

**City of Rockingham (COR) Annual Electors Meeting (AEM) Wednesday 18.12.2019**

**Motions put forward by Hands Off Point Peron (HOPP) Founder and Spokesperson Dawn Jecks**

**Opening comments:**

1. For those who may not be aware, the State government is conducting a planning investigation in relation to future tenure and use of the land of Pt Peron. This includes forming a 'community reference group' to discuss and provide advice to the State government about tenure and planning for Pt Peron
2. Hands Off Point Peron was invited to have a representative on the community reference group
3. My first thought was yes, but after looking closely at the State government's terms of reference for the planning investigation it became clear that there is serious problem – the planning investigation is to consider "residential opportunities'. This means it is considering the option of privatising some of the land at Pt Peron for housing.
4. Private housing at Pt Peron has no public support whatsoever and should never have been included in the planning investigation terms of reference. It is of great concern that housing has been included in the terms of reference, and that is why, in good conscience, HOPP felt it necessary to decline the invitation to be a member of the Community reference group.
5. HOPP has thought carefully about how to fix this problem. We believe we have the solution. Two steps are immediately required:
  1. *Make the bush forever at Pt Peron an A class reserve; and*
  2. *Confine the scope of the planning investigation to looking at tenure and development options that fall within the ambit of the original planning classification of Pt Peron – "open space – nature/passive recreation". This would rule out housing.*
6. With this in mind I have two motions I would like to put to this evening's electors meeting for approval. I seek the opportunity to speak separately to each motion.

**Motion #1**

**That, COR make representation to the WA Government, early in the New Year, for the WA Government to make Bush Forever site 355 an A Class reserve as a matter of urgency, rather than awaiting the outcome of the planning investigation that is currently taking place for the Pt Peron area.**

**Points to make:**

1. I congratulate and acknowledge Cr Stewart's motion which was passed in 2018 that Council SUPPORTS the classification of Cape Peron Reserve 48968 being transferred to Class A.  
*Motion: That Council SUPPORTS the classification of Cape Peron Reserve 48968 being transferred to Class A, subject to the designated Purposes of the Reserve being clearly defined through the transparent and collaborative consultation process, which will determine the most sustainable long- term future land uses for Cape Peron, as advocated in Council's June 2018 resolution.*

2. However, given the concerns about the terms of reference for the planning investigation, I believe it is vital to secure the A class reserve status of the bush forever at Pt Peron immediately. It is too risky to wait until after the planning investigation has been completed.
3. Bush Forever site 355 is vested with the Department of Biodiversity Conservation & Attraction whereas each of the small parcels of land along the Mangles Bay beach area are vested with different entities. This means that the process of making all of Cape Peron an A class reserve is likely to be complicated and drawn out. As an urgent first step the bush forever needs to be protected against the risk of some of it being bulldozed and privatised for housing following the planning investigation.
4. Bush Forever site 355 can be made into an A Class Reserve simply by the Minister of Lands making an executive order pursuant to section 42 of the Land Administration Act. It is a straightforward exercise and would demonstrate the State Government's commitment to keeping the Point Peron "Bush Forever" *forever*.
5. Once a Bush Forever has A Class enshrined in law it will make it much harder for Governments to bulldoze it for housing. That's why for me, A Class is urgent. There is no down side, only an up side, and so I seek this meeting's support for my motion.

## **Motion #2**

**That, the COR make representations to the WA State Government for the scope of the Department of Planning Lands and Heritage's Point Peron Planning Investigation to be confined to the consideration of land tenure and development options that fall within the ambit of the original classification of Point Peron - "*open space – nature/passive recreation*".**

### **Points to make:**

1. Despite the fact that the MBM proposal was withdrawn by the Minister for Planning Rita Saffioti on 1<sup>st</sup> March 2018, the threat of privatisation and urbanisation of Point Peron public land remains.
2. My concerns are based primarily on publically available Department of Planning (DoP) documents which show that:
  - a. When the Mangles Bay Marina (MBM) proposal was on the table the Metropolitan Peel Sub-regional Planning Framework classified the MBM proposal area land as "*Open Space - Nature Passive Recreation*".
  - b. In May 2015 the DoP issued a proposal to change the classification of the land subject to the MBM proposal to "*urban expansion*"
  - c. In March 2018 the final version of the amended Metropolitan Peel Sub-regional Planning Framework Document showed the land subject to the MBM proposal as "*planning investigation area*"

- d. So the DoP started out wanting to change the Pt Peron land from “*open space nature/passive recreation*” to “*urban expansion*” but following the rejection of the MBM proposal ended up changing the classification from “*open space nature/passive recreation*” to “*planning investigation*”.
3. After extensive research on this matter I have come to the conclusion that this major change was made without any genuine public consultation let alone public support. The proposal to go from “*open space nature/passive recreation*” to “*planning investigation*” classification was not disclosed to the public, let alone supported by the public.
  4. The Metropolitan Region Scheme amendment process in relation to the MBM proposal showed that the public overwhelmingly supports the “*open space nature/passive recreation*” classification. There was/is no sound reason to depart from this longstanding classification, or to have a planning investigation that considers options such as housing that are inconsistent with it.
  5. The MBM proposal was fundamentally flawed and should not serve as a trojan horse for some other type of tenure or development that is at odds within “*open space – nature/passive recreation*”.
  6. To address the problem the scope of the planning investigation should be confined to options that fall within the ambit of “*open space – nature/passive recreation*”. This would exclude housing.
  7. I ask the electors present to support my motion.