

# COCKBURN COAST

## District Structure Plan

### **COCKBURN COAST REFERENCE GROUP MEETING 1 SUMMARY**

December 2006



---

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

---

<b>INTRODUCTION &amp; WORKSHOP PROCESS.....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>POSSIBILITY 1 – COASTAL LIGHT RAIL/TRANSIT .....</b>	<b>3</b>
Group Feedback.....	3
Individual Feedback.....	4
<b>POSSIBILITY 2 –COCKBURN ROAD TRANSIT .....</b>	<b>6</b>
Group Feedback.....	6
Individual Feedback.....	6
<b>POSSIBILITY 3 – METRO RAIL .....</b>	<b>8</b>
Group Feedback.....	8
Individual Feedback.....	9
<b>POSSIBILITY 4 – CENTRAL TRANSIT .....</b>	<b>10</b>
Group Feedback.....	10
Individual Feedback.....	11
<b>NEXT STEPS .....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>APPENDIX 1 COMMUNITY REFERENCE GROUP MEMBERS .....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>APPENDIX 2 SUSTAINABILITY PRINCIPLES .....</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>APPENDIX 3 WORKSHOP AGENDA .....</b>	<b>17</b>

## INTRODUCTION & WORKSHOP PROCESS

The first meeting of the Cockburn Coast Reference Group was held on Saturday 2 December 2006 at the Tradewinds Hotel, East Fremantle. The purpose of the meeting was to:

- present information on the preliminary consultant findings and sustainability assessment
- discuss possibilities for future land uses and identify considerations for further testing

Dr Mike Mouritz, from the Department for Planning and Infrastructure opened the meeting. Linton Pike, reference group facilitator, outlined the purpose of the group and its terms of references. Linton noted that the group has an important role in working with the project team to develop a structure plan for the site. Meetings will involve confidential discussions and as such, individual members are not to speak on behalf of the group.

Project consultants delivered their preliminary findings, which included presentations from

- Ray Haeren - Taylor Burrell Barnett (planning)
- Duncan Foster - Worley Parsons (traffic engineering)
- Tanya Stul – Oceanica
- Dale Newsome - ENV Australia (environmental)
- John Syme - Syme Marmion – (sustainability assessment)

Following the consultant findings, Ray Haeren presented four possibilities for the Cockburn Coast area. Ray noted that these possibilities were *not* concept plans for the area, but rather a series of ideas that were designed to prompt discussion and feedback. Ray also noted that the intention was not to determine a 'preferred' possibility, but to discuss the advantages and disadvantages of each as a means to move forward in developing a structure plan.

The following section provides a brief overview of each possibility and the feedback received from meeting participants. This has been broken into feedback received during the group discussion and feedback received from the individual feedback sheets.

In some cases the advantages, disadvantages and comments listed under each possibility will be conflicting. It is expected that these differences and issues will be discussed during subsequent reference group meetings.

## POSSIBILITY 1 – COASTAL LIGHT RAIL/TRANSIT

Key features of Possibility 1 include:

- Light rail along existing freight reserve
- Cockburn Road to become movement/activity corridor
- High density residential along the coast
- Low density residential on the ridge
- Mixed use around transit and Power Station
- Industrial uses slightly reduced
- Biodiversity corridor retained
- Switchyard relocated

### Group Feedback

Advantages	Disadvantages
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Relocation of the switch yard.</li> <li>▪ Biodiversity corridor</li> <li>▪ Mixed use land uses</li> <li>▪ Retention of the industrial area.</li> <li>▪ Rail link to Fremantle</li> <li>▪ The concept of light rail is good.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Retention of the industrial area with access and local area impacts.</li> <li>▪ Produces different land values for land owners –this is not highest and best land use from an economic perspective.</li> <li>▪ The land near the coast may be better used for mixed use and high density residential.</li> <li>▪ There could be one or two more stations.</li> <li>▪ Light rail could extend to service the South Fremantle landfill site along Cockburn Road or other roads.</li> <li>▪ Higher mix of mixed use and residential taking up recreational opportunities on the coast.</li> <li>▪ It doesn't maximize the space to the north of the switching yard and Power Station.</li> <li>▪ Provision of low density throughout – should be mixed use and high density all the way along the coast with a focus on the TOD areas.</li> <li>▪ Low density east of Cockburn Road.</li> <li>▪ Low levels of walkability and fails on public transport.</li> <li>▪ Need to do more with transit and its adjoining land uses.</li> <li>▪ Look for energy efficient buildings, wind generation village efficiency.</li> <li>▪ Concern at ability of the network to manage the associated volumes.</li> </ul>

#### Comments

- The switch yard provides power for the wider area. Demand load will increase and another zone substation will be needed (provision is needed around 2.5km centres).

