



Point Samson District Structure Plan

Schedule of Submissions

No/Ref	Date Received	Name	Address	Submission	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response	Officer Recommendation
1	9th June 2015	Ian Banks	Delilah's B & B 12 McCourt Street, Point Samson	<p>The proposal to systematically remove all of the Tamarisk trees along the Point Samson foreshore & proposed management strategy of beach sand movement, as detailed in the Structure plan, is not in my view and many of the Samson residents a sound proposal, as borne out by the signed petition delivered to CoK offices 05th Nov 13.</p> <p>The Tamarisk trees have protected the foreshore in Samson for approx. 50 years now. Some will argue they are not native & have no place, however, please consider all the positive characteristics of the tree, such as; sand bank stability, shade, acting as a wind break, a site for birds to nest, excellent sand barrier. Another important characteristic of the tree is, it is maintenance free. It doesn't require irrigation.</p> <p>I believe the trees have more than demonstrated their suitability & benefits to the shoreline stability & infrastructure behind them. Previous attempts to establish trees along the foreshore have failed due to unsuitability & lack of water. The City clearly doesn't have the resources to manage adequately the existing gardens & infrastructure. May I suggest the Tamarisk trees be pruned, a much cheaper option.</p> <p>I refer you to the attached photo taken outside the Samson Tavern on the Tamarisk tree line. This photo was taken in 2011. On this occasion there wasn't a storm surge. I don't for one minute think the proposed sand movement barriers depicted in the Management plan will have any stabilising effect at all. In fact, quite the opposite, the barriers will end up as beach litter requiring ongoing maintenance.</p> <p>I urge CoK to think carefully about the impact to residents & businesses who have invested here. The Structure management plan, as it stands, has merit but some of the proposals [as outlined] in it, clearly do not suit a Category D cyclone area, such as Point Samson.</p> <p>Please see attached photo in support of my submission, taken at the Pt Samson Tavern Car Park (copy of signed petition available on request).</p>	<p>Issue/Comment No.1:</p> <p>-Removal of Tamarisk Trees.</p>	<p>Officer Response No.1:</p> <p>-No Tamarisk Trees are proposed to be removed by the Point Samson Structure Plan.</p> <p>-On the 28th January 2015 Council resolved to adopt the Point Samson Foreshore Management Plan subject to modifications in accordance with an attached schedule of modifications which read 'Note in section 3.2.3 that although the UDLA foreshore masterplan recommends systematic removal of the Tamarisk trees, there are community concerns about this recommendation and that any removal and rehabilitation will only occur when the community is generally in favour of removing specific trees or when required for community safety'.</p> <p>-The retention or staged removal of specific Tamarisk Trees to facilitate dune rehabilitation will be considered in the progression of the Foreshore Works Implementation Plan and subject to community consultation. These are separate exercises from the Point Samson Structure Plan.</p>	<p>Officer Recommendation No.1:</p> <p>-Note that in 2016 as part of progressing the Point Samson Foreshore Works Implementation Plan, the City will proceed to tender on a fencing and revegetation management plan which will consider staged tamarisk tree removal in consultation with the Point Samson community.</p>
2	10th June 2015	Cesar Rodriguez, Manager Advice & Proposals Dept of Aboriginal Affairs	Ground Floor, 151 Royal Street, East Perth WA 6004 Cesar.rodriquez@daa.wa.gov.au	<p>DAA understands that the proposed Plan is for various developments within Point Samson and that the City is aware of their obligations under the Aboriginal Heritage Act 1972 [AHA] as outlined on the table listing the heritage places on table 9 of the proposed plan on page 37.</p> <p>The City should note that the unregistered places listed in the table 10 [P37] are currently lodged places on the DAA Aboriginal Heritage Database and if the City has any additional information regarding the places to which the AHA may apply, this information must be reported under section 15 of the AHA which states:</p> <p><i>Any person who has knowledge of the existence of any thing in the nature of Aboriginal burial grounds, symbols or objects of sacred, ritual or ceremonial significance, cave or rock paintings or engravings, stone structures or arranged stones, carved trees, or of any other place or thing to which this Act applies or to which this Act might reasonably be suspected to apply shall report its existence to the Registrar, or to a police officer, unless he has reasonable cause to believe the</i></p>	<p>Issue/Comment No.2:</p> <p>-Aboriginal Heritage considerations and statutory obligations.</p>	<p>Officer Response No.2:</p> <p>-Noted. City is aware of obligations under the Aboriginal Heritage Act 1972.</p>	<p>Officer Recommendation No.2:</p> <p>-No change required.</p>

No/Ref	Date Received	Name	Address	Submission	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response	Officer Recommendation
				<p><i>existence of the thing or place in question to be already know to the Registrar.</i></p> <p>DAA notes that although consultation with the Native Title group wasn't undertaken during the preparation of the Plan the City and the Ngarluma Aboriginal Corporation [NAC] would undertake the consultation independently. [P57].</p> <p>As there are heritage places within the proposed plan DAA suggests that before any surveys are undertaken that the City contact the Department for advice regarding the City's obligations under the AHA.</p>			
3	24th June 2015	Ian and Dagmar Kraus	49 Meares Drive, Point Samson	<p>The implementation of the proposed car parks in Meares Drive will affect us as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Property and business devaluation; -Interruption of view; -Noise; -Constant come and go of vehicles; -Caravans parked up for hours and overnight; -Reverse alarms; -Damage to fauna and flora; -Littering; -Loitering/rowdy behaviour/party venue; and -Car parking area used as toilet. <p>We have become exposed to all the undesirable situations listed above in the days prior to the completion of the footpath to the look out at the top of Meares Drive. The area opposite our house was used by the public as an unofficial car park. This situation was brought to the attention of the Shire of Roebourne. The completion of the footpath</p> <p>The first foreshore/structure plan for point Samson was done by UDLA in consultation with the PSCA. When the draft plan came out there was uproar within the wider community, regarding the car parking in Meares Drive and the removal of the Tamarisk trees. Two petitions were presented to the Shire and scheduled meetings were held to discuss the proposals. Following the meetings, a decision was made to remove the car parks from the plan and leave the tamarisk trees in place subject to further consultation with the Point Samson community. John Graham president of the PSCA and CoK staff stated at the time, car parks along Meares drive were off the plan.</p> <p>A further three workshops were held with the community to discuss the foreshore plan. Not one of these workshops mentioned car parking Meares Drive. As a matter of interest, at the last workshop maps of Point Samson were laid out and participants were invited to write their comments on them. We note there was no car parking on Meares drive marked on those maps!</p> <p>To see the reintroduction of car parking along Meares drive on the latest Point Samson structure plan comes as both a surprise and disappointment. It would appear community objection was not taken seriously! As stated in our previous submission, we strongly object to any car parking on Meares Drive directly in front of residential housing and also to additional walkways to the beach for the following reasons:</p> <p>The proposed location car parks will ruin the visual aspect we currently enjoy. The</p>	<p>Issue/Comment No.3.1:</p> <p>-Objection to on-street car parking indicatively depicted on Meares Drive.</p>	<p>Officer Response No.3.1:</p> <p>-Precinct Plan No.1 within the Structure Plan report depicts proposed on-street car parking along sections of Meares Drive.</p> <p>This proposed car parking to be noted as requiring further investigation and the monitoring of informal parking activities over time to determine evidence of demand.</p>	<p>Officer Recommendation No.3.1:</p> <p>-As per Officer Recommendation No.1</p> <p>- Proposed car parking depicted within Precinct 1 plan along Meares drive to be noted in the Structure Plan as requiring further investigation at a later stage.</p> <p>It is further recommended that informal on-street parking activities along Meares Drive be monitored and the need for the proposed car parking reconsidered at a later date based on evidence of demand.</p>
					<p>Issue/Comment No.3.2:</p> <p>-Objection to formalisation of car parking at Meares Drive Lookout.</p>	<p>Officer Response No.3.2:</p> <p>-The Lookout is a popular informal car park with a portion located over a freehold lot (former harbour masters house). The portion of this informal car park cannot continue to be used for a public car park. Both the Point Samson Foreshore Enhancement Plan (UDLA 2013) prepared for the Point Samson Community Association and the City's Foreshore Management Plan recommend a decked lookout, shade structure and fenced pedestrian access at the Lookout for Sam's Beach.</p> <p>While community concerns about parking in this area are understood, there will be a need to provide some parking at the Sam's beach node in recognition of the popularity of this area, especially if a decked lookout is constructed. Planning for this area can be considered in more detail as part of progressing the Foreshore Works Implementation Plan.</p>	<p>Officer Recommendation No.3.2:</p> <p>Investigation into the formalisation of car parking at the Lookout is to be considered as part of future foreshore works planning and subject to community consultation.</p>

