

Scheme Amendment 54 Jarman - Schedule of Submissions		
Summary of Comments Received	Officer Response	Officer Recommendation
<b>1. Department of Mines, Industry Regulation and Safety (DMIRS)</b>		
The DMIRS has determined that this proposal raises no significant issues with respect to mineral and petroleum resources, geothermal energy and basic raw materials.	Noted.	Noted.
<b>2. Department of Water and Environmental Regulation (DWER)</b>		
The Department supports the proposed amendment and is satisfied that it includes the relevant planning policies to address sensitive environmental and water receptors.	Noted.	Noted.
<b>3. Rob &amp; Anna Vittenbergs</b>		
Assessment of the island and deteriorating infrastructure should be undertaken before amending the planning scheme, and should consider condition reports for buildings, fauna and flora survey, archaeological and ethnographic study and risk assessments (fire, marine safety). Special provision should be made for protection of foreshore nesting birds.	The concerns over heritage values and the condition of existing buildings and infrastructure on Jarman Island and the potential risks posed for future visitors are valid, as are concerns over the risks posed by emergency situations. It is noted that proposed Clause 6.9.3 (e) of the Scheme Amendment requires a Bushfire Management and Emergency Evacuation Plan in accordance with SPP 3.7. Concerns over the risk to conservation values of Jarman Island from future visitors are also valid. A desktop fauna and flora survey has been undertaken in preparing the Scheme Amendment. The Department of Biodiversity, Conservation and Attractions has raised similar concerns in its submission. about fauna like foreshore nesting birds. These concerns should be considered by the DPLH and other relevant State Government departments as part of finalising the Scheme Amendment.	Supported. These concerns to be considered as part of finalising the Scheme Amendment.
Restoration of the lighthouse and the lighthouse quarters urgently required. The lighthouse has been neglected since 2003 when it was partially restored. Priority should be given to restore the lighthouse quarters for historical and safety reasons before the amendment to the planning scheme is made.	Concerns over heritage values and the condition of existing buildings and infrastructure on Jarman Island and the potential risks posed for future visitors are valid. These concerns should be considered by the DPLH and other relevant State Government departments as part of finalising the Scheme Amendment.	Supported. These concerns to be considered as part of finalising the Scheme Amendment.
Assumed visitor transportation will be conducted during daylight hours by qualified proponent in surveyed vessels. Visitor numbers, particularly at night will need to be strictly controlled. Detailed emergency plan will need to be implemented to make provision for evacuation.	Concerns over the risks posed by emergency situations are valid. The need to control the number of visitor numbers on Jarman Island is recognised and has been addressed through the inclusion of a Special Condition which allows the City to limit the number of overnight visitors and staff. These concerns should be considered by the DPLH and other relevant State Government	Supported. These concerns to be considered as part of finalising the Scheme Amendment.

Scheme Amendment 54 Jarman - Schedule of Submissions		
Summary of Comments Received	Officer Response	Officer Recommendation
<p>Jarman Island in its current state is a testimonial to abject failure of key stakeholders to respect and preserve this important historical precinct.</p> <p>We are not averse to low impact tourism development, but only after substantial progress is made on the topics raised above.</p>	<p>departments and stakeholders as part of finalising the Scheme Amendment.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that the heritage buildings and infrastructure on Jarman Island have deteriorated over time. Concerns raised in submissions regarding the current state of Jarman Island will be passed to the DPLH (the current management authority responsible for Jarman Island) to consider.</p> <p>The DPLH will be made aware of this view.</p>	Supported.
<b>4. Point Samson Community Association (PSCA)</b>		
<p>The PSCA has been concerned about the future of Jarman Island and deterioration of historic infrastructure. The lighthouse was partially restored in 2003 and now, along with the lighthouse keeper's quarters, is in a very poor state of disrepair and subject to ongoing vandalism. PSCA is of the view that the proposed amendment should not proceed until a number of factors are considered and acted upon, prior to authorising development on the island. Important areas requiring detailed professional consideration are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Condition, stability and safety of buildings, underground tanks, boat shed and rubbish tip.</li> <li>- Flora and fauna survey, including nesting shorebirds</li> <li>- Weed eradication.</li> <li>- Archaeological and ethnographic study.</li> <li>- Risk assessment (fire, marine safety and accident recovery).</li> </ul> <p>Should relevant authorities form a decision-making group to determine viability and limits of proposed low impact tourism development, the PSCA would be a keen participant given tourism and marine expertise of many of our members.</p>	<p>Concerns over heritage values and the condition of existing buildings and infrastructure on Jarman Island and the potential risks posed for future visitors are valid. A bushfire assessment report and desktop fauna and flora survey have been prepared in support of the proposed amendment. Further investigations such as archaeological and ethnographic studies will be required at the development application stage. It is noted that proposed Clause 6.9.3 (e) of the Scheme Amendment requires a Bushfire Management and Emergency Evacuation Plan in accordance with SPP 3.7. The Department of Biodiversity, Conservation and Attractions has raised similar concerns in its submission about fauna including foreshore nesting birds. These concerns should be considered by the DPLH and other relevant State Government departments as part of finalising the Scheme Amendment.</p> <p>The City would fully support the inclusion of the PSCA should a decision-making group be formed to guide low impact tourism development on Jarman Island.</p>	<p>Supported. These concerns to be considered as part of finalising the Scheme Amendment.</p> <p>Supported.</p>
<b>5. Department of Jobs, Tourism, Science and Innovation</b>		

