

# COCKBURN COAST

## District Structure Plan

### **COCKBURN COAST REFERENCE GROUP**

### **MEETING 3 SUMMARY**

**April 2007**



---

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

---

<b>1. INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2. QUESTION &amp; ANSWER.....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>3. MEETING OUTCOMES.....</b>	<b>6</b>
3.1 Movement and Transport .....	6
3.2 Development West of the Railway Line .....	6
3.3 Mixed Use Areas.....	7
3.4 Mixed Business Areas.....	7
3.5 Public Open Space .....	7
<b>4. SUMMARY &amp; OVERALL PREFERENCE.....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>APPENDIX 1. MEETING PARTICIPANTS .....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>APPENDIX 2. COMBINED FEEDBACK SHEETS .....</b>	<b>12</b>

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The third Cockburn Coast Reference Group meeting was held on Saturday 17 March 2007 at the Fremantle Maritime Museum. The purpose of the meeting was to

- present the concept options for the Cockburn coast
- seek feedback from the reference group on the concept options

Linton Pike, meeting facilitator from Estill & Associates opened the meeting, and outlined the purpose and process.

Duncan Foster from Worley Parsons provided an update on the transport context for the Cockburn coast area. Duncan noted that:

- Two options for bus rapid transit have been developed; both present different opportunities and constraints and provide priority for transit vehicles over general traffic through the study area.
- Option 1 runs along Cockburn Road and Hampton Road. This provides a more direct link to Fremantle Station and utilises the existing Hampton Road Bus Lanes. However, there are constraints associated with congestion on Hampton Road and it may be difficult to achieve priority beyond Cockburn Road.
- Option 2 runs closer to the coast and Marine Terrace. The advantages are that it brings the stations closer to the coast and allows better integration with the Power Station Site. However, it may also increase the travel time to Fremantle, and there are challenges associated with achieving a coastal connection.

In terms of the road network Duncan noted that

- The current traffic volume on Hampton Road (between Douro and Rockingham Roads) is approx 30,000vpd.
- The current traffic volume on Cockburn Road is 17,000vpd.
- The Coast area will generate approx 22,500 trips per day with the majority of these (85%) to external locations.
- The Cockburn Coast development will increase congestion on existing roads – the challenge is to manage this congestion and develop the most balanced transport outcome.
- Hampton Road will continue to constrain traffic in the future as the capacity of the roads connecting to it is greater than its own capacity:-

There are still some questions regarding the road network. In particular:

- How much capacity should be provided on Hampton Road?
- How much capacity should be provided on Cockburn Road and the Cockburn Coast Drive (*what sort of character should they have*)?
- How should the intersections of major roads and the Cockburn Coast Drive be treated?
- What level of east-west connection is required and to where?

The preliminary findings to date include:

- The reallocation of existing kerbside lanes on Hampton Road between Douro Road and Rockingham Road results in a decrease of approximately 5,000 vehicles per day (approx 29,000 vpd).
- The character of Cockburn Road through the project area will be extremely important in determining the amount of through traffic on this road.
- Winterfold Road appears to play an important role for east-west trips (greater than Forrest Road).
- The ultimate configuration of Stock Road will influence the amount of through traffic in the study area.
- Congestion on Hampton Road places an increased emphasis on the need for transit priority in the coastal corridor.

Following Duncan's presentation, Ray Haeren and Ben De Marchi from Taylor Burrell Barnett presented two planning options for the area.

The key features of **Option 1** were:

- Rapid transit along Cockburn & Hampton Roads
- Limited development west of the railway line
- Limited mixed business development
- The retention of the switchyard
- The primary school located north, closer to Rolinson Road

The key features of **Option 2** were:

- Rapid transit located along the coast
- The relocation of the switchyard with increased development west of the railway line
- A greater area of mixed business and mixed use areas
- The primary school located further south, closer to the Power Station site.

The **main points of difference** were:

- The road transport network
- The transit route layout
- The level of coastal development
- The location of the switchyard

Finally, John Syme from Syme Marmion & Co presented a sustainability assessment of the two options. John noted that because the two options are broad

concepts, only some of the sustainability assessment strategies discussed at the second reference group meeting have been used to assess the options.