## Individual Feedback

Advantages	Disadvantages
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The switch yard is relocated</li> <li>▪ Biodiversity corridors retained</li> <li>▪ Industrial use retained</li> <li>▪ Industrial uses reduced</li> <li>▪ Balance between industrial/mixed use</li> <li>▪ Good mix of low and high density residential</li> <li>▪ Mixed use and high density / TOD supported</li> <li>▪ Mixed use around power station</li> <li>▪ Maintains no road hierarchy</li> <li>▪ Good for regional traffic to access Fremantle from the south</li> <li>▪ Utilising the existing rail link and maximising resources / reserve</li> <li>▪ Good usage of beachside land</li> <li>▪ Low density along ridgeline</li> <li>▪ Freight rail retained</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Light rail by itself won't be a sufficient transport solution to the increased population</li> <li>▪ Due consideration should be given to the volume of heavy haulage vehicles entering Precinct 2</li> <li>▪ There is a potential for a bottleneck at Rollinson Road/Cockburn Road—particularly in regards to heavy haulage vehicles</li> <li>▪ The intersection of Rockingham Road / Hampton Road / Cockburn Road / may be problematic</li> <li>▪ No allowances have been given for the current bridge construction of Cockburn Road over freight railway line</li> <li>▪ Significant cost would be incurred to relocate the switchyard as existing power line need to be redirected</li> <li>▪ Mixed use near beach</li> <li>▪ Need more local transport emphasis (ie walking, cycling, tram/light rail)</li> <li>▪ Not using area west of rail line – should use some of it</li> <li>▪ Ensure there is high density on the ridge</li> <li>▪ High density (height conflict) along the coast (there is no provision for viewing corridors)</li> <li>▪ Industrial uses incompatible with residential – not the best use of land</li> <li>▪ Less public open space</li> <li>▪ Increased traffic along Forrest Road as E/W link (there are one lane “pinch points” in sections) that may cause congestion</li> <li>▪ Light rail less attractive than full use of existing rail system (upgraded as necessary)</li> <li>▪ Any retail/mixed use must be exposed to rail or main road movements to ensure viability and vibrancy</li> <li>▪ More light rail stations to be located</li> <li>▪ Potential for 5 traffic signals sites along new Cockburn Road</li> </ul>

### Comments

- Light rail might be more appropriate than heavy rail – closer stations, less impact
- Enhance Cockburn Road (widen) rather than waste more funding on another road.
- Promote the exclusion of motor vehicles.
- People should appreciate that mixed use, light industrial and commercial aspects are required to support the area. Simply maximising returns from the land will detract from the area, and not sustain employment / trades in servicing the area.
- Should be residential / mixed use north of switch yard west of railway line.
- Good beach orientation is essential.

- Must manage road junction bottlenecks:
- Need to allow for a future substation site in the northern part of the area to supply these developments.
- High density needs to be near rail stations.
- Push for passenger rail on freight line.
- As a general across all possibilities I would like the freight line moved and integrated with an upgraded Cockburn Road because I see this as a highly undesirable feature to be located between residential and beach.
- Needs to take adjoining land into consideration (all possibilities)
- Consider water transport (all possibilities)

## POSSIBILITY 2 –COCKBURN ROAD TRANSIT

Key features of Possibility 2 include:

- High density
- View corridors retained with low density residential
- Mixed use focus on transit and power station
- Consolidated industrial with commercial buffer to residential
- Switchyard consolidated and screened
- Coastal road alignment with freight

### Group Feedback

<b>Advantages</b>	<b>Disadvantages</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ View corridors along the spines with some lower density</li> <li>▪ Retention of employment opportunities in the industrial area.</li> <li>▪ Coastal road aligned with freight.</li> <li>▪ Good coastal accessibility offered by road/rail corridor.</li> <li>▪ POS around Power Station and linking to Port Coogee is a positive.</li> <li>▪ Upgrade bus way to light rail.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Retention of the industrial uses. Take it out or reduce it in size.</li> <li>▪ Lack of green biodiversity corridor.</li> <li>▪ Divisive effect of the combined road and rail corridor alienating the foreshore.</li> <li>▪ Western Power needs a bigger site not a smaller one.</li> <li>▪ Low density along the railway line is a wasted opportunity. Could do better in this regard.</li> <li>▪ Allocating view corridors to industrial land. Change the land use to mixed or residential.</li> </ul>

### Comments

- Provision for a Primary School is required with good links to transport (east of Bennett Road and west of Cockburn Road may be best).
- Check for capacity at other schools. Look for co-location opportunities with multi use open space.