No/Ref	Date Received	Name	Address	Submission	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response	Officer Recommendation
				<p>noise levels increase with vehicles constantly coming and going, many fitted with reverse alarms. Vehicle engines left running by those who look and then move on. Other problems such as, littering, loud music, the area used as a toilet, unsocial behaviour, the list goes on and directly affects resident's lifestyle. All the aforementioned occurred on a daily basis, prior to completion of the footpath. On the weekends the situation was worse. On occasion Caravans were parked up for long periods, sometimes overnight. The proposed car parking certainly isn't in line with the objectives of the Town Planning Scheme No.8 ii 'Facilitate the development of Point Samson as a tourist node compatible with the social and environmental setting' nor with iii "Retain, the fishing village atmosphere in Point Samson."</p> <p>Given there is already adequate parking in Point Samson – some with disability access – including at the look out at the top of Meares Drive, we don't believe it is necessary to put more car parking in. Tourists enjoy and indeed, should be encouraged to walk along the footpath or down at the beach and leave their vehicles at a place where it doesn't intrude on home owner's privacy and peace and quiet. Promoting walkways for locals and visitors alike is appropriate in a small town. It only takes approximately 40 minutes to walk around the whole perimeter of this town – 3 minutes from the car parking community hall along Meares drive to the lookout – now the footpath has been finished this is accessible with a wheel chair or pram.</p> <p>The proposed car parking in Meares Drive directly across the road from residential property is of great concern and we urge you to reconsider.</p>	<p>Issue/Comment No.3.3:</p> <p>-Absence of indicative car parking on plans presented at community workshops.</p>	<p>Officer Response No.3.3:</p> <p>-The community workshops discussed different versions of the Structure Plan as the design evolved. The preparation of the precinct plans was a level of detail that followed the development of the Structure Plan.</p>	<p>Officer Recommendation No.3.3:</p> <p>-As per officer recommendation No.3.1 indicative on-street car parking depicted on Meares Drive is to be removed from Precinct Plan No.1.</p>
					<p>Issue/Comment No.3.4:</p> <p>-Opposition to additional walkways to the beach</p>	<p>Officer Response No.3.4:</p> <p>-The precinct plans within the Structure Plan report indicatively depict additional walkways to the beach. These walkways are considered to be important to channel pedestrian movement through the dune and protect the dune from multiple unformalised pedestrian thoroughfares.</p>	<p>Officer Recommendation No.3.4:</p> <p>-No change required.</p>
4	29th June 2015	Debra Costarella	5 Macleod Street Point Samson	<p>I am a resident of Point Samson and I am the secretary of the PSCA. I have been attending the meetings that the Cofk have held to consult with our community.</p> <p>These meetings were pointless as I feel that the consultants did not hear all of our thoughts. The plan is simply exactly what the consultants wanted not what this community wanted. Very disappointed in the whole process and outcomes.</p>	<p>Issue/Comment No.4:</p> <p>-Pointless community consultation.</p>	<p>Officer Response No.4:</p> <p>-The City refutes the assertion that the community consultation process for the Point Samson Structure Plan was pointless. A lengthy and involved consultation process included three separate community workshops and the advertisement of a draft structure plan to solicit comment feedback and recommendations.</p> <p>The consideration of submissions and the opportunity to respond to recommendations as part of finalising the Structure Plan will conclude the consultation process for this project.</p>	<p>Officer Recommendation No.4:</p> <p>-No change required.</p>