These include:

### **Environment**

- Maintain Biodiversity

### **Social**

- Site responsive design
- High levels of connectivity
- Maximise safety/well being
- Diverse housing form/dwelling type
- Rapid / frequent public transport
- Access to public transport
- Maximise alternate modes of transport

### **Economic**

- Maximise public benefit from expenditure
- Maximise scale and diversity of employment base
- Promote economic development and employment opportunities

John provided population and employment numbers for the two options. These are outlined below:

	Option 1	Option 2
Population	9,100	7,800
Jobs	1,900	3,800
Employment self-sufficiency	43%	75%

John also provided some concept drawings and possibilities for the power station site.

Following the presentation and a brief question and answer session, meeting participants worked in small groups to discuss and assess the two options. In particular, participants were asked to review the plans in terms of the advantages and disadvantages in relation to:

- movement and transport;
- development west of the railway line;
- mixed use areas;
- mixed business areas and;
- public open space.

## 2. QUESTION & ANSWER

Q	In regards to the differences in employment numbers between the options, where do the additional jobs come from in option 2
A	Similar multipliers are used against mixed use and mixed business. In Option 2 we have allowed for an increase in commercial floor space. This will be filled with a range of economic activities.
Q	What is mixed business use? We have smells from some businesses and there are impacts from the cold store with chemical uses and freight traffic? These uses are not compatible with residential areas.
A	The options are not mutually exclusive and we are testing component parts. Mixed business does not preclude the mixture of these elements and this occurs elsewhere at the moment in an urban context rather than suburban context. Fremantle operates like this at the moment. There is no residential component around the Cold Store.  There is also a need to maintain a level of employment opportunity.
Q	There is a need for more information on the job numbers. Both options showing mixed use seem incompatible with industrial and other uses retained in the options.
A	The figures allow for the change in business uses over time. It is about land areas and multipliers for land uses of the type proposed. If the intent is for the Cold Store to stay then we need to plan for it.
Q	The presentations and the work around the Power Station show the potential of the site and are great, however the Regional Open Space on the foreshore is not appropriate for development. Open space is critical given the intensity and scale of activity proposed.
A	One of the issues and considerations is safety and security in a secluded environment with car thefts reported in the area now.  The question is what level of surveillance is required and to consider all implications not just the open space implications.  Further discussion on this is needed today.
Q	Rapid transit is the best option for public transport to Fremantle. How will rapid transit operate on Hampton Road given the existing high volume of traffic? Marine Terrace is the only 'rapid' option.
A	It is a significant issue; neither option is a perfect solution and present challenges from a cost, impact and sensitivity perspective.  Comment is welcome as we work towards agreeing the best solution in the long term.  The coastal link needs further analysis if it is considered suitable to ensure good access to the Fremantle train station.  The 'rapidness' of the link will be influenced by the public transport priority measures that are available and acceptable. Hampton Road is and will be congested. We need to accept that public transport priority measures are a critical ingredient.  Marine Terrace may be a better option but Hampton Road will work with appropriate measures
Q	Level crossings are always an issue. Why can't we provide more at grade transport options for pedestrians and traffic given the implications of double stacked freight trains and associated clearances

A	It is a problem experienced at many locations throughout the metro area. It is driven as a rail safety issue. The notion of the bridges is to work with the natural topography as well to maximize the ridge line effect. They are a cost but will add character.
Q	When will some analysis be available with regard to impacts of 30% rail freight targets? Long trains and regular frequency will see extensive level crossing closures and efficiency. Mews Road closed for 7 or 8 minutes at a time now.
A	Projections are available and the length of trains will have associated significant level crossing closures.  The advice is that it is a given and we needed to allow for buffering and level crossing opportunities.  The analysis can be presented to the next workshop if it is made available.
Q	The switch yard options (in or out) will have associated affects does it imply that power will be under grounded if the switch yard stays?
A	Yes power will be under grounded for supply power. We need to provide for access corridors for this purpose and an additional zone sub station of 1ha.  The location is to be determined but has not yet been identified.
Q	What about the east/west link to Roe Highway and Stock Road? What affect if this link is not provided as a critical regional link.
A	We are preparing modelling to assess the need and affect of Stock Road link options. Information to be provided at the next meeting.