### Individual Feedback

<b>Advantages</b>	<b>Disadvantages</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Coastal link road provides north-south travel and coastal access</li> <li>▪ View corridors with low density – provides views and housing mix</li> <li>▪ Primary School on site</li> <li>▪ Added POS on end of power station</li> <li>▪ High density spines</li> <li>▪ Cockburn Road upgraded to take</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Reduction of a green corridor –</li> <li>▪ Cockburn Road upgrade separates community due to high volumes of traffic through area</li> <li>▪ Switchyard retained in “prime location” but “downgraded” – this is questionable.</li> <li>▪ Potential for 5 traffic signals in the area</li> </ul>

<p>pressure off traffic.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Switchyard consolidated and screened.</li> <li>▪ Consolidated industrial with commercial buffer</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Bus services along Cockburn Road are not enough –needs to be in combination with light rail</li> <li>▪ Realignment of Coastal Road with freight link will create even more noise</li> <li>▪ Poor residential utilisation</li> <li>▪ Industrial zone retained – not compatible</li> <li>▪ Regional traffic is mixed with local traffic</li> <li>▪ Lower speed due to congestion</li> <li>▪ Focus on upgrade of Cockburn Road.</li> <li>▪ Cost of new infrastructure for light rail (compared with the upgrading of the existing rail infrastructure)</li> <li>▪ Not possible to reduce the size of the switchyard. It will need to increase in size to cater for greater regional growth in power demand and ignores the need for a new zone substation to supply power to local developments.</li> <li>▪ Too much high density</li> </ul>
--	--

### Comments

- An opportunity exists to relocate the switchyard from the area – it should be taken. While the cost has been consistently referred to as ‘significant’ in the overall scheme it is not.
- Foreshore access along the entire length of the coast is vital.
- No point having view corridors over industrial land.
- Should be more residential / mixed use north of switch yard west of railway line.
- Should not be any low density.
- Support this plan as it connects this area with the Port Coogee.
- There is a good mix of use and keeps people working and engaged in this area.
- The focus should not only be maximising land values but also consider functionality.
- Even moving the switchyard such a small distance would cost in the order of \$100M. The current site could be screened for a fraction of the cost.
- Consider South Fremantle Landfill Site as a dual use option (ie school with public open space)

## POSSIBILITY 3 – METRO RAIL

Key features of Possibility 3 include:

- High density around stations and up onto ridge
- Medium to high density throughout
- Mixed use focus on Cockburn Road
- No industrial identified (staging/transitional arrangements necessary)
- Switchyard relocated to Spearwood Avenue
- Biodiversity corridor retained

### Group Feedback

Advantages	Disadvantages
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Removal of industrial component as mixed use.</li> <li>▪ Higher density makes metro rail more viable</li> <li>▪ Links to Cockburn Central.</li> <li>▪ Regional and local traffic separated.</li> <li>▪ Less need for traffic signals and less rat running likely.</li> <li>▪ Rockingham Road realignment to Rollinson Coastal link road is good but may create a rat run to Fremantle and become a coastal barrier - don't want to prevent coastal access</li> <li>▪ is a positive and offers good access to residential.</li> <li>▪ Linking of Spearwood and Cockburn Road. Could be improved with a staggered T but may overload the north south link with less traffic controls.</li> <li>▪ Retention of Beeliar Open Space is a good option.</li> <li>▪ Rationalise POS and the road reserves to create a better outcome to be more site responsive.</li> <li>▪ East west link is good.</li> <li>▪ Proposed main street on Cockburn Road</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Lost economic opportunities with removal of industrial</li> <li>▪ No space for dedicated light rail beneath bridge under construction.</li> <li>▪ May need more POS near the higher density.</li> <li>▪ Rockingham Road and Hampton Road may be problematic from a design perspective with poor operational capacity.</li> <li>▪ Metro rail on the coast line may be too far from the residential catchment.</li> <li>▪ Coastal link will minimise the take-up of light rail.</li> </ul>