No/Ref	Date Received	Name	Address	Submission	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response	Officer Recommendation
5	4th July 2015	Paul Horton	PO Box 257 Wickham	<p>I totally agree with the submission made by the owners of number 49 and Lot 120 (<i>Submission No.3</i>).</p> <p>The foreshore/Structure plan for Point Samson was made by UDLA in consultation with the PSCA. When the draft plan was produced there was an uproar from the general community, regarding the car parking in Meares Drive and the removal of the Tamarisk trees. Two petitions were presented to the Shire and scheduled meetings were held to discuss the proposals. Following the meetings, a decision was made to remove the Car Parks from the Plan and leave the Tamarisk trees in place subject to further consultation with the Point Samson community. The President of the PSCA, John Graham and CoK staff stated at the time that the Car Parks along Meares Drive were off the plan.</p> <p>A further three workshops were held with the community to discuss the Foreshore Plan – none of these mentioned car parking on Meares Drive. As a matter of fact at the last workshop maps of Point Samson were laid out and participants were asked to write any comments on them. We noted that there was no car parking marked on Meares Drive on the maps. Comments were made on the maps that car parking should not be included in the area.</p> <p>To see the reintroduction of car parking [albeit in a different location!] along Meares Drive on the latest Point Samson Structure Plan seems to be contrary to previous agreements and reassurances. It would appear that the community objection was totally disregarded and not taken seriously. As stated in our previous submission we strongly object to any car parking in Meares Drive in front of residential housing and also to additional walkways to the beach for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The recently created walkway is extensively used by residents walking dogs and toddlers, tourists sightseeing and evening strolling, cars constantly crossing the walkway will be a hazard. The noise levels increase with vehicles constantly coming and going, many fitted with reversing alarms, vehicle engines left running by those that look and move on. Loud music from car sound systems with doors left open. Littering [at present Meares Drive is reasonably free of litter]. Unsocial behaviour, and bushes used as toilets. The proposed location of Car Parks will ruin the visual aspect, most residencies are single storey thus would be looking out at parked cars instead of the Indian Ocean, which owners have paid a premium for. [could well lower the rateable value of the properties, hence the rates!] <p>The list goes on and on and would directly affect residence peace and lifestyle, all the fore mentioned already occurs at the car park at the top of Meares Drive and on the foreshore before the walkway was established. At weekends the situation was far worse, on occasions Campervans were parked for long periods including overnight.</p> <p>The proposed Car Parking certainly isn't in line with the objectives of the Town Planning Scheme 8 ii. "Facilitate the Development of Point Samson as a tourist node compatible with the social and environmental setting" nor with iii. "retain the Fishing Village atmosphere in Point Samson".</p> <p>Given that there is already adequate parking in Point Samson – some with</p>	<p>Issue/Comment No.5.1:</p> <p>-Objection to on-street car parking indicatively depicted on Meares Drive.</p>	<p>Officer Response No.5.1:</p> <p>-As per Officer response No.3.1</p>	<p>Officer Recommendation No.5.1:</p> <p>-As per Officer Recommendation No.3.1</p>
					<p>Issue/Comment No.5.2:</p> <p>-Objection to remove Tamarisk trees.</p>	<p>Officer Response No.5.2:</p> <p>- As per Officer Response No.1.</p>	<p>Officer Recommendation No.5.3:</p> <p>-As per Officer Recommendation No.1.</p>
					<p>Issue/Comment No.5.3:</p> <p>-Absent information from the final community workshop.</p>	<p>Officer Response No.5.3:</p> <p>- As per Officer Response No.3.3</p>	<p>Officer Recommendation No.5.3:</p> <p>-As per Officer Recommendation No.3.1.</p>

No/Ref	Date Received	Name	Address	Submission	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response	Officer Recommendation
				<p>disability access – including the lookout at the top of Meares Drive, we don't believe that it is necessary for additional parking. Tourists enjoy and should be encouraged to walk along the footpath [free from cars crossing] and down to the beach leaving their cars in the established car parks where it doesn't intrude on home owner's privacy, peace and quiet.</p> <p>Promoting walkways for locals and visitor alike is appropriate in a small town. It only takes 40 minutes to walk around the whole village – 3 minutes from the Community Hall Car Park to the lookout at the top of Meares Drive, accessible by wheelchairs and/or prams.</p> <p>We request that the proposed car parking along Meares Drive, directly across the road from residential property should be removed from the plan.</p>	<p>Issue Comment No.5.4:</p> <p>The proposed on-street parking on Meares Drive is contrary to Town Planning Scheme Provisions for the character of Point Samson.</p>	<p>Officer Response No.5.4:</p> <p>-As per Officer Response No.3.1.</p> <p>-As per Officer Response No.3.2</p>	<p>Officer Recommendation No.5.4:</p> <p>-As per Officer Recommendation No.3.1.</p> <p>-As per officer Recommendation No.3.2.</p>
6	9th July 2015	John Graham - President PSCA – submission 1	PO Box 93 Wickham	<p>Community Members and Residents of Point Samson and Committee Members on the PSCA would like to highlight the areas where dissatisfaction is felt with the Draft Point Samson Structure Plan.</p> <p>After the final community presentation by Cardno there was a lot of frustration aired at the content of the Point Samson Structure Plan. Many have commented since that they would prefer that the town be left alone and feel that they are being dictated to by consultants that have primarily ignored that the PSCA has already developed a plan for the town's foreshore areas. The Point Samson Community Association in consultation with its community and residents committed a considerable amount of time developing a plan for the town's foreshore development. This involved a number of community consultations over a 19 month period, extensive work, research and a large sum of money to cover the costs of the consultation process. The content of the City of Karratha Point Samson Structure Plan foreshore concepts (other than dune rehabilitation measures) are at odds with what evolved from local community consultations held by the PSCA over that period of 19 months. We invested \$145,000 of community funding into developing the Point Samson Foreshore Master Plan and would expect that the community projects as outlined in our plan be supported and included by the City of Karratha.</p>	<p>Issue/Comment No.6.1:</p> <p>-Preference for PSCA Foreshore Enhancement Plan</p>	<p>Officer Response No.6.1:</p> <p>-Preference for PSCA Foreshore Enhancement Plan is noted. It is further noted that the City's Foreshore Management Plan has several elements which align with the PSCA plan whilst being cognisant of the City's budgetary constraints. It is important to note that the Structure Plan represents the planning for future development areas and extends beyond foreshore areas.</p> <p>Both the Structure Plan and preliminary designs for the Foreshore Works Implementation Plan reflect the recommendations of the PSCA Foreshore Enhancement Plan and CofK Foreshore Management Plan to retreat from the encroachment into the primary dune and the rehabilitation of the dune.</p> <p>The provision of a linear park at the expense of Miller Close as identified within both the PSCA Foreshore Enhancement Plan and the City's Foreshore Management Plan is considered to be a long-term design. A staged approach to the rehabilitation of the primary dune and the establishment of a linear park will avoid a substantial and immediate reduction in car parking provision and difficulties in establishing the linear park before the dune is rehabilitated i.e. sand movement.</p> <p>Investigations into the modification of car parking on Miller Close to facilitate dune rehabilitation are being undertaken in a manner which will allow the linear park concept to be implemented at a later time – most likely when the life of the infrastructure warrants replacement. In this way, the modifications to the car parking may be considered as a staged approach to the long term implementation of the linear park.</p>	<p>Officer Recommendation No.6.1:</p> <p>- The Structure Plan may be modified to clearly represent the staged approach to the implementation of the City's Foreshore Management Plan inclusive of the linear park with due regard to the PSCA Foreshore Enhancement Plan (2013).</p>