Scheme Amendment 54 Jarman - Schedule of Submissions		
Summary of Comments Received	Officer Response	Officer Recommendation
No objection. The Department has reviewed the proposal and has no comment to make at this time.	Noted.	Noted.
<b>6. Alan Wilson</b>		
<p>I support the proposed Scheme Amendment.</p> <p>Jarman Island is important to the history of Cossack. The two lighthouse keeper cottages have continued to deteriorate since the galvanised iron roofs were removed during the 2<sup>nd</sup> World War. Chimney of the kitchen has collapsed recently. Conservation and potentially restoration work on the cottages are urgently needed. The lighthouse was extensively restored in 2003 at a considerable cost but is starting to deteriorate again, tourist development will highlight this problem.</p> <p>Tourist development of the island would attract funding for restoration works. Current structures are a hazard to the public.</p> <p>Request additional provisions in both the Cossack and Jarman Island Scheme Amendments to encourage development of 100% renewable energy sources.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Supported. Concerns over heritage values and the condition of existing buildings and infrastructure on Jarman Island and the potential risks posed for future visitors are valid. The state of these buildings and determination of required restoration and conservation works should be considered by the DPLH as part of finalising the Scheme Amendment.</p> <p>Noted. Concerns regarding the condition of existing buildings and infrastructure on Jarman Island and the potential risks posed for future visitors are valid. Activating Jarman Island to cater for low impact tourism development could provide an alternative means to secure funding to undertake restoration and conservation works.</p> <p>Development on Jarman Island will not be connected to standard urban services. It is likely that development proposals will include alternative power, water and wastewater systems, including renewable energy. The City would have no objection to promoting Jarman Island as an off-the-grid tourism development powered by largely renewable energy sources.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Supported. These concerns to be considered as part of finalising the Scheme Amendment.</p> <p>Supported. These concerns to be considered as part of finalising the Scheme Amendment.</p> <p>Supported. The City would have no objection to promoting Jarman Island as an off-the-grid tourism development powered by largely renewable energy sources</p>
<b>7. Department of Biodiversity, Conservation and Attractions (DBCA)</b>		

Scheme Amendment 54 Jarman - Schedule of Submissions		
Summary of Comments Received	Officer Response	Officer Recommendation
<p>DBCA records indicate occurrence of numerous conservation significant shorebird species within the Cossack Townsite. The area between Jarman Island and Cossack Townsite also supports Flatback Turtles and resident green turtles.</p> <p>DBCA recommends including a provision under Clause 6.9.2 to state due regard is given for best practice artificial light management being designed and implemented, in accordance with relevant legislation for development proposals which may impact shorebirds and marine turtles.</p> <p>DBCA recommends the planning process gives due consideration to avoiding and or minimising potential impacts to shorebirds and marine turtles from artificial light and inappropriate visitor interactions. Include an additional provision under Clause 6.9.2 a) to state due regard be given to avoiding or minimising potential impacts to shorebirds and marine turtles from inappropriate visitor interactions.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>DPLH to consider this recommendation with DBCA to determine the best approach.</p> <p>DPLH to consider this recommendation with DBCA to determine the best approach.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
<b>8. Department of Primary Industries and Regional Development (DPIRD)</b>		
The Department does not object to the proposed amendment to allow for existing buildings on the island to be used for community purposes and tourism development.	Noted.	Noted.
<b>9. Department of Fire and Emergency Services (DFES)</b>		
DFES notes that Jarman Island is not currently located within a Bushfire Prone Area. DFES recommends consideration should also be given to additional complexities of responding to emergencies regarding Jarman Island.	Supported. The draft Scheme Amendment proposes to introduce a new Scheme provision which states the Local Government may require supporting documentation including a Bushfire Management Plan and Emergency Evacuation Plan in accordance with State Planning Policy 3.7 – Planning in Bushfire Prone Areas (SPP 3.7). Agree that further consideration should be given to the complexities of responding to emergency situations and natural hazards on Jarman Island. These concerns should be considered by the DPLH and other relevant State Government departments as part of finalising the Scheme Amendment.	Supported. Further investigation regarding responses to emergency situations and evacuation to be considered as part of finalising the Scheme Amendment.
<b>10. Main Roads Western Australia (MRWA)</b>		

Scheme Amendment 54 Jarman - Schedule of Submissions		
Summary of Comments Received	Officer Response	Officer Recommendation
MRWA has no comment or objection to the proposed planning scheme amendment.	Noted.	Noted.