## 3. MEETING OUTCOMES

### 3.1 Movement and Transport

#### *Option 1*

- Question the priority of Cockburn Coast Drive and Rockingham Road intersection. More work is required to determine best the priority.
- In both options there are too many road links to Cockburn Coast Drive
- High speed transit link works best in Option 1.
- Continue the road to the east of railway reserve to extend to Rollinson Road.
- Foreshore access to Beeliar Regional Park is good but need to cater for bikes and pedestrians.
- Interpretive trail linking to Clontrarf Hill is needed.

#### *Option 2*

- 4 way connection CC Drive and Spearwood in option 2
- Road link to follow Spearwood Road not the Port Coogee link
- East west link at Power station
- Robb Road on the west to continue through to the north
- Better for rapid transit using Marine Terrace
- Local CAT link at South Beach good

**Preference:** Hybrid

### 3.2 Development West of the Railway Line

#### *Option 1*

- Mixed use parallel with Rollinson Road is a concern and should have community/civic focus and not for private use.

#### *Option 2*

- Support for removal of switch yard and use of the available space.
- Questioned the mixed use pocket to the north – there are height implications for those behind this area.
- Prefer this option but should be mixed use.
- Funds must be dedicated to relocating the switch yard
- Oppose this development west of railway line. Needs to have community focus not private use
- Could occur even if switch yard remains with an expanded Option 1 scenario.
- Not unhappy with this concept but must be appropriate and high quality with public facilities such as cafes and restaurants.

**Preference:** Mixed views



### 3.3 Mixed Use Areas

#### *Comments*

- Option 1 is the preferred option for Emplacement Crescent and residential mixed use areas.
- Preference for Option 1 with Option 2 too diluted and distributed.
- For both options there is concern at the amount of mixed use question its future success. Change some of the mixed use to residential
- Supported mixed use around the power station.
- Strong support for mixed use on Cockburn Road at ground floor
- Concern at mixed use around existing industrial areas and concern at the potential impacts of buffers on the Cold Stores and industrial uses. Managing the compatibility of land use is a challenge – needs to be regulated.
- Height of the mixed use should be at the eastern side and reducing to the coast.
- Mixed use needs better definition – what does it include?

**Preference:** Option 1 with reduced mixed use and more residential

### 3.4 Mixed Business Areas

#### *Comments*

- Option 1 is preferred option with mixed business around the Cold Store site.
- Need to plan for the future need in the event that the Cold Store moves. Question the need for mixed business around the Cold Store area.
- Surprise at the extent of mixed business following on from earlier workshops.
- Better outcome is mixed use residential and allow for changes to Cold Store land use in the future. Transition arrangement if Cold Store changes in the future.
- Emplacement Crescent to be mixed use not mixed business
- More business buffer around Cold Store
- Not keen to see new industries of similar scale or size in the future but recognizing that the existing will stay.
- Mixed business around Cold Stores to become mixed use.

**Preference:** Option 1 preferred with flexibility to change over time.

### 3.5 Public Open Space

#### *Option 1*

- Open space on Emplacement should be shown
- Needs a link over or under Cockburn Coast Drive from Emplacement Crescent.
- Link Cockburn Road to the primary school.

### *Option 2*

- Prefer to move school away from Cockburn Road and use open space as buffer to mixed business
- May be a need to expand open space around the Primary School and move the primary school to the north to provide for active recreation areas.
- Discussion of school site identified that consideration be given to Power Station site location and different from the conventional approach.
- Keep the road beside the rail reserve.
- Not enough open space in this option with the pumping station to be coloured yellow as public utility
- This is the preferred option with linear park links and school
- Rockingham Road, Cockburn Road and Cockburn Coast Drive area may need more open space.