No/Ref	Date Received	Name	Address	Submission	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response	Officer Recommendation
				<p>Key issues that have been identified post Point Samson Structure Plan consultation are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Concepts around Community Park are not acceptable in any form. The children’s playground park, Centenary Park, Community Park and the Community Hall are the heart and soul of our town. They exist mainly through funds raised by our community, its residents and members plus thousands of volunteer hours by a group of dedicated individuals. As far as the Point Samson Community is concerned the areas within the boundaries of our parks and the hall are to remain untouched. Any proposed changes to these areas are to be approved by the Point Samson Community Association through consultation with the local community	<p>Issue/Comment No.6.2:</p> <p>-Objection to concepts around community park and concern regarding impacts to children’s playground park, Centenary Park and the Community Hall</p>	<p>Officer Response No.6.2.1:</p> <p><i>Land Use Controls</i></p> <p>-The children’s playground park, community park and community hall are proposed to have a ‘Town Centre’ zone. This land use zone supports tourism community and civic land uses.</p> <p>In addition to having a Town Centre zone, this area is also proposed to be defined as a ‘Special Control Area’ which would require the preparation of a Development Plan. The preparation of a Development Plan would need to demonstrate how development may occur which is appropriate to the location. The consideration of the development plan by council would be informed by community consultation.</p> <p>The application of an appropriate land use zone and the requirement for the preparation of a Development Plan through the imposition of a Special Control Area will enable development options which are appropriate to the location to be appropriately considered.</p>	<p>Officer Recommendation No.6.2.1:</p> <p>No change required.</p>
					<p>Officer Response No.6.2.2:</p> <p><i>Foreshore Works Implementation Plan</i></p> <p>-No changes are proposed to the Children’s playground park, Centenary Park or the Community Hall.</p> <p>-The modification of car parking areas adjacent to the primary foreshore dune are being considered in the progression of the Foreshore Works Implementation Plan which is separate from the Structure Plan.</p> <p>The Point Samson Foreshore Works Plan is considering modified car park arrangements which respond to the dune encroachment and drainage issues identified within the Foreshore Enhancement Plan (UDLA 2013) prepared for the PSCA and the City’s Foreshore Management Plan.</p>	<p>Officer Recommendation No.6.2.2:</p> <p>No change required.</p>	
				<ul style="list-style-type: none">The ‘Boat Shed’ is a planned community project that will result in the construction of a storage facility/meeting area. The purpose of the building is to store ‘kid friendly’ sail craft and sporting equipment that will be purchased by the PSCA. Storage areas will be available for local families to store Kayaks, Paddle Boards etc. The building will have a clubhouse theme to provide a meeting place for those who have an interest in water sports and possible future Pilbara Surf Life Saving Club use. If located adjacent to the Community Hall a ramp constructed diagonally to the beach would provide safe beach access with watercraft, will act as a drain and also prevent the wind tunnelling effect that causes the sand inundation to the car park and hall. As stated previously it was disappointing that our ‘Boat Shed’ was dismissed in the City’s second draft presentation because the <i>consultant couldn’t rationalise</i> the concept. The location of this facility needs to be in the vicinity of the Community Hall, not in front of the local tavern. <i>Discussed at meeting with David Pentz and Andrew Ward.</i>	<p>Issue/Comment No.6.3:</p> <p>-Objection to proposed location of Boat shed as depicted in draft Foreshore Works Implementation Plan.</p>	<p>Officer Response No.6.3:</p> <p>-Discussions on a boat shed have been previously discussed as part of the preparation of the PSCA Foreshore Enhancement Plan and may be further considered through the planning of foreshore works.</p>	<p>Officer Recommendation No.6.3:</p> <p>- Forward the feedback on the proposed location of the boat shed to the Foreshore Works Implementation project management team for consideration in the progression of the project.</p>

No/Ref	Date Received	Name	Address	Submission	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response	Officer Recommendation
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In their current form the proposed 'Car Park Rationalisations' and Drainage that will take place through Cardno's concept will create unacceptable problems through the inability of larger vehicles being able to turn around. I would suggest that you consult the operators of your rubbish trucks and also the drivers of community buses to discuss the implications of planned changes. Both foreshore car parks will have "dead ends" with turning options for nothing bigger than a large four wheel drive. It appears there has been no consideration for the issues we already have with the traffic flow or lack thereof currently in the town. <i>Discussed at meeting with David Pentz and Andrew Ward</i> ➤ For almost half of the year many tourists arrive in town towing caravans or driving large mobile homes. The removal of adequate turning areas will create frustration and anger to those who inadvertently enter into the 'Rationalised' parking areas and a forced to reverse out. ➤ There will be safety issues that will result in the likelihood of injury to pedestrians. ➤ Proposed parking bays at the Caravan Park boundary will create unacceptable conditions for campers through exposure to noise, light, and exhaust gasses. Discussed at meeting with Andrew Ward 	<p>Issue/Comment No.6.4:</p> <p>-Car parking access and pedestrian safety concerns associated with preliminary planning for the Foreshore Works Implementation Plan.</p>	<p>Officer Response No.6.4:</p> <p>- While the car parking and access concerns associated with the preliminary foreshore works planning are separate from the Structure Plan, the submission may contribute to the planning of the foreshore works and are duly noted.</p>	<p>Officer Recommendation No.6.4:</p> <p>-Note submission to inform planning for foreshore works. No change to Structure Plan required.</p>
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The concept of a loch type public marina development with retail and residential aspects was discussed and largely supported at Workshops 1 & 2. It was asked that the CoK take whatever steps necessary to have the proposed site rezoned now to allow any interested developers the opportunity to invest and develop the site without going through the approval process that has proved to be a deterrent in the past. This needs to be included in our structure plan and in the form as discussed during consultations. A development of this kind would provide residential, tourism, retail and employment opportunities while providing sustainable growth to the town's population and economy. The City of Karratha's proposed changes for the harbour area are welcomed however they need to be expanded on to allow for a possible development around a loch type marina. 	<p>Issue/Comment No.6.5:</p> <p>-Appropriate zoning to be placed over the future marina area.</p>	<p>Officer Response No.6.5:</p> <p>-The Structure Plan report includes substantial information on the harbour area which translates to an expanded harbour zone to enable a future marina. A Special Control Area land use control is to apply over the proposed Harbour zone which would require the preparation of a Development Plan.</p> <p>-The application of the Marina Zone and designation as a Special Control Area for the Marina area and surrounds are appropriate because they allow for the marina to be developed but require an overall plan and further consultation before anything can be developed.</p> <p>-With Precinct plan 2 – Marina Precinct the following details are considered: objectives; opportunities, limitations; built form controls; and potential design layout. These details will inform the preparation of the Development Plan to facilitate appropriate development.</p>	<p>Officer Recommendation No.6.5:</p> <p>-No change required.</p>
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The concepts that were presented have left many of us feeling largely ignored. We are concerned at the amount of time, money and resources that has been invested in producing new concepts. It seems that our hours of volunteer work and community participation have produced a plan that is not to the liking of the consultants engaged by the City of Karratha hence their need to rewrite our already completed Foreshore Master Plan. 	<p>Issue/Comment No.6.6:</p> <p>-The Structure Plan does not represent the PSCA Foreshore Management Plan.</p>	<p>Officer Response No.6.6:</p> <p><i>Linear Park</i></p> <p>-Both the Foreshore Enhancement Plan (UDLA 2013 prepared for the PSCA and the City's Foreshore Management Plan have informed the preparation of the Structure Plan. It is important to note that the Structure Plan represents the planning for future development areas and extends beyond foreshore areas.</p> <p>While the PSCA Foreshore Enhancement Plan and the City's Foreshore Management Plan propose a linear park behind the primary dune at the expense of a substantial portion of Miller Close, it is considered that investigations into the modification of the car park between the primary dune and the Community Hall as part of progressing the Foreshore Works</p>	<p>Officer Recommendation No.6.6:</p> <p>-Update Structure Plan to demonstrate staged modification of car parking and dune rehabilitation on Millers Close and long-term implementation of linear park</p>

