 2 above.	Support. As per submission 2 above.

SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS

			<p>Previous Shire decisions, strategies and policies, have recommended that this area of Old Broome be zoned Residential R10 to</p> <p><i>“Ensure the historical character and amenity is protected from redevelopment” . (LPS 1998).</i></p> <p>This rationale has been reinforced through, amongst others, the Broome Housing Strategy (1997), TPS4 (2004), Broome Planning Steering Committee (2005) and the Local Housing Strategy (2009) and is still relevant and pertinent today.</p> <p>At the Special Meeting of Council on November 20, 2013, the Council endorsed the Officers Comments and Recommendation that;</p> <p><i>“officers acknowledge that the Local Housing Strategy 2009 proposed that the area between Robinson and Herbert Streets remain coded R10 in recognition of its historic character”</i></p> <p>And that</p> <p><i>“in line with the Local Housing Strategy 2009 the lots between Weld and Robinson Streets are to remain Mixed Use in LPS6, but that the density coding is to remain R10 as per that of the TPS4”.</i></p> <p>Having once again so recently accepted the rationale that this area remains R10 density coding in recognition of its historical character how is it possible to entertain a conflicting rationale that it can have the higher density of Mixed Use R40?</p> <p>This area should be included in Area I – Old Broome Special Character Area of the Old Broome Development Strategy. This will ensure the area retains R10 density.</p> <p>The area north of the hospital and in the vicinity of Weld, Stewart, Robinson and Barker Streets sits immediately adjacent to the proposed Special Character Area.</p> <p>This area east of Herbert Street is the oldest residential area of Broome. The area north of the hospital and in the vicinity of Weld, Stewart, Robinson and Barker Streets is a distinct representation of the character and amenity of Broome and it is essential to Broome’s identity that this area is protected through appropriate density, design and policy provisions.</p> <p>As established in previous Shire policy the key characteristics of Old Broome are the wide road reserves, large tree lined verges, relatively large, heavily vegetated lots and a distinctive scale and design of buildings. This is all represented in the area in questions.</p> <p>The area in question contains two of Broome’s most celebrated historic buildings, St. John of God Convent and McDaniel’s House on Barker Street between Weld and Robinson Streets. Both of these buildings are listed on the State Register of Heritage Places and afforded a category ‘A’ listing on Broome’s Municipal Heritage Inventory meaning they are <i>“essential to the heritage of the locality.”</i> If the Old Broome Development Strategy is to have an Old Broome Special Character Area, then surely these two buildings should be included in it, when they sit less than one block away from the proposed Special Area boundary.</p> <p>The cultural and heritage significance of this area is further enhanced, (refer to Clause 10.2.1 of LPS6 sections (h), (i), (k), (n) and (o)) in that it also contains two other buildings which are</p>		
--	--	--	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--

SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS

			<p>in good condition and were established in 1912, and sits adjacent to ‘Arthurs Flats’ the Master Pearlers House and 24 Stewart Street which is also on the Broome Municipal Heritage Inventory. The corner of Barker and Robinson Streets is often referred to by local families as ‘Mango Trees’, in reference to the 11 mango trees planted by the late Phillip Cox, Broome’s (possibly Australia’s) first indigenous Shire Councillor who resided there and planted one mango tree for each grandchild. Stewart Street between Weld and Robinson also contains two of the last remaining houses purpose built for the meatworkers in the 1970’s.</p> <p>Including this area in the Old Broome Special Character Area would also connect the proposed Old Broome Character area through to the Old Courthouse and on to Chinatown. Mixed Use with a R40 density, with new three storey commercial buildings, extra car parking and loss of vegetation in this area will detract from the amenity of the popular attraction of the Courthouse and the Courthouse markets and from the vistas along Barker and Stewart Streets which enhance this experience. Conversely, it would also disconnect the Old Broome Special Character Area from the iconic heart of Old Broome that is the Courthouse and associated gardens.</p> <p>With regards to this area of Old Broome the draft Old Broome Development Strategy is incongruous with the action of Objective 7 of the Local Housing Strategy (2009) Objective 7 which is to “Protect the Character of Old Broome”.</p> <p>The Map on Future Urban Land on page 10 of the Local Housing Strategy clearly defines this area of Old Broome to be retained R10.</p> <p>East of Herbert Street is the only area left of Broome to have a R10 coding. To change this to R40 diminishes the options of residents who would prefer to live on a larger block than offered in any of the new housing estates. We, and other residents in the area bought blocks designated as R10 and rightfully according to all Shire documents have maintained the expectation that they would remain R10. A change to Mixed Use and R40 is diminishing our existing rights to our property and devaluing our property.</p> <p>We strongly believe our lifestyle and the enjoyment of our property will be adversely affected by the rezoning when properties in our immediate neighbourhood are developed according to R40 Mixed Use.</p> <p>As no Urban Design Guidelines have been released for public comment or endorsed by the Council, they cannot obviously be relied upon to support or reject any rationale.</p> <p>Our outdoor living areas will be adversely affected due to changes to our skyline, breezes, views, amenity, noise levels, the level of vegetation on adjoining blocks and increased heat due to reflection and increased thermal mass of the new buildings.</p> <p>We are concerned that Mixed Use Business and increased housing density will result in an increase in social issues, such as noise and possible anti-social behaviour, which will affect the amenity of the area.</p> <p>There are serious concerns around traffic congestion, and in particular traffic safety, around Broome Primary School and Broome Hospital in Robinson Street. Robinson Street has both a student pick up/drop off area and an ambulance entrance. Any increase in building density or change in zoning to Robinson Street will exacerbate these traffic and safety issues.</p>		
--	--	--	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--

SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS

			<p>Designating this area of Old Broome as R40 in the Old Broome Development Strategy, when both the TPS4 and LPS6 maintain an R10 coding is opening the possibility for disjointed Scheme Amendments to increase density from R10 to R40. Amongst other ramifications this could prove costly for the Shire and the applicants as Residents of this area would object to any development for inappropriate Mixed Use or which increase building density, and would expect Councillors to do the same, for those reasons outlined in Clause 10.2.1 of the LPS6, in particular the matters 10.2.1 (h), (l), (j), (k), (l), (n), (o), (p), (q) and (v).</p> <p>Clause 10.2.1 of LPS6 states;</p> <p>(h) the conservation of any place that has been entered in the Register within the meaning of the <i>Heritage of Western Australia Act 1990</i>, or which is included in the Heritage List under clause 7.1, and the effect</p> <p>(i) the compatibility of a use or development with its setting;</p> <p>(j) any social issues that have an effect on the amenity of the locality'</p> <p>(k) the cultural significance of any place or area affected by the development;</p> <p>(l) the likely effect of the proposal on the natural environment and any means that are proposed to protect or to mitigate impacts on the natural environment;</p> <p>(n) the preservation of the amenity of the locality;</p> <p>(o) the relationship of the proposal to development on adjoining land or on other land in the locality including but not limited to, the likely effect of the height, bulk, scale, orientation and appearance of the proposal;</p> <p>(p) whether the proposed means of access to and egress from the site are adequate and whether adequate provision has been made for the loading, unloading, manoeuvring and parking of vehicles;</p> <p>(q) the amount of traffic likely to be generated by the proposal, particularly in relation to the capacity of the road system in the locality and the probable effect on traffic flow and safety;</p> <p>(v) whether adequate provision has been made for the landscaping of the land to which the application relates and whether any trees or other vegetation on the land should be preserved.</p> <p>As so many of the subclauses of 10.2.1 are applicable to the vicinity of Robinson, Barker, Weld , and Stewart Streets, it is apparent this area is inappropriate for R40 density Mixed Use Development.</p> <p>Chapter 4.2 of the Draft Old Broome Development Strategy rightfully points out that “<i>it is important that the Old Broome Development Strategy does not facilitate commercial development in access of genuine need, which may serve to divert commercial activity from Chinatown</i>”, however applying a density coding of R40 to Mixed Use in this area in question would be doing just that.</p>		
--	--	--	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--

SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS

			The rationale that increasing building density in this unique area of Old Broome is required for the estimated increased commercial office space throughout all of Broome of 15,866m ² by 2031 is seriously flawed when considering the new commercial development east of the Broome Boulevard has a total developable area of 223,650m ² . It would be more appropriate for this 'Service Commercial' zone to be amended to permit some commercial office space, than to allow scheme amendments to increase density in the historically and culturally sensitive areas of Old Broome. Furthermore, the Vacant Land and Redevelopment sites identified in Figure 4 of the OBDS does not identify any potential sites in the vicinity of Weld, Barker, Robinson and Stewart Streets.		
70	E. Foy PO Box 114 BROOME, WA, 6725				
a			I object to this proposed Planning Policy because I do not think that local people have been consulted enough and their views incorporated into this strategy. Financially this will affect us because there is nothing in the consultation which demonstrates the costs of these changes to the residents of the Shire of Broome. I think that with the Government budgeting that the Council needs to more closely consider their budget and concentrate on maintaining and completing what they already have. We do not need to live in cluster homes like people in the cities live, we live in the Kimberlies and we need open community space and large yards in Old Broome.	As per submission 35(a) above.	Reject. As per submission 35(a) above
b			I think that the Shire should consider a new shopping outlet instead of only focusing on development of Chinatown. We should open up a new shopping centre where people live so that residents of Broome have a choice.	The provision of commercial shops is based on the centres hierarchy as set out in the Shire of Broome Local Commercial Strategy. The Seaview Local Centre and Fong Store Local Centre provide local residents with retail choice within a walkable distance	Reject
c			I believe that the Shire should remember that this town was founded on the Pearling industry & we should try and preserve the boat shed and other old buildings and large blocks of Old Broome and recognising the Aboriginal and indentured labour that contributed to the foundation of Broome. The Beach down from the Continental should be appropriately named as a 'Lugger Beach' where the luggers would be maintained.	The use of the name 'Conti Foreshore' reflects the park name used by the Shire. People are able to make representation to Council to change park names.	Note submission.
d			The Shire should work on getting the logo back on their letterheads. The new logo has no meaning and does not identify with the town that was founded on Pearling Luggers.	The comments are noted. This is not a matter to be addressed through the OBDS.	Note submission.
e			The Shire has not adequately considered the social impacts of this proposed strategy.	Social impact assessments are a tool that is typically used to assess individual development proposals. A development proposal is reasonably concrete in terms of the scale of development proposed and this allows projections to be undertaken as to how such development may impact, either positively or negatively, on the local area. It is difficult to undertake a social impact assessment for a strategic document as a Development Strategy as the extent to which the Strategy will be implemented by landowners, as well as the timeframe for implementation, is unknown. As discussed above, the OBDS will not rezone any land	Reject.

SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS

				<p>but will provide the planning framework to assess rezoning applications put forward to Council by individual landowners.</p> <p>The OBDS will also guide Council consideration of individual development proposals. Under Clause 10.2 of Local Planning Scheme No. 6, the Shire is required to have due regard for the following when making a determination on a Planning Application:</p> <p><i>(j) any social issues that have an effect on the amenity of the locality;</i> <i>(x) the potential loss of any community service or benefit resulting from the planning approval.</i></p> <p>This will ensure that consideration of potential social impacts is undertaken for all new developments in Old Broome.</p>	
71	D. Fong PO Box 60 BROOME, WA, 6725		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suggest that proposed archway in Chinatown be located on Eastside of Male Oval with signage displaying brief history of Jap town/Chinatown. The sign should be high enough to discourage vandalism. • If the oriental archway is located in the roundabout as originally proposed then information signage should still be installed on Male Oval. • I do walking tours of Chinatown and the lack of knowledge particularly amongst locals is disturbing. 	The Old Broome Development Strategy deals with the area generally south of Frederick Street and east of Herbert Street. Development in Chinatown is not part of this Strategy.	Note submission.
72	P. Lowe PO Box 309 BROOME, WA, 6725				
a			<p>General Comments:</p> <p>I notice this claim on the Strategy Plan: ‘The heritage of Old Broome is one of its key defining characteristics so its conservation is critical to retaining the essence of what makes it special.’ I endorse this statement wholeheartedly, and I appreciate any efforts made to retain that heritage. It does seem to me that the effect of the development strategy risks removing most of that heritage. The heritage includes large blocks, many shade trees, quiet neighbourhoods, old buildings and the like. Turning all that into a commercial area, complete with big new car parks and areas with ‘nil setback’ seems at odds with the intention to protect heritage.</p>	As per submission 15 (c) above.	Reject.
b			<p>Given that a significant number of retail premises in the two existing shopping centres are at present standing vacant, and that many houses are now on the market, I wonder where the pressure to create numerous new commercial premises, and denser residential areas, is coming from. However, I not with relief that the strategy envisages a long-term implementation.</p> <p>I consider that any town, especially a town as beloved of its residents as Broome is, should be allowed to develop organically, in response to need. Grand new concept plans prepared by out-of-town consultants seldom meet the needs of local people. Like our long-term residents, I grieve already about the accelerating disappearance of the Broome I knew, the increase in housing density, the loss of trees, the obliteration of verges, the ugly metal fences, the concrete driveways, the utilitarian multiple dwellings. The loss of Old Broome in</p>	As per submissions 15(c) and 17(c) above.	Reject.

SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS

			its present form will be regretted by many, particularly if new developments follow the utilitarian pattern of recent buildings in the area.		
c			I am pleased to note the development strategy mentions extensions to walk and cycle paths around Broome and considers public open space.	Noted.	Note submission.
d			Town Beach and Conti Foreshore Plan While I endorse some features of the Town Beach and Conti Foreshore Plan, it seems to me in danger of overdoing the ‘enhancements’, as has happened at Streeter’s Jetty, where the old-world, natural approach is now under concrete, with regimental-looking rocks plonked around it and a tarmacked car park, all of which have ruined the former ambience. Specific responses to proposed features of this Plan follow:	Noted.	Note submission.
e			1. I see that the nature of the look-out points along the foreshore is not detailed, but I urge planners to remember that most people value a natural landscape. Anyone who walks along the green area above the foreshore can look out and see the view, and all that is needed is a series of benches near shade trees for people to sit on to admire it. Grander structures and interpretive signs would detract from the appeal of the place. Less is more. Similarly, trail markers are completely unnecessary on a beach, where one can’t get lost. They would detract badly from the natural appeal of the beach. A beach is a beach, not a kids’ adventure trail.	Noted. The Concept Plan is intended to serve as a non-statutory tool to identify potential project ideas and orientate them spatially. It does not provide the level of detail of a true Master Plan and should not be used as such. The elements on the Concept Plan are indicative and will be subject to future investigations (including an assessment of feasibility) and detailed design. The design of lookouts and trails can be further considered at a later stage of the process.	Note submission.
F			2. Every effort should be made to preserve public open space. Like many people I have spoken to, I object strongly to any further reduction in the grassed area at Town Beach, including an extension of the water feature, the building of a skate park and the moving of Town Beach Café. I object particularly to the building of a big new car park at the end of Hopton Street, which would further erode the open space. The grassed area is used by many, many families and other groups for relaxing and recreation, to celebrate special occasions and so on, as recognised in the plan. This is certainly an important aspect of Broome’s heritage that needs protecting. I also object to a car park being constructed in the existing grassed areas near the ‘pearling woman’ statue, again eroding the public open space.	The skate park is discussed in the officer’s response to submission 1 above, and the car parking at Town Beach is discussed in response to submission 10 above. As discussed above, the elements on the Concept Plan are indicative and will be subject to future investigations (including an assessment of feasibility) and detailed design. The OBDS notes under Element 33 in Section 5.2 (Concept Plan Elements) that Car parking near the Women of Pearling statue, if undertaken, will formalise current informal use of the area for parking, and will remain unsealed.	Support in part. As per submissions 1 and 10 above.
g			3. The Plan does not specify what the safe swimming area would consist of, but a permanent barrier of rocks should not be considered without extensive research into the likely effect of such a barrier on the immediate environment, water flow, the seagrass beds further out and so on, and into weather it would be a hazard to boats. I would support the placement of a removable barrier that does not trap fish or interfere with the natural flow of water, and the provision of irukandji nets.	As per submission 15(i) above.	Support in part. As per submission 15(i) above.
h			4. I object strongly to the building of ‘Strategic mixed-use development sites’ on the shoreward side of Hamersley Street (9), which would spoil forever the famous ‘open vistas to Roebuck Bay’ along that stretch of Hamersley Street, mentioned in the report. In what way are these sites ‘strategic’? What is the ‘strategy’ they embody?	As per submission 41(h) above.	Note submission.
i			5. PCYC: whether it is retained or relocated, the deep Robert Street verge with its enhancing vegetation and Bowerbird nests should be retained and cared for. I have assisted on occasion in removing climbing weeds from the trees there, but more regular tending is required.	Noted.	Note submission.
73	K. Thomas PO Box 236	20 Barker Street			

SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS

	BROOME, WA, 6725				
a			<p>I have lived in Walcott St for the passed forty years, at the corner of Anne St and then later moving to corner of Barker St, closer to the airport after commitments from those involved to relocate the airport.</p> <p>The airport is still there 15 years later and with the expected increase of air traffic its relocation should be of greater importance than any proposed changes to old Broome. The Old Broome Development Strategy fails to address this issue.</p>	<p>The matter of relocating the airport is not dealt with through a precinct based land use planning strategy.</p> <p>The Shire of Broome Strategic Community Plan 2013 – 2023 sets out the following strategy - <i>Lobby the State Government to ensure a new serviced airport site is made available.</i></p> <p>Similarly, the Shire of Broome Local Planning Strategy contains the following strategy – <i>Relocate the international airport.</i> The Local Planning Strategy maps show the relocation of the airport to the proposed site on Broome Road.</p>	Reject.
b			<p>I strongly object to the proposed opening of the northern end of Walcott St to Frederick St. I also object to the changes to town beach and question the cost of such a proposal at a time when business, property owners and in fact a lot of the community are struggling to get by. I would object strongly to the Broome shire borrowing money or increasing shire rates to cover the cost of implementing these proposed changes.</p>	As per submission 3 above.	Support in part As per submission 3 above.
74	B. Thomas PO Box 5323 BROOME, WA, 6725		<p>I am opposed to the proposed changes to town beach. I think the current layout of town beach is sufficient and provides a great area for families to spend time.</p> <p>I also object to the proposed opening up of Walcott St onto Frederick St. As there are no kerbs or footpaths at the end of this street the cost involved I imagine is significant. I believe the rate payers money could be better spent on more important projects around the town.</p>	As per submissions 1, 3, 10 and 28 above.	Support in part. As per submissions 1,3,10 and 28 above/
75	GoolaraboolooMilli binyarri Indigenous Corporation PO Box 7475 BROOME, WA, 6725				
a			<p>1. Introduction</p> <p>1.1. This submission is made by the Goolarabooloo Millibinyarri Indigenous Corporation.</p> <p>1.2. Our members are Goolarabooloo people and include the senior law bosses Phillip Roe and Richard Hunter. The law bosses have authorised this submission.</p> <p>1.3. Goolarabooloo are responsible for a large area of the Dampier Peninsula associated with the body of Aboriginal Law known as the Northern Tradition, within the Yawuru Determination area and the Goolarabooloo and Jabirr Jabirr native title claim areas. This area, known as the Song Cycle Path, is of ultimate cultural, social, religious and environmental importance to Goolarabooloo and other indigenous people within the Shire of Broome.</p> <p>1.4. These submissions are made in response to the Shire of proposed Local Planning Strategy – ‘Old Broome Development Strategy’. This submission does not address the Native Title or other implications of the proposed policy.</p> <p>2. Submissions</p> <p>3. Goolarabooloo would like to make the following general submissions in relation to the proposed Local Planning Policy and Old Broome Development Strategy (further the ‘Strategy’):</p>	Noted.	Note submission.
b			3.1. Consultation under the Strategy:	Once the OBDS is adopted by Council, it will become a	Note submission.

SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS

			<p>3.1.1.The Strategy sets out details of the consultation undertaken to date in the preparation of the Draft. It does not however indicate the consultation process proposed under the Strategy, or Policy, once implemented.</p> <p>3.1.2.The Strategy outlines consultation conducted with various groups, including Yawuru, in the development of the proposed strategy. Limited reference is also made to future consultation with Yawuru in relation to stabilisation of the dune system at Demco Beach, as well as heritage consultation and agreement under the Yawuru Indigenous Land Use Agreement, signed 25th February 2010.</p> <p>3.1.3.It is acknowledged that Yawuru should be consulted in relation to the proposed Strategy and Policy, and any planning and development subsequent to it. However this consultation should not be limited to Yawuru PBC as there are several other Aboriginal groups who have significant cultural and heritage interest within the strategy area which are connected to law and culture and are independent of land tenure.</p> <p>3.1.4. The views of these other Aboriginal people and groups are not necessarily represented by Yawuru PBC and any agreements or consultation entered into by it.</p>	<p>Local Planning Policy and there will be no further consultation undertaken, unless the OBDS is reviewed over time. For Local Planning Policy review, the Shire's Local Planning Policy 8.23 – Public Consultation – Planning Matters requires that a Community Engagement Plan be prepared to determine the significance of the project and the engagement activities that are to be undertaken.</p> <p>For future Scheme Amendments, subdivision applications or development applications in the Old Broome area, the level and method of consultation will be as per the Shire's Local Planning Policy 8.23, Public Consultation – Planning Matters.</p>	
c			<p>Submission One:</p> <p>It is submitted that cultural and heritage consultation in relation to the preparation and implementation of this Strategy and Policy should be conducted independently with other Aboriginal groups, including Goolarabooloo, in order to ensure that their cultural heritage rights and interests are protected within the Old Broome Development area.</p> <p>1.1. Consultation required in relation to the Song Cycle Path:</p> <p>1.1.1. The area for which consultation with Goolarabooloo is specifically required is the area of the Song Cycle Path. The significance and extent of the Song Cycle Path, and the cultural authority of Goolarabooloo to speak in relation to it, has been extensively documented over the past 30 years and detailed in various submissions to the Shire of Broome.</p> <p>1.1.2. The extent of the area of the Song Cycle Path can be seen generally in the map at Appendix 1. The Song Cycle Path encompasses the entirety of the area subject to the proposed Local Planning Policy – Old Broome Development Strategy.</p> <p>1.1.3. It is disappointed to Goolarabooloo that the Shire has again failed to mention the extent and significance of the Song Cycle Path, and its importance to Aboriginal people of the Dampier Peninsula and to the cultural heritage of the Shire of Broome, in the proposed Strategy and that no consultation has been undertaken in relation to the Song Cycle Path within the Strategy area.</p> <p>1.1.4. The acknowledgement and protection of the Song Cycle Path under the Strategy would be in line with the object of the Local Planning Policy <i>'To ensure that all land use and development within Precinct 2 – Old Broome: Reveals, interprets and conserves Old Broome's historic character and heritage laces'</i>.</p> <p>1.1.5. In relation to this submission it is noted again that the application of the <i>Aboriginal Heritage Act</i> within Western Australia currently is such that the protection offered to Aboriginal heritage objects and places is limited in the first instance and temporary at best (because the administration of the Act reveals that there is an almost absolute certainty that an application for authorisation to damage or destroy the site under section 18 will be given).</p>	<p>Consultation undertaken for the OBDS is discussed in the officer's response to submission 35(a) above.</p> <p>Part 2 of the OBDS contains Figure 3 – Places of Heritage Significance which shows that large areas of Old Broome are located within the boundaries of an Aboriginal Heritage Site as shown on the Department of Aboriginal Affairs Register. Under Section 17 of the <i>Aboriginal Heritage Act 1972</i>, it is an offense to alter a Site, unless approval to do so has been received from the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs.</p> <p>Council has previously resolved in November 2013 to write to the Department of Aboriginal Affairs to express concern in relation to the registration and protection of places of Aboriginal Heritage significance under the <i>Aboriginal Heritage Act 1972</i>. Discussions over the administration of this Act are ongoing and fall beyond the scope of the OBDS which is principally designed as a land use policy.</p>	Reject. As per submission 35(a) above.

SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS

			<p>It is of specific concern that the application of the Aboriginal Heritage Act is such that Song Cycles (or Song Lines), are unable to be protected under, even when an aboriginal heritage place has been mapped and identified, and its cultural heritage significance has been authoritatively established. This position under the <i>Aboriginal Heritage Act Western Australia</i> is of extreme and ongoing concern to Goolarabooloo.</p> <p>1.1.6. It is therefore essential that the Shire of Broome make provision for the protection of Aboriginal cultural heritage places at the local level within local planning policies and strategies. This approach is also in line with the objects of the proposed Local Planning Policy – Old Broome Development Strategy (as noted at 2.3.3) and the stated mission and values of the Council itself.</p>		
d			<p><u>Submission Two:</u></p> <p>It is submitted that the extent of significance of the Song Cycle Path should be incorporated into the proposed Strategy in order to protect the cultural heritage associated with this area.</p> <p>Further it is submitted that Goolarabooloo should be consulted, directly, in relation to any development proposal or planning matter that may impact (either directly or indirectly) on their cultural heritage rights and responsibilities within the area of the Song Cycle Path and that this requirement be incorporated into the proposed Strategy.</p> <p>1.1. Consultation requirements:</p> <p>1.1.1. Any consultation under the Strategy, in relation to cultural heritage, should be conducted in line with international standards and obligations (see appendix 2) and based on the principles of Free Prior informed Consent (see appendix 3). This requires that any development, within Goolarabooloo Country and the area of the Song Cycle System, should only occur:</p> <p>a) with free, prior and informed consent of the Goolarabooloo Community and Law Bosses; and</p> <p>b) in a culturally and environmentally appropriate way (in accordance with the principles set out in Appendix 4)</p>	As per submissions 75(b) and 75(c) above.	As per submissions 75 (b) and 75(c) above.
e			<p><u>Submission Three:</u></p> <p>That any consultation in relation to the development and implementation of the proposed Strategy and Policy be conducted in accordance with the principles of Free, prior informed consent and be in line with international standards and obligation.</p> <p>These principles of should be incorporated into the Old Broome Development Strategy and should apply equally to consultation with Goolarabooloo and other groups under the proposed Policy and generally to all consultation conducted by the Shire of Broome.</p> <p>These submissions in relation to the Old Broome development strategy and Policy, apply to all planning policies developed under the Town Planning Scheme no 4 and similarly to any subsequent development, planning and policies and policies under the Local Planning Scheme No. 6.</p>	As per submissions 75(b) and 75(c) above.	As per submissions 75(b) and 75(c) above.
76	S. Griffiths	7 Sands St			
a			RE: Old Broome Development Strategy. Incorp Town Beach Conti Foreshore	Car parking at Town Beach is discussed in the officer's	Support in part. As per

SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS

			<p>Please give due consideration to these key points. Unfortunately I only returned to Broome yesterday and have not had opportunity to read proposal in full.</p> <p>1. Recommend prime waterfront land is not used for trailer and vehicle parking (see 12, Catalinas 17) Promote walking and bicycle riding and recognise the area is already congested. Give priority to access parking in existing areas.</p>	<p>response to submission 10 above.</p> <p>With respect to the parking south of Catalina's, the Concept Plan is intended to serve as a non-statutory tool to identify potential project ideas and orientate them spatially. It does not provide the level of detail of a true Master Plan and should not be used as such. The elements on the Concept Plan are indicative and will be subject to future investigations (including an assessment of feasibility) and detailed design.</p> <p>It is recommended that the Catalina's boat parking be retained on the Concept Plan as current practice of boat ramp users parking on verges and on private property is not ideal. However it is noted that future investigations will need to consider the major drain which is located in the area.</p>	submission 10 above.
b			<p>2. Higher density development means many more people in a small area. Where will these people recreate? POS is paramount for healthy living and long term planning</p>	<p>The OBDS in Section 2.1.12 of Part 2 acknowledges that there is a shortfall of Public Open Space (POS) in Old Broome, as much of the area was subdivided before the requirement for mandatory provision of 10% POS at subdivision.</p> <p>However, whilst there are limited 'pocket parks' in the precinct, Town Beach and the Conti Foreshore are shown in the Shire's Local Planning Strategy as a District-level park. It is considered that this area caters for the recreational needs of a large portion of Old Broome residents. The Concept Plan provides a variety of options for enhancing recreational facilities along the foreshore. Additionally, the northern portions of Old Broome are located within the walkable catchments for two other District level parks as shown on the LPS – Male Oval and Haynes Oval.</p>	Note submission.
c			<p>3. At Town Beach a takeaway café is requested NOT a restaurant. Where is it to be relocated please?</p>	<p>The text for Element 19 – Relocate the Town Beach Cafe in Section 5.2 of the OBDS states that the new cafe building '<i>will accommodate a café/restaurant and a kiosk to cater for both formal dining and casual refreshments.</i>'</p>	Note submission.
d			<p>4. Support the rebuilding of the Old Jetty for community access NOT for commercial development and use a place to fish, stroll and ponder.</p>	<p>As per submission 29(b) above.</p>	Note submission. As per submission 29(b) above.
e			<p>5. Redevelop Caravan Park as a REGIONAL PARK! Relocate caravan park else where. A regional park already – has shade, water, access etc DO THIS FOR BROOMES FUTURE (Think Centrall Park think Kings Park)</p>	<p>The OBDS Concept Plan recommends that the Roebuck Bay Caravan Park will remain as a Caravan Park, and potentially be upgraded to enhance visitor experiences. It is not proposed to alter this recommendation.</p>	Reject.
f			<p>6. Skate Park is noisy and not consistent with quiet amenity or water based activity. Proposal is a poor use of prime POS.</p>	<p>As per submission 1(a) above.</p>	Support. As per submission 1(a) above.
g			<p>7. Please use a better term it is not DEMCO Beach. Use of this term is incorrect.</p>	<p>Should advice be provided as to the appropriate name to use for this part of the coastline this will be incorporated into the maps and figures.</p>	Note submission

SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS

h			8. Tram Line. While it sounds okay the reality is unless it suits a transport function (ie people moved to key places rather than driving) it is not supported. I assume it will be a tourist type of activity at cost – not public transport. Therefore it will detract from the family and community amenity and require large ugly areas to “store” trams etc. I do not support this initiative as it stands.	As per submission 11(b) above.	Note submission. As per submission 11(b) above.
i			9. I do not support any development on the bay side of the existing roads except a low key pathway, to reduce POS and amenity and to mitigate risks to property in vulnerable coastal areas.	<p>There are two privately owned lots on the eastern side of Hamersley Street across from Bedford Park. One lot (601) is currently developed for residential use and the other (Lot 451) is vacant and has an existing development approval in place issued April 2014 which has not been actioned. These lots are zoned to allow development, however the OBDS stipulates that such development shall:</p> <p><i>allow for a high level of general public access on the ground floor level and ensure vistas to Roebuck Bay are retained. Any building on this site should be sensitively designed, have a ‘light’ construction and address all four sides. The development should not be ‘privatised’ nor dominate the location visually.</i></p> <p>The Concept Plan identifies the potential for up to two buildings to be constructed along the Town Beach Foreshore – the relocated Town Beach Cafe and a ‘Catalina Plane Hangar and Museum,’ which is shown to the east of the museum. The exact location, size, and design of these buildings is yet to be determined. The officer’s response to submission 15(a) above outlines the work that is being done as part of the Coastal Vulnerability Study (CVS) and why more foreshore development has not been recommended. The outcomes of the CVS may lead to amendments of the OBDS.</p>	Note submission.
j			10. ‘NIL SETBACKS’ will change the overall feel and amenity of the TB area and Old Broome. It will lead to over development of a key cultural and heritage area. Reducing visual amenity restricting breezes and making a small peninsula feel “crowded”.	Nil setbacks are only shown along the streets that are depicted as such on Figure 2 – Strategy Plan. These streets include Frederick Street, Hamersley Street north of Guy Street, and Robinson Street south of Guy Street. These streets already have an emerging Mixed Use character and accommodate a higher level of vehicle and pedestrian movement. Larger setbacks will be required on other streets in Old Broome and will be more fully articulated in the Old Broome Design Guidelines.	Reject.
77	L. Middleton				
a			Broome supports thousands of species of fish and wildlife, and they are crucial for the regional economy, culture and quality of life. Healthy coastal habitats also protect us from the effects of cyclones and flooding. However, coastal habitats and wildlife are under pressure from human activities such as development and pollution. Now, sea-level rise and other climate changes due to global warming will create even greater challenges for our coasts, foreshores and estuaries.	The importance of healthy coastal habitats is noted. Section 4.5.1 – Natural Resources and Environmental Management outlines the environmental significance of Roebuck Bay and recognises the ongoing threat of erosion on the coastal landscape. It discusses the Coastal Vulnerability Study (CVS) and potential impacts of sea level rise. The objectives / principles of	Reject.

SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS

		<p>We are facing an ecological crisis that could see wholesale loss of wildlife populations and profound changes in our outdoor way of life.</p> <p>The planning department of the Broome Shire is in a unique position to assist the community in understanding and adapting to the expected consequences of climate change. However, the Old Broome Development Strategy has failed to address this issue in any depth or incorporate the changes needed to address raising sea levels, coastal erosion or potential loss of currently inhabited lands or the potential loss of critical infrastructure.</p> <p>What is the psychological mechanism that allows the Broome Shire to know something is true but act as if it is not? Even when the science is in why is it so difficult for planning officers to accept that climate change will and does pose a dire problem for our small community, that is surrounded by ocean on three sides and sits on a small fragile eroding peninsula.</p> <p>Old Broome Development Strategy has in all reality ignored it completely.</p> <p>Humans are wired to respond strongest to threats that are visible, immediate, have historical precedent, have direct personal impact, and are caused by an “enemy”. Climate change is none of these – its invisible, unprecedented, drawn out, impacts us indirectly, and is caused by us.</p> <p>Until we understand what excites, threatens, and motivates us, we will not reimagine the full impact of climate change. In the end, climate change really has the potential to bring out the qualities that make us human: our limitations, our strengths.</p> <p>Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change’s Fifth Assessment Report findings show we’re already experiencing the ever-increasing impacts of global warming: ice caps and Arctic sea ice melting and collapsing; more extreme weather-related events like droughts and floods; dying corals; stressed water supplies; rising, increasingly acidic oceans and fish and other animals migrating with some going extinct.</p> <p>Unless we, as a community act quickly, our coastal foreshore, our food and water supplies, critical infrastructure, security, health, economies and communities will face ever-escalating risks, leading to increased human displacement, migration, and conflict.</p> <p>The Shire and the Broome community can not afford to do little or nothing or keep on pretending it’s not real, or ignore it long enough it will go away or carry on “business as usual – all of which are not viable options. One of our main human unique abilities is foresight, the capacity to look ahead to avoid dangers and exploit opportunity. It’s time for our community leaders to be visionary and steer away from inappropriate planning and development and work towards building resilience on local levels.</p> <p>The earth’s changing climate is forcing reconsideration of strategies for conserving natural resources and urban planning. Planners need to understand where and when the resources they manage might be vulnerable to climate change. They also need a better understanding of the factors that contribute to that vulnerability. This knowledge is essential to determine which planning management actions are realistically sustainable and successful in long term economics.</p> <p>Roebuck Bay foreshore and some adjacent inland areas are already under threat as a result</p>	<p>Section 4.5.2 (Natural Resources and Environmental Management) include:</p> <p><i>1. To protect, conserve, and enhance the natural resources and environment in the Old Broome precinct, particularly Roebuck Bay.</i></p> <p><i>2. To ensure that new development is ‘future proofed’ by taking into account the potential impacts of coastal vulnerability and climate change.</i></p> <p>Strategies to help achieve these objectives include:</p> <p><i>1. Ensure the Shire’s statutory framework is updated to reflect the outcomes of the Coastal Vulnerability Study.</i></p> <p>The ‘statutory framework’ to be updated to reflect the outcomes of the CVS includes Local Planning Policies such as the OBDS. If necessary, recommendations in the OBDS will be amended once the results of the CVS are known.</p>	
--	--	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS

			of erosion and occasional inundation during high tides and/or storm surges.		
b			<p>Vulnerability Study information provides the baseline for developing scientifically grounded strategies for climate change adaptation. It also provides planning decisions makers with the information to determine which adaptation options might have a higher probability of maintaining ecosystem and community resilience.</p> <p>Assessment of climate change vulnerability for ecosystems and habitats should be used to directly inform key conservation/resource management and planning.</p> <p>The Shire of Broome should be congratulated for undertaking a Coastal Vulnerability Study, however this is only the first step in the process. Once this study has been completed we then need to develop an Adaptation Plan.</p> <p>Releasing the Old Broome Development Strategy before the completion of the Coastal Vulnerability Study has basically put the cart before the horse. Until we have a clear understanding of our local vulnerabilities associated with raising sea levels and other expected climate impacts on our community, a planning document of this nature should be in all reality be an Adaptation Plan.</p>	<p>As per above. Once the outcomes of the CVS are available, the Shire will be able to commence adaptation planning using the baseline data. This may result in amendments to the OBDS and other Shire planning documents.</p> <p>The Old Broome Development Strategy is needed to provide additional guidance on the recommendations of the Shire's endorsed Local Planning Strategy, which shows the entirety of the Old Broome area as 'Mixed Use.' The Shire considers the OBDS to be an important document to ensure that the introduction of new 'Mixed Use' development occurs in a coordinated, rather than ad-hoc, manner. This guidance will be needed as soon as the Local Planning Strategy comes into force and therefore the decision was made to progress the OBDS prior to the finalisation of the CVS.</p>	Reject.
c			<p>The climate-change vulnerabilities results from this study should be released to the community in order to review, refine and use in identifying community adaptation strategies that would be appropriate, achievable and over the coming decades.</p> <p>The Shire planners have not made the link between climate change vulnerability assessment and adaptation strategies at all within the Old Broome Development Strategy.</p>	<p>The CVS will be made publicly available once finalised. It is anticipated that a Local Planning Policy, and potentially a Scheme Amendment, will be needed to incorporate the results into the Shire's planning framework. Local Planning Policies and Scheme Amendments require a period of public advertising.</p> <p>It is difficult to envisage what adaptation planning strategies will be appropriate in the absence of the modelling data.</p>	Note submission.
d			<p>Paleoecology has shown that past episodes of climate change triggered ecosystem change at regional and local scales with varying speed and intensity.</p> <p>As the current rate of global change increases, the Broome community can expect profound shifts in key ecological processes to cascade through natural systems, resulting in altered productivity, changes to species composition, local extinctions, and many instances of ecological degradations or collapse.</p> <p>The Broome Community is scarcely prepared for these changes and this. While the modern scientific study of ecosystems dates back over a century, we do not sufficiently understand the many linkages between key climate variables and ecosystem dynamics across diverse landscapes.</p> <p>Nor do we fully understand the effects of other stressors, such as those tied to land use, that have already reduced the resiliency of many natural ecosystems.</p> <p>One certain conclusion that we can draw from our experience is that ecosystems will not simply 'move' as climate changes, but will instead transform in unprecedented ways because of the controlling link between climate and many ecosystem processes.</p> <p>In any given place, we need to better understand and assess the relative vulnerability of ecosystems, natural communities, and habitats to the specific climate-induced stressors that</p>	Noted.	Note submission.

SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS

			<p>a re most likely to occur here. We also need to integrate this assessment with knowledge of other existing stressors, such as land & water use change, non-native species invasions, and pollution effects. An integrated assessment will be needed to directly inform investments in adaptation strategies by all stakeholders.</p> <p>The task then, is to develop tools that build on our current understanding of ecosystem processes, structure, and composition so that we can begin to evaluate possible vulnerabilities in a transparent way.</p> <p>Transparency is absolutely essential because it allows for measuring key inputs and outputs, documenting uncertainty, and revising assessments as new information becomes available.</p> <p>In sum, the challenges for the Broome Shire Council in the coming decades are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To develop transparent, scientifically grounded forecasts of ecosystem characteristics that may enhance or inhibit their transformation under anticipated climate regimes. • To clarify conservation strategies that strengthen ecosystem resilience and minimize the potential for ecological degradation or collapse through a loss of ecological integrity and infrastructure; • To facilitate the natural transformation of ecosystems in ways that maximise retention of biodiversity and food-web dynamics, and; • To identify Adaptation Action that has the greatest probability of success. 		
e			<p>Stormwater drainage Preparing a comprehensive drainage strategy for Old Broome should be foremost in our planning prioritises. Imposing a whole new set of accumulative impacts on our already existing stormwater issues will only exacerbate the current glitches.</p> <p>Stormwater drainage into Roebuck Bay is a concern, as some outlets do not have any compensation or nutrient stripping. Early indications from water quality monitoring suggest that these drains contain higher than normal nutrient loads which can lead to adverse environmental impacts such a Lyngbya algal blooms.</p> <p>I support the preparation of a comprehensive drainage strategy for Old Broome. However, I am afraid that this is purely rhetoric and I strongly believe there is no real intention, interest or motivation to address this issue seriously.</p>	<p>Action 3 of Section 4.5.4 (Natural Resource and Environmental Management) of the OBDS is:</p> <p><i>3. Prepare a comprehensive drainage strategy for Old Broome to determine the most appropriate ways to achieve site drainage on a street-block by street-block basis that does not result in requirements for excessive amounts of fill or in significant height differences between adjacent properties.</i></p> <p>As discussed in the officer's response to submission 14(e) above, once adopted the OBDS will become an Informing Strategy under the Shire's Integrated Planning Framework. This means that it will used to guide future revisions to the Shire's Corporate Business Plan, Long Term Financial Plan and the annual budget. Projects in the OBDS will be allocated to the relevant Shire departments and it will be the responsibility of these departments to determine the best way to carry them forward.</p> <p>Sections 4.5.3 and 4.5.4 also contain additional Strategies and Actions relating to improving stormwater management in Old Broome prior to the completion of the Drainage Strategy:</p> <p><i>4.5.3 Strategies / Policy</i></p> <p><i>2. Ensure that new drainage infrastructure is</i></p>	Support. No modifications required.

SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS

				<p><i>consistent with Better Urban Water Management principles and the Shire's Stormwater Management Policy.</i></p> <p><i>4.5.4 Actions</i></p> <p><i>1. Investigate retrofitting existing drains in Old Broome to reduce discharge of nutrient loads into Roebuck Bay.</i></p> <p><i>2. Investigate opportunities for the retention of stormwater in existing landscaped areas of Public Open Space, such as in portions of Bedford Park.</i></p>	
f			<p>Given the high-density housing purposed for Old Broome, words are on things but actions signify true intentions. The newly developed blocks on Guys street where houses are clustered together and surrounded with concrete leaving no soakage areas. These few new developments have just increased the flow and volume of storm water down Guy street and directly into Roebuck Bay.</p> <p>Additional car parks and more high-density development will increase the escalation, concentration and accumulation of the amount of unrestrained noxious storm water entering Roebuck Bay.</p> <p>Broome's township once had good stormwater drainage. Water would spread out across the landscape evenly, enabling it to soak back into the ground. The concrete curbing undertaken in the 90s around town has effectively turned the streets into the local drainage system and Roebuck Bay into a compensation basin.</p> <p>Until the existing drainage issues and the polluting of Roebuck Bay is genuinely tackled no new infrastructure should be approved. Otherwise, we will just continue to produce effects that will eventually kill the Bay.</p> <p>It is in all our interest to address the storm water drainage issue foremost because the costs associated with trying to reify this will only increase over time. The social, environmental and economic impacts will also be cumulative.</p> <p>We also must remain mindful that outgoing stormwater drains also act as avenues for saltwater intrusion. Reducing discharge of nutrient loads into Roebuck Bay can only be achieved through community education. Bedford Park is already being used as a nature place for the retention of stormwater to the point of saturation in the most moderate rain events.</p>	<p>The officer's response to submission 69(e) above outlines strategies and actions in the OBDS to improve stormwater management in Old Broome. The provision of 'high density' housing is discussed in submission 16(c) above, and the impacts of kerbing are discussed in submission 64(d) above.</p>	Note submission.
g			<p>The only proven, effective, economic and ecological appropriate way to address the erosion issue and increase the protection of vulnerable locations along the length of the foreshore is to plant mangroves. Growing and strengthening mangroves doesn't stop the sea level rise, but it does stop erosion. Communities with mangroves as a barrier to the sea are much less impacted by storms and cyclones.</p> <p>Constructing tiers into pindan cliffs is the most unwise and inappropriate concept to prevent erosion of the pindan cliffs on the north side of the old jetty. Firstly, the construction of the tiers will in fact contribute to the loss of very foreshore they seek to protect. The purpose building of tiers will effectively act as a cascading waterfall in the wet and will also be undermined by wave action making it susceptible to collapse.</p>	<p>Planting mangroves as a coastal defence may be considered as part of a future adaptive response to the CVS outcomes.</p> <p>Element 28 of the Concept Plan focuses on 'Coastline Stability and Revetment' and makes specific reference to the eroded pindan cliffs at Town Beach. Element 28 recommends erosion protection and control measures to be implemented at vulnerable locations along the length of the foreshore, including a revetment to help prevent further erosion of the</p>	Note submission.

SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS

			PLANT MANGROVES!	pindan cliffs. The Shire has already prepared a plan (Town Beach Revetment Strategy / Plan) and undertaken detailed design to construct the revetment, and is currently sourcing funding to carry out the works. The amphitheatre is secondary to the primary purpose of limiting erosion.	
--	--	--	------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--