## **4. SUMMARY & OVERALL PREFERENCE**

Overall, there was no clear preference for either of the two options; however discussion focussed on the following components of each option:

Option 1:

- The rapid transit link
- The level of development west of railway corridor
- The level of mixed use
- Mixed business and the rapid transit along Cockburn Road

Option 2:

- The level of development west of the railway
- The primary school location
- Rapid transit along Marine Terrace
- The mixed business buffer area

## APPENDIX 1. MEETING PARTICIPANTS

<b>Name</b>	<b>Precinct/ Organisation</b>
Joe Rifici	2
Chris Lewis	2
Paul Paino	2
Jamie Pasqua	2
Mark Westlake	2
Ian Ricciardi	2
Bruno Micalizzi	2
Alan Green	3
Steve Johnston	3
Ken Williamson	5
Grahame Aldridge	5
Sheila Wainwright	5
John Sanders	6
Reg Boston	6
Lindsay Hill	7
Ashley Palmer	7
Tony Narvaez	7
Mike Hulme	2 & 3
Logan Howlett	Community Representative
Daryll Smith	Cogee Beach Progress Association
Cathy Hall	South Fremantle resident
Jeff Hunter	Western Power
Manfred Heske	Community Representative
Jeff Hunter	Western Power
Lindsay Broadhurst	Main Roads WA

### Steering Committee & Project Working Group Members

<b>Name</b>	<b>Precinct/ Organisation</b>
Allen Blood	City of Cockburn
Paul Ferrante	LandCorp
Mario Claudio	LandCorp

**Project Team Members**

John Halleen	Department for Planning & Infrastructure
Lauren 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
John Syme	Syme Marmion & Co
Duncan Foster	Worley Parsons
Linton Pike	Estill & Associates
Geordie Thompson	Estill & Associates
Simon Barns	Estill & Associates

**Observers**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Precinct/ Organisation</b>
Peter Goff	Planning Consultant (Gosh Leather)
Sue Woolhouse	Office of the Minister for Planning & Infrastructure
Chris Melsom	Hassell (planning consultant for LandCorp)

<b>Apologies</b>	
Dr Mike Mouritz	Department for Planning & Infrastructure
Mike Moloney	LandCorp
Peter Tagliaferri	City of Fremantle
Stephen Lee	City of Cockburn
Ian Edwards	Main Roads WA
David Van Den Dries	Main Roads
Nick Lee	Precinct 5
Kenneth Tushingam	Verve Energy

## APPENDIX 2. COMBINED FEEDBACK SHEETS

What are the advantages/what do you like about this option?

Please use the following headings as a guide for your comments and indicate which is the table's preferred option and why.