No/Ref	Date Received	Name	Address	Submission	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response	Officer Recommendation
						<p>Implementation Plan are likely to result in a reduction of car parking bays. The loss of bays would be compounded if the car parking bays on Millers Close were sacrificed for a linear park.</p> <p>-Investigations into the modification of car parking on Millers Close to facilitate dune rehabilitation are being undertaken in a manner which may, at a future time, allow the linear park concept to be investigated for implementation – most likely when the life of the infrastructure warrants replacement. In this way, the modifications to the car parking may be considered as a staged approach to the long term implementation of the linear park as represented within both the PSCA Foreshore Enhancement Plan and the City's foreshore Management Plan.</p>	
				<p>The PSCA is of the opinion that the remedial works (dune rehab, car parks and footpaths) in the first stage of the structure plan are something the council should be funding entirely. Rio Tinto funding should not be spent on civil works, this is something that should be funded and provided by the City of Karratha just like any other town. Rio Tinto's monetary contribution should be spent on improving the overall amenity of the town and infrastructure projects.</p> <p>In summary of the final City of Karratha presentation there are those that feel the presentation lacked an understanding of the community's vision for the future of its town. The community has been presented with concept plans from a group who are not familiar with where we live, why we live here, and why we continue to live here.</p>	<p>Issue/Comment No.6.7:</p> <p>-Remedial works (dune rehab, car parks and footpaths) should be funded by CofK with RTIO contributions spent elsewhere</p>	<p>Officer Response No.6.7:</p> <p>-Remedial works are being paid by the City with the public amenity structure funded by RTIO contributions.</p>	<p>Officer Recommendation No.6.7:</p> <p>-No change required.</p>
				<p>Failure by the City of Karratha to notify the key stakeholders of the Draft PS Structure Plan content prior to the council meeting is of great concern.</p> <p>It is the opinion of PSCA members that insufficient and incorrect information was provided to councillors prior to their voting for or against the proposed Structure Plan.</p>	<p>Issue/Comment No.6.8:</p> <p>-Lack of advertisement that the Structure Plan was being presented to Council to initiate Public Advertising.</p> <p>-Insufficient and incorrect information has been provided to Council.</p>	<p>Officer Response No.6.8:</p> <p>-The Structure Plan was presented to Council for the public advertisement of the draft proposal. Stakeholders were invited to comment on the draft structure plan during the public advertisement period.</p> <p>The assertion that insufficient and incorrect information being provided to Council has not been demonstrated and is not supported.</p>	<p>Officer Recommendation No.6.8:</p> <p>-No change required.</p>
7	12th July 2015	John Graham – President PSCA – Submission 2	26 Cliff Street Point Samson	<p>Environmental impact is an issue through the possible development of land within this proposed area. Just a few of the commonly seen species that inhabit the area are Slider Skink, Tata Lizard, Monitor Lizards, Olive Python, Gwardar, King Brown, Echidna, Pheasant Coucal, Peaceful Dove, Red Faced Finch, Quail, Sacred Kingfisher, Kangaroo and Rock Wallaby.</p> <p>Due to the significant amount of native and migratory species that inhabit the area it is in need of protection, not development. The wilderness aspect should be retained through a zoning of Conservation/Reserve not R10. It is an area that is frequently visited by many locals and visitors who walk the area daily.</p> <p>Point Samson is almost an island. The reduction in habitat for these species should not be a consideration.</p>	<p>Issue/Comment No.7.1:</p> <p>-Concerns regarding Environmental impact from proposed Precinct 5 – Residential North</p> <p>-Opposition to future development over area which should be zoned for Conservation/Recreation to facilitate environmental protection.</p>	<p>Officer Response No.7.1:</p> <p>-Part 12 of the Structure Plan investigates Site Conditions and Environment considerations. It is noted that detailed environmental investigation and an environmental assessment will be required as part of the process for the rezoning of land.</p>	<p>Officer Recommendation No.7.1:</p>
8	12th July 2015	John Graham – Owner Occupier	26 Cliff Street	The last 12 months has seen an unprecedented impact on City of Karratha property values. There is a significant over supply of vacant properties and land within the City of Karratha district. While it has been argued that we are seeing a	<p>Issue/Comment No.8.1:</p> <p>-Development should be</p>	<p>Officer Response No.8.1:</p> <p>-The Structure Plan is to enable future development to</p>	<p>Officer Recommendation No.8.1:</p>

No/Ref	Date Received	Name	Address	Submission	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response	Officer Recommendation
		concerns	Point Samson	<p>return to a normalised market the impact on those who were willing to commit to living in the region and purchase properties during peak demand periods is deeply disturbing. Plummeting home prices, the PUP fiasco and diminishing confidence within the business community has placed a worrying amount of financial pressure on those who were willing to commit to living, working and investing in the area. Those of us that chose to purchase homes in Point Samson did so to enjoy what the town has to offer. The small family friendly community surrounded by natural landscapes is the attraction of the town.</p> <p>It should be mandatory that any future development be supported by the Point Samson Community Association through consultation with the local community. There will be no significant economic benefit as a result of further residential development within the township of Point Samson unless it is to support commercial investment within the town. Residential development as a source of increasing the City of Karratha's ratepayer base would be an unacceptable outcome. Development should be restricted to what the community proposed for a Marina precinct. This would provide higher density residential space with a smaller footprint and would be seen as an attractive investment opportunity. This main focus needs to be directed at tourist/apartment style accommodation and associated services.</p>	restricted to Marina precinct.	be investigated rather than expand the City's rate base.	-No change required.
				Point Samson Foreshore Enhancement Plan concepts other than dune rehabilitation have been largely ignored in the plan as prepared by Cardno.	<p>Issue/Comment No.8.2:</p> <p>- PSCA FMP has been largely ignored in the draft Foreshore Works Implementation Plan prepared by Cardno.</p>	<p>Officer Response No.8.2:</p> <p>-As per Officer response No.6.6</p>	<p>Officer Recommendation No.8.2:</p> <p>-As per Officer Recommendation No.6.6</p>
				Point Samson Foreshore Enhancement Plan's Miller Close linear park concept has been dismissed by Council without consultation with the PSCA.	<p>Issue/Comment No.8.3</p> <p>-Linear Park concept has been dismissed without consultation.</p>	<p>Officer Response No.8.3:</p> <p>-As per Officer Response 6.6</p>	<p>Officer Recommendation No.8.3:</p> <p>-As per Officer Recommendation No.6.6</p>
				<p>Excessive reduction to Community Hall car parking bays. From 52 to 19 with minimal turnaround area demonstrates the incompetence of the author.</p> <p>Carpark rationalisation and drainage funding allocation is excessive in proportion to improved public amenity.</p>	<p>Issue/Comment No.8.4:</p> <p>-Concerns regarding Community Hall and Miller Close drainage and carpark rationalisation.</p>	<p>Officer Response No.8.4:</p> <p>-The City is progressing a Foreshore Works Implementation Plan which includes an amenity structure dune rehabilitation and modification to the car parks near the foreshore which have been constructed within the primary dune and suffer dune encroachment and drainage compromise.</p> <p>The Structure Plan recognises the opportunity to retreat from the primary dune in a staged manner, working towards the future implementation of the principles within the City's Foreshore Management Plan, with due regard to the PSCA Foreshore Enhancement Plan.</p> <p>Concerns regarding car parking rationalisation and potential traffic complications will be forwarded to the Foreshore Works Implementation project management team for consideration.</p>	<p>Officer Recommendation No.8.4:</p> <p>-Forward concerns regarding the car parking and dune rehabilitation to the City's Infrastructure Services for consideration in the progression of the Foreshore Works Implementation Plan.</p>
				<p>Environmental impact is an issue through the possible development of land within this proposed area. Just a few of the commonly seen species that inhabit the area are Slider Skink, Tata Lizard, Monitor Lizards, Olive Python, Gwardar, King Brown, Echidna, Pheasant Coucal, Peaceful Dove, Red Faced Finch, Quail, Sacred Kingfisher, Kangaroo and Rock Wallaby.</p> <p>Due to the significant amount of native and migratory species that inhabit the area it is in need of protection, not development. The wilderness aspect should be retained through a zoning of Conservation/Reserve not R10. It is an area that is</p>	<p>Issue/Comment No.8.5:</p> <p>-Environmental concerns</p>	<p>Officer Response No.8.5:</p> <p>-As per Officer Response No.7.1</p>	<p>Officer Recommendation No.8.5:</p> <p>-As per Officer Recommendation No.7.1</p>