## Individual Feedback

Advantages	Disadvantages
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Maintains road hierarchy, separates regional and local traffic. Eliminates the need for traffic signals</li> <li>▪ Rollinson Road connection to Forrest with less rat running</li> <li>▪ Corner of Cockburn Road and Rockingham Road to be low impact area.</li> <li>▪ Good links to Port Coogee and Fremantle</li> <li>▪ Spearwood Avenue link to Cockburn also good.</li> <li>▪ Switch yard relocated</li> <li>▪ High density around stations to support the rail system.</li> <li>▪ Retains existing public open space</li> <li>▪ Biodiversity retained</li> <li>▪ No residential / industrial conflict</li> <li>▪ Primary school better located.</li> <li>▪ Best use of existing rail system and infrastructure</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Corner of Cockburn Road and Rockingham Road may allow more traffic.</li> <li>▪ Road on the coast will create a barrier to coastal access</li> <li>▪ Removes industrial content.</li> <li>▪ Light rail is long walk from main residential, which will discourage use</li> <li>▪ Too much high density along the coast and no allowance for viewing corridors</li> <li>▪ Not enough POS in high density area</li> <li>▪ Retail at the end of Rollinson is not well integrated</li> <li>▪ Impact on freight rail – might inhibit important freight operations</li> <li>▪ Roe 8 development may impact on external community</li> <li>▪ Heavy passenger rail is not appropriate for future residential areas – light rail better</li> <li>▪ Passenger railway line conflict with current bridge contract for Perth- Catherine development.</li> <li>▪ School too close to industrial area</li> </ul>

## Comments

- Should be more residential / mixed use west of the railway line.
- Coast Road must be a local road, not a highway into Fremantle
- There are systems that make freight / passenger use possible on a single track.
- What route upgrade will be needed if the Fremantle Outer Harbour happens?
- The comment on developing an “eco village” is interesting. The opportunity for this area to be a true eco village rather than the minimal attempts at South Beach, Port Coogee is extremely positive planning
- The area will not work without mixed use that includes current light industrial.
- Continue the new Cockburn Road further north to overcome potential efficiency problems at Cockburn / Rockingham / Hampton intersection.

## POSSIBILITY 4 – CENTRAL TRANSIT

Key features of Possibility 4 include:

- Retail focus around central transit, with commercial buffer onto Cockburn Road
- Strategic industrial sites retained, with commercial buffer onto Cockburn Road
- Switchyard retained and screened
- Biodiversity corridor retained

### Group Feedback

Advantages	Disadvantages
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Light rail alignment is central to residential areas</li> <li>▪ Light rail link (tram or hybrid) to South Terrace is good but may be impossible due to road reserve width. If not possible consider Marine Terrace.</li> <li>▪ Retail mix is good if it promotes activation.</li> <li>▪ Local road coastal link is a positive.</li> <li>▪ There are good mixed use and commercial opportunities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The school is poorly located and is too far north (however it needs to relate to South Fremantle landfill site development and as such it may not be too far north).</li> <li>▪ Separate freight line and its impact.</li> <li>▪ Retention of industrial is too much. Need to scale it back and minimise potential conflicts.</li> <li>▪ School, cold room and cold storage not a good mix.</li> <li>▪ Poor east west links at Port Coogee.</li> <li>▪ Low density to the east of the railway and west of Bennett St.</li> <li>▪ Lack of mixed use in higher density areas.</li> <li>▪ Road hierarchy is poor for regional and local traffic. Need to strengthen the eastern link (Rockingham Highway) and diminish the western link (Cockburn Road).</li> <li>▪ Provision of car parking at the coast. There is a need for passive surveillance to make the beach north of the power station more accessible, inviting and safe.</li> </ul>