No/Ref	Date Received	Name	Address	Submission	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response	Officer Recommendation
				<p>frequently visited by many locals and visitors who walk the area daily.</p> <p>Point Samson is almost an island. The reduction in habitat for these species should not be a consideration.</p>			
9	13th July 2015	Mark Willson Water Corporation	PO Box 100 Leederville WA 6007	<p>Karratha City-SP Point Samson District Structure Plan</p> <p>Thank you for your email dated 21 May 2015. The Water Corporation offers the following comments in regard to this proposal.</p> <p>The statement/s made on pages 14 and 15 do not truly represent the servicing situation. The following amendments should be considered from the report.</p> <p>Water Supply Infrastructure – p14</p> <p><i>Point Samson is supplied with potable water via a gravity fed main from a storage facility nine kilometres away at Wickham. An upgrade to a two kilometer section of this main is planned, which is critical to provide additional maintain current capacity to serve Point Samson as the network is presently at capacity.</i> Suggested adding the following wording;</p> <p>The existing water scheme is not able to support new services for proposed development, new services in Point Samson at present. A water scheme planning review shall be required to determine what infrastructure upgrades are required to support further development in Point Samson.</p> <p>15.6 Water Supply – p51</p> <p><u>Network Supply</u></p> <p>The Wickham Tank has a TWL of 65.9 not 75m.</p> <p>The report states that in Point Samson there are; 130 single services and 140 multiple services, Business Warehouse has 8 commercial, 8 other, 114 Residential and 5 vacant. These figures do not seem quite correct, and need to be checked if they need to be included in the report.</p> <p><u>Future Supply and Demand</u></p> <p>Any significant proposed development of an extra service would shall require a planning scheme investigation, and there would be a requirement for an increase in the storage and treatment facilities in Wickham and the amplification and/or duplication of the nine kilometer water main to Point Samson. Suggested adding the following wording;</p> <p>The existing water scheme is not able to support new services for further development in Point Samson at present. A water scheme planning review shall be required to determine what infrastructure upgrades are required to support further development in Point Samson.</p> <p>Delivery and Funding New Infrastructure</p> <p>The principle followed by the Water Corporation for the delivery and funding of new infrastructure required to service proposed new subdivision / development is one of user pays [developer/proponent]. The infrastructure required and associated costs may include;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Water and sewerage reticulation. ○ New headworks assets eg. Tanks & large distribution mains not scheduled on the Water Corporation’s ‘5-year Capital Investment Program’ are not eligible for funding contributions by the Corporation. ○ Upgrading of existing water or wastewater assets that are deemed to be triggered by new development. ○ Projects to protect existing water or wastewater assets affected by new development. 	<p>Issue/Comment No.9.1:</p> <p>-Clarifications regarding water supply and infrastructure provision to be updated.</p>	<p>Officer Response No.9.1:</p> <p>-Structure Plan report to be updated to comply with Water Corporation advice.</p>	<p>Officer Recommendation No.9.1:</p> <p>-Modify Structure plan to align with Water Corporation advice.</p>

No/Ref	Date Received	Name	Address	Submission	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response	Officer Recommendation
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Land to locate new assets on being ceded free of cost. Headworks contribution for water and wastewater. <p>Urban Water Management</p> <p>In conjunction with general climatic changes, water efficiency is an extremely high priority in all development proposals, and should be accompanied by a water management plan that to address the State Water Strategy 2003, State Water Plan 2007 and the State Planning Policy 2.9 and 'Better Urban Management' implementation guide.</p> <p>In particular items that should be addressed include appliance labelling standards, incentives for occupants to be water efficient, garden and irrigation design, leak detection and maintenance, and opportunities explored for recycling. Alternatives for irrigating POS areas rather than using drinking water scheme should be considered. Please find further information on the Corporations website under non-drinking water options.</p> <p>http://www.watercorporation.com.au/home/builders-and-developers/subdividing/non-drinking-water-options</p> <p>The Water Corporation's Water Ever' 10 year plan aims to reduce water use in the Northwest by working with communities and businesses on a range of programs, including; water use behavior change and replacement of inefficient fittings for residents and small business, leak detection and repair, water efficiency solutions for major businesses.</p>			
10	13th July 2015	Russell Brady - Rempearl Pty Ltd (Samson Beach Tavern/Bistro/Chalets/Caravan Park and store)	PMB 346 North Fremantle WA 6159	<p>We appreciate the efforts of the City Of Karratha and the Point Samson Community Association in putting together the Point Samson District Plan and in principle, fully support the plan.</p> <p>Our concerns are based on issues which are in the scope of things relatively minor which I am sure can be addressed. The parking issue is in two parts.</p> <p>My understanding is that prior to planning approval being granted for the bistro, formally known as Moby's Kitchen, the developer, Mr. W.A. Miller was required to provide 11 car bays. I understand Mr. Miller was quoted \$30,000 as his contribution. These bays were duly provided in a joint arrangement between the then Shire and Mr Miller which resulted in what is now the circular carpark / turnaround in front of the Bistro being constructed. Assuming this is to be correct, which the original owner/operator of Moby's Kitchen, Mr David Patience assured me was, then we need to be assured that their removal will not affect our business in any way and should we in future apply for planning approval for any reason and have parking issues be presented as grounds for refusal.</p>	<p>Issue/Comment 10.1:</p> <p>-Modifications to the parking area in front of tavern/bistro.</p> <p>-Removal of bays from Meares and implications to future development opportunities.</p>	<p>Officer Response No.10.1:</p> <p>-Two separate visual audits of car parking demand in Millers Close identified that there is strong demand for car parking near the Point Samson Tavern and reduced car parking closer to the Children's Playground. It is noted that while draft designs for dune rehabilitation on Millers Close within the Foreshore Works Implementation Plan would result in a reduced number of car bays, that there would remain sufficient car parking within Millers Close, albeit a reduced supply in proximity to the Tavern. In isolation this would not restrict the development potential of adjacent development sites.</p>	<p>Officer Recommendation No.10.1:</p> <p>-Forward the consideration of dune rehabilitation and car park rationalisation submission to the Foreshore Works Implementation project management team for consideration in the progression of the project.</p>
				<p>We also assume and would appreciate confirmation that the proposed turn around area at the front of the Tavern/Bistro would be sufficient size to allow the septic pump out truck access to service the system located at front. I believe that if necessary the system could be relocated to the rear of the complex however that would be a costly exercise.</p>	<p>Issue/Comment No.10.2:</p> <p>-Confirmation that cul de sac head is large enough to allow septic truck access.</p>	<p>Officer Response No.10.2:</p> <p>-The design for Millers Close is in a draft format and may be modified to reflect the concerns of the submission.</p>	<p>Officer Recommendation No.10.2:</p> <p>-Forward the concern regarding the size of the cul de sac head and its current use to the Foreshore Works Implementation project management team for consideration in the progression of the project.</p>
				<p>Given the close proximity the proposed parking bays to the exiting caravan bay sites along that area as well as removal of the existing verge to create the new bays we believe that the coming and going of vehicles, particularly at night with vehicle headlights as well as vehicle noise, music and so on will have a detrimental effect on our guests, not to mention the safety issues that may arise. The bays will only be at most a couple of meters from existing sites and the height differential will ensure the full effect of headlights through any caravan or camper window from a couple of meters away, not an ideal situation I am sure you will agree.</p>	<p>Issue/Comment No.10.3:</p> <p>-Relocation of parking bays along Miller Close from the ocean side to the caravan park side.</p> <p>-Conflict of proposed bays with caravan park occupiers.</p>	<p>Officer Response No.10.3:</p> <p>-The design for Millers Close is in a draft format and may be modified to reflect the concerns of the submission.</p>	<p>Officer Recommendation No.10.3:</p> <p>-Forward the feedback on the draft design of the Millers Close car park to the Foreshore Works Implementation project management team for consideration in the progression of the project.</p>

No/Ref	Date Received	Name	Address	Submission	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response	Officer Recommendation
				We believe the use of traffic barriers or solid walls to create a barrier would detract from the natural beauty of the area which we and the City have strived to keep open. Considering the removal of parking bays in front of the tavern/bistro as well as the large reduction of bay numbers at the community hall we believe these bays will be well utilized, particularly in the evenings. A recent incident in the rear carpark some two weeks ago in which a vehicle mounted the curbing and demolished a substantial limestone pillar shows that such incidents can occur, it was fortunate that no one was in the vicinity at the time. Hopefully the City will consider the bays being relocated back on the ocean side.			
				<p>At present we have sufficient bays to comply with present licensed patron numbers (for the tavern) as well as sufficient land within the existing car park to expand that by approximately 8 bays should they be required. Given that the District Plan refers to an increase in the local population, then it can safely be assumed that they will be <i>required</i>.</p> <p>I refer to the Design Report of the Point Samson Foreshore which shows Sea Eagle road running alongside our present car park, which presents no issue however having 3 points of entry to a relatively small car park seems excessive. As well as reducing the available bays it may also create a defacto road or short cut. We believe the carpark entrance opposite the Tavern would be sufficient and would still allow us the option of increasing the number of bays in the future.</p>	<p>Issue/Comment No.10.4:</p> <p>-Demand for car parking at the end of Bartley Court.</p> <p>-Car park design between General Store and Holiday Park Caravan Park.</p>	<p>Officer Response No.10.4:</p> <p>- The design for Bartley Close and nearby car park is in a draft format and may be modified to reflect the concerns of the submission.</p>	<p>Officer Response No.10.4:</p> <p>-Forward the feedback on the draft design of Bartley Court and nearby car park to the Foreshore Works Implementation project management team for consideration in the progression of the project.</p>
				<p>Whereas we understand that option is the best available and the most practical for all concerned I raise the following concerns. At present we have our gas tank filled up on a regular basis, this involves the tanker parking in the car park (proposed road) and running the filler hose to the tank, I am sure you would agree this would not be an ideal scenario should that part of the car park be a public road. The bin compound would be very close to the proposed road and apart from the obvious problems caused by that (4.5 meter bin of kitchen waste) the issue of the waste truck blocking the road may also be a problem.</p> <p>A similar issue may arise with the regular pump out of the grease trap, we presently use the block next door to access the trap but that will no longer be available for that purpose. We believe a solution to these potential problems may be by way of a land swap. That being, the land thru the existing car park in exchange for a strip of land down the side of the Tavern/Bistro sufficient in width and length to allow us to undertake the mentioned services away from the proposed road.</p>	<p>Issue/Comment No.10.5:</p> <p>-Proposed resumption of land to create an extension of Bartley Court / Sea Eagle Way thru the top of the present car park.</p> <p>-Proposed land exchange.</p>	<p>Officer Response No.10.5:</p> <p>-As discussed with the submitter onsite, the design of the car park</p> <p>-The City does not own the identified land and is therefore unable to enter into land exchange discussions.</p>	<p>Officer Response No.10.5:</p> <p>-Forward the feedback on the draft design of Bartley Court and nearby car park to the Foreshore Works Implementation project management team for consideration in the progression of the project.</p>
11	13th July 2015	Taryn and Glenn Higgins	4 McCourt Street Point Samson WA	In summary of the final City of Karratha presentation and after some discussion and consultation with various stakeholders since the draft plan was presented to council, we feel there has been a lack of understanding and communication between many parties. It appears some decisions have been made without due diligence in notifying all concerned about the broader context of the community's vision for the future of its town or informing parties of the correct information.	<p>Issue/Comment No.11.1:</p> <p>-Lack of consultation with the community.</p>	<p>Officer Response No.11.1:</p> <p>-As per Officer Response No.4</p>	<p>Officer Recommendation No.11.1:</p> <p>-As per Officer Recommendation No.4</p>
				The biggest concern is that should Stage 1 proceed according to the current draft plan the community will suffer and the consequences and backlash the Point Samson Community Association and the City of Karratha will experience will be embarrassing. Not to mention the tax payer's money and external funding that will be wasted on works that is not going to improve the town of Point Samson. In reality the proposed Stage 1 works will cause more problems and issues with traffic flow and parking than we already have.	<p>Issue/Comment No.11.2:</p> <p>-More problems with car parking and traffic would be created by the proposed designs.</p>	<p>Officer Response No.11.2:</p> <p>-Concerns regarding car parking rationalisation and potential traffic complications will be forwarded to the Foreshore Works Implementation project management team for consideration.</p>	<p>Officer Recommendation No.11.2:</p> <p>-Forward concerns regarding car parking rationalisation and potential traffic complications will be forwarded to the Foreshore Works Implementation project management team for consideration.</p>
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Point Samson Foreshore Enhancement Plan concepts other than dune rehabilitation have been largely ignored in the plan as prepared by Cardno. Point Samson Foreshore Enhancement Plan's Miller Close linear park concept has been dismissed by Council without consultation with the PSCA. The plan lacks the ideas of the community to maximise the opportunity for a family 	<p>Issue/Comment No.11.3:</p> <p>-Disregard for linear park concept depicted within PSCA Foreshore Management Plan.</p>	<p>Officer Response No.11.3:</p> <p>-As per Officer Response No.6.8</p>	<p>Officer Recommendation No.11.3:</p> <p>-As per Officer Recommendation No.6.8</p>