## Individual Feedback

Advantages	Disadvantages
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Leaves industrial area – narrow band allows commercial precinct to service the residential area. Mixed use makes the area work.</li> <li>▪ High density</li> <li>▪ Calm coastal road link to Fremantle</li> <li>▪ South Terrace transit link</li> <li>▪ Retail around power station and transit stations</li> <li>▪ Biodiversity retained</li> <li>▪ Traffic split between roads new north south bypass to take most traffic</li> <li>▪ Transit rail more centrally located to residential</li> <li>▪ Reduction in industrial</li> <li>▪ Minimal cost to integrate the switchyard into the surrounding development</li> <li>▪ TOD / density along rail passenger transport</li> <li>▪ The use of the South Fremantle land fill site is a possibility as POS or an active recreation area</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Switchyard retained and screened.</li> <li>▪ No public open space amongst high density areas.</li> <li>▪ Not enough train stops between areas.</li> <li>▪ Makes no provision for light industrial.</li> <li>▪ Cockburn Road should be upgraded for north bound traffic.</li> <li>▪ Transit way divides area.</li> <li>▪ No road hierarchy - regional roads have similar status (does not work).</li> <li>▪ Intersection treatment at Newmarket Hotel very problematic.</li> <li>▪ Poor east-west connectivity.</li> <li>▪ Proposed light rail along freight rail line is problematic as it clashes with new bridge of Port Catherine.</li> <li>▪ Retaining existing industrial</li> <li>▪ Freight line remains</li> <li>▪ Primary school poorly located. Locate primary school closer to Cockburn Road. Transit link would then be a greater used link.</li> <li>▪ High density in centre may be too dominant if it is in one block</li> <li>▪ There is a lack of POS at the high density node</li> <li>▪ No allowance made for a new zone substation.</li> <li>▪ Small (if any) additional residential which makes this light rail option unviable</li> <li>▪ Potential detrimental impact on freight train by additional future development</li> </ul>

### Comments

- Support possibility 4 except should be more public open space in high density area.
- Need to maintain commitment to 'viewing corridors' with high density development on coast. Heights of high density development on coast – problematic (line of sight).
- There has to be a mix use to make this area work. The school should be further south.
- My preferred option but requires more residential west of railway line, should be more high density.
- What type of industries will be permitted on Cockburn Road?
- Make South Terrace / Marine Terrace one-way road traffic bringing traffic in and out of Fremantle, to enable other transport modes on these key streets. Both should become true avenues, not the clutter/mess they are today, with no identity.

- Include allowance for extension of the switchyard to cater for future regional growth in power demand.
- Not removing the switchyard takes away an opportunity situated next to the power station (which is to be a focal point or hub) to take full advantage of the retail / high density location.
- Thank you to the team in ensuring the communication of the importance of the continuing use of the freight rail, as determined in the freight network review. This freight rail is the only link to the inner harbour, uses less fuel per tonne carted by truck, less GHG emissions per tonne carted and reduces heavy truck traffic.

## **NEXT STEPS**

- The next the meeting of the Cockburn Coast Reference Group will be on Saturday 3 February at the Tradewinds Hotel, East Fremantle. An email reminder will be sent to reference group participants prior to the 3 February.
- Dr Mike Mourtiz asked reference group members to consider changing the name of the study area to something other than 'Cockburn coast'. Any suggestions to be submitted to John Halleen at [John.Halleen@dpi.wa.gov.au](mailto:John.Halleen@dpi.wa.gov.au) or Lauren Aitken at [Lauren.Aitken@dpi.wa.gov.au](mailto:Lauren.Aitken@dpi.wa.gov.au)

## APPENDIX 1 COMMUNITY REFERENCE GROUP MEMBERS

	<b>Name</b>	<b>Precinct/ Organisation</b>
1	Joe Rifici	2
2	Ian Ricciardi	2
3	Chris Lewis	2
4	Bruno Micalizzi	2
5	Paul Paino	2
6	Mark Westlake	2
7	Jamie Pasqua	2
8	Steve Johnston	3
9	Alan Green	3
10	Ken Williamson	5
11	Grahame Aldridge	5
12	Sheila Wainwright	5
13	Nick Lee	5
14	John Sanders	6
15	Reg Boston	6
16	Lindsay Hill	7
17	Tony Narvaez	7
18	Ashley Palmer	7
19	Mike Hulme	2 & 3
20	Logan Howlett	Community Representative
21	Daryll Smith	Cogee Beach Progress Association
22	Cathy Hall	South Fremantle resident
23	Les Richardson	Community Representative
24	Manfred Heske	Community Representative
25	Sue Woolhouse	Office of the Minister for Planning and Infrastructure
26	Gavin Giles	Fremantle Port Authority
27	Ian Edwards	Main Roads WA
28	David Van Den Dries	Main Roads
29	Kenneth Tushingham	Verve Energy
30	Jeff Hunter	Western Power
31	Gene Lin	Western Power