No/Ref	Date Received	Name	Address	Submission	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response	Officer Recommendation
				friendly lineal foreshore environment with improved amenity.			
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The current road layout and traffic management in Point Samson lacks flow due to the current road network in Point Samson. The plan shows excessive reduction to Community Hall car parking bays from 52 to 19 with lack of turnaround areas for anything bigger than a large four wheel drive. This is also the case with proposed changes to the carpark along the foreshore and towards the Tavern including in front of and adjacent to the caravan park. It is hard to understand the thought processes or lack thereof behind these carpark designs. The end result will cause more problems than we already and would be embarrassment to the CoK and the Point Samson Community. 	Issue/Comment No.11.4: -Object to reduction of car parking bays in Community Hall car park and Millers Close and proposed cul de sac heads.	Officer Response No.11.4: -As per Officer Response No.84	Officer Recommendation No.11.4: --As per Officer Recommendation No.8.4
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lack of consultation with the property/business owners in this area also highlights the lack of thought processes and needs for our community and tourists / visitors to town. 	Issue/Comment No.11.5: -Lack of consultation	Officer Response No.11.5: -As per Officer Response No.4	Officer Recommendation No.11.5: -As per Officer Recommendation No.4
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Carpark rationalisation and drainage funding allocation is excessive in proportion to improved public amenity and beautification of the town's foreshore area. 	Issue/Comment No.11.6: -Objection to extent of car park and drainage rationalisation.	Officer Response No.11.6: -As per Officer Response No.8.4	Officer Recommendation No.11.6: -As per Officer Recommendation No.8.4
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Remedial works (dune rehab, carparks and footpaths) in the first stage of the structure plan are something the council should be funding entirely. Rio Tinto funding should not be spent on civil works, this is something that should be funded and provided by the City Of Karratha just like any other town. Rio Tinto's monetary contributions should be spent on improving the overall amenity of the town and long term infrastructure projects that benefit the community. 	Issue/Comment No.11.7: -As per Issue/Comment No.6.7	Officer Response No.11.7: -As per Officer Response No.6.7	Officer Recommendation No.11.7: -As per Officer Recommendation No.6.7
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Failure by the City of Karratha to notify the key stakeholders of the Draft PS Structure Plan content prior to the council meeting is of great concern. 	Issue/Comment No.11.8: -Lack of advertisement of draft Structure Plan prior to presentation to Council for Advertising	Officer Response No.11. -The advertisement of draft Structure Plans is the stage at which stakeholders are advised of comment and invited to make submissions. There is no pre-advertisement advertisement.	Officer Recommendation No.11.8 -No change required.
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The plan lacks the family friendly foreshore environment we had all hoped for and discussed during community consultations, especially considering the town of Point Samson has been identified by the City of Karratha as the main tourist attraction/destination in the Pilbara. 	Issue/Comment No.11.9: -Lack of family friendly foreshore environment i.e. Linear Park.	Officer Response No.11.9: -As per Officer Response No.6.6	Officer Recommendation No.11.9: -As per Officer Recommendation No.6.6

No/Ref	Date Received	Name	Address	Submission	Summary of Comments Made	Officer Response	Officer Recommendation
12	16th July 2015	Rio Tinto Iron Ore	152 – 158 St Georges Terrace Perth WA 6000	<p>RTIO submits that in considering the potential expansion of residential capacity in Point Samson the City of Karratha (the City) should consider the proximity of Cape Lambert to Point Samson. We recognise that port operations can result in potential social impacts such as noise, dust, traffic and amenity. However, our cumulative social impact mitigation plans and Community Infrastructure & Services Partnership (CISP) with the City demonstrate our commitment to enhancing and sustaining the liveability of communities neighbouring our operations.</p> <p>We make the below submission regarding the following sections of the Plan.</p> <p>9.4 Population Targets and capacity for Growth</p> <p>In reference to the Plan’s comments regarding the risk of extreme storm surge events limiting population growth we submit that any expansion of Point Samson should be mindful of the impact of population growth on emergency response facilities and plans within neighbouring towns and cities. Similarly, the impact of population targets should be considered across the full range of community and government services, noting that Point Samson residents access Wickham as a regional service centre, including facilities funded solely by Rio Tinto and community infrastructure and services supported by our CISP and other key stakeholders.</p>	<p>Issue/Comment No.12.1:</p> <p>-Consideration of implications from an increased population upon demand for services within the Wickham Settlement</p>	<p>Officer Response No.12.1</p> <p>-Noted and upheld</p>	<p>Officer Recommendation No.12.1</p> <p>-Structure Plan report to be updated to reflect implications upon services within Wickham with special regard to planning for emergency events.</p>
				<p>10.2 Land Ownership and Tenure and 15.3 Strategic Industry Buffer</p> <p>Ministerial Reserve 35813 – RTIO supports the City’s view that the area within the provided boundary be re-designated as an ‘industrial buffer and landscape protection’ zone.</p>	<p>Issue/Comment 12.2:</p> <p>-Support for creation of ‘Industrial buffer and landscape protection’ area.</p>	<p>Officer Response No.12.2</p> <p>-Noted</p>	<p>Officer Recommendation No.12.2</p> <p>No change required.</p>
				<p>15.7 Power</p> <p>We submit that this section should be redrafted to read ‘the communities of Dampier, Wickham, Pannawonica, Paraburdoo and Tom Price are supplied power through an independently owned and operated network by Pilbara Iron (Rio Tinto)’</p>	<p>Issue/Comment 12.3:</p> <p>Power provision clarification.</p>	<p>Officer Recommendation No.12.3</p> <p>-Supported.</p>	<p>Officer Response No.12.3</p> <p>Modify to clarify power provision.</p>