**Steering Committee & Project Working Group Members**

	<b>Name</b>	<b>Precinct/ Organisation</b>
	Dr Mike Mouritz	Department for Planning & Infrastructure
	Peter Tagliaferri	City of Fremantle
	David Nicholson	City of Fremantle
	Stephen Lee	City of Cockburn
	Allen Blood	City of Cockburn
	Mike Moloney	LandCorp
	Paul Ferrante	LandCorp
	Mario Claudio	LandCorp

**Project Team Members**

	John Halleen	Department for Planning & Infrastructure
	Laurie Aitken	Department for Planning & Infrastructure
	Glen Finn	Department for Planning & Infrastructure
	Ray Haeren	Taylor Burrell Barnett
	Ben De Marchi	Taylor Burrell Barnett
	Emma Jeffcoat	Taylor Burrell Barnett
	Duncan Foster	Worley Parsons
	Tanya Stul	Oceanica
	Dale Newsome	ENV Australia
	John Syme	Syme Marmion & Co
	Karen Hyde	Syme Marmion & Co
	Linton Pike	Estill & Associates
	Geordie Thompson	Estill & Associates
	Simon Barns	Estill & Associates

## **APPENDIX 2 SUSTAINABILITY PRINCIPLES**

### ***Environmental***

- Promote efficient use of resources, land and infrastructure
- Demonstrate best practice responsible environmental management, facilitating remediation and rehabilitation
- Capitalise on the exceptional natural assets of the Cockburn Coast through improvement, enhancement and provision of greater access to the local environment

### ***Social***

- Engage the community in the planning, design and development of Cockburn Coast, instilling a sense of ownership and ensuring equitable outcomes
- Create a vibrant, landmark destination that is connected, integrated, diverse and accessible
- Tell the story of the Cockburn Coast through the identification, management and promotion of significant sites that contribute to the area's cultural heritage, and to build on these unique features to provide a sense of place

### ***Economic***

- Ensure diversity of land uses to facilitate locally based employment, providing services that are appropriate to the needs of the local and wider community
- Encourage development that is commercially feasible, attractive to the market and to the wider community
- Demonstrate a range of affordable housing strategies

### ***Built form and Transport***

- Demonstrate efficient land use and transport in the district structure plan through the application of transit orientated design principles
- Demonstrate innovation in the development of Cockburn Coast, through the application of best practice technologies and design
- Provide opportunities for the use of alternative transport modes, through the provision of quality public transport, cycling and pedestrian infrastructure combined with interconnected urban design  
Broad stakeholder representation will be provided

## APPENDIX 3 WORKSHOP AGENDA

Start Time	Item	By
9.00	Welcome and Introductions	Dr Mike Mouritz
9.05	<b>Meeting Overview</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Purpose &amp; Process</li> </ul>	Linton Pike
9.10	<b>Project Reference Group</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Purpose</li> <li>▪ Introductions</li> <li>▪ Draft Terms of Reference for confirmation</li> </ul>	Linton Pike / All
9.20	<b>Workshop One Outcomes</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Key themes and consideration</li> </ul>	Linton Pike / All
9.30	<b>Preliminary Consultant Findings</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Opportunities and constraints (Planning, Coastal Processes, Transport, Environmental)</li> </ul>	Taylor Burrell Barnett, Worley Parsons, ENV Australia, Oceanica
10.00	<b>BREAK</b>	
10.10	<b>Sustainability Assessment</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Triple bottom line approach</li> <li>▪ Review of sustainability guiding principles</li> <li>▪ Implementation methodology</li> </ul>	Syme Marmion
10.30	<b>Discussion on Possibilities</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Taylor Burrell Barnett to present broad possibilities</li> <li>▪ Group workshop: discussion regarding the advantages &amp; disadvantages for the possibilities</li> <li>▪ Presentation/discussion of findings</li> </ul>	Taylor Burrell Barnett / All
12.15	<b>Key Themes/Considerations for Further Testing</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Group to discuss key items for further investigation</li> </ul>	All
12.35	<b>Next Steps</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Minutes (and email addresses)</li> <li>▪ Next meeting</li> </ul>	Linton Pike
12.45	Close Workshop	