### Movement and Transport

Option 1	Option 2
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Question priority of Cockburn Coast Drive with Rockingham Road</li> <li>▪ Question number of road connections to Cockburn Coast Road – possibly too many?</li> <li>▪ Preference for high speed rapid transit along Cockburn Road alignment</li> <li>▪ Direct line to Fremantle (BRT) with possible CAT system</li> <li>▪ Maximises pedestrian access from Beeliar to foreshore</li> <li>▪ Bridges must accommodate both pedestrians and bikes</li> <li>▪ Interpretive trail linking Clontarf through Beeliar</li> <li>▪ Need to promote and demonstrate alternative travel modes</li> <li>▪ Like Cockburn Road transit – good location of stations</li> <li>▪ Too many connections through to Cockburn Coast Drive? Probably just two would be enough</li> <li>▪ This option will increase the pressure on Cockburn Road.</li> <li>▪ Can't see how rapid transport will work on Hampton Road.</li> <li>▪ Don't support the location of Road 4.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Preference for high speed rapid transit along Cockburn Road alignment</li> <li>▪ Preference for 4 way connection – Cockburn Coast Road / Spearwood Ave</li> <li>▪ Preference for transit to follow Spearwood Ave alignment continuing east.</li> <li>▪ Preference for east/west connection to Power Station precinct</li> <li>▪ Provides good northern network to run a local CAT network</li> <li>▪ Further investigation of dual use of freight rail for public transport</li> <li>▪ Bridges must accommodate both pedestrians and bikes</li> <li>▪ Interpretive trail linking Clontarf through Beeliar</li> <li>▪ Support road link to Fremantle at coast with CAT connection</li> <li>▪ Don't like central transit</li> <li>▪ Not viable through centre</li> <li>▪ Would impact on their land. Realignment?</li> <li>▪ Could it be redirected to Road 4 and Rollinson intersection, then west to freight rail? Or relocate the alignment to the south.</li> <li>▪ Will be difficult to get transitway through coastal link (concern)</li> <li>▪ Consider better connections to the beach</li> </ul>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Prefer low speed Cockburn Road with through traffic on Coast Drive.</li> <li>▪ Transit option more central on Cockburn Road</li> <li>▪ Pedestrian connection across Cockburn Road to Primary school required</li> <li>▪ Limited additional development pocket north of identified development on Option 1</li> <li>▪ Retention preservation of existing park</li> <li>▪ Provide passive surveillance</li> <li>▪ Prefer direct road with level crossing (south into Port Coogee)</li> <li>▪ Prefer road 4 to stay east of Railway at least to Rollinson</li> <li>▪ Cat bus access from Rollinson to Marine Terrace</li> <li>▪ Reconsider Roe 8 reserve to Stock Road</li> </ul>	<p>for the existing community.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Prefer rapid transit along Marine Terrace.</li> <li>▪ Prefer East West connection through road 6</li> <li>▪ North of power station</li> <li>▪ Pedestrian over passes seem too long</li> <li>▪ Prefer option 2's location of school though if it moved further north it could have a larger POS area attached</li> <li>▪ Road 4 to remain east of Railway down to Rollinson road</li> </ul>
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**Development on western side of railway**

Option 1	Option 2
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Keep substation but also build along reserve</li> <li>▪ Question pocket of mixed use to west of freight and up the top of the plan.</li> <li>▪ Would there be height restrictions?</li> <li>▪ Need to protect views behind. Could shift it to north between ANI and Rollinson Road.</li> <li>▪ Retaining the switchyard doesn't help the idea of a town centre – need to think about the area holistically.</li> <li>▪ Don't support residential development west of the railway – should be community/civic use only and coloured as green space.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Maximise the development and its effectiveness to complement the SFPS and have it as a publicity accessible (appropriate to the location)</li> <li>▪ Must be quality development</li> <li>▪ Need more information on moving substation, where to?</li> <li>▪ Development on the coast is important. Moving switchyard is not key as you can build around it.</li> <li>▪ No height but wants to be a destination, preserve coastal views.</li> <li>▪ Support if switchyard could be moved – would be a waste if left as open space.</li> <li>▪ Funds to pay for Switchyard relocation</li> <li>▪ Special opportunity in power station – exciting best practice plans. Identity. Would draw in Port Coogee</li> <li>▪ Development on west would support power station.</li> <li>▪ All as mixed use.</li> <li>▪ Regional POS is critical. Development west of the railway will draw significant community outrage.</li> <li>▪ Preferred option with Switchyard removed</li> <li>▪ Relocate switchyard to old quarry</li> <li>▪ Funds from all development west of railway to fund new switchyard and relocation</li> <li>▪ New substation should be in mixed business area not residential</li> <li>▪ Residential or mixed use should extend along road six to Robb Road</li> <li>▪ Green corridor is better on option 2</li> </ul> <p>South of school</p>



**Mixed use areas**

<b>Option 1</b>	<b>Option 2</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Preference for residential mixed use around Emplacement Crescent</li> <li>▪ Support mixed use surrounding Power Station</li> <li>▪ Questioned the amount of mixed use shown</li> <li>▪ Not happy with location of school near mixed business (incompatible uses).</li> <li>▪ Need an understanding of other options for school site</li> <li>▪ Don't want to use standard school template - school in power station or Beeliar Park</li> <li>▪ Need defined corridor for power infra in worst case scenario for switchyard and regional high tension lines.</li> <li>▪ Question whether you need such a great quantity of mixed use – Why is it equal to residential?</li> <li>▪ Like mixed use in Emplacement Crescent – too much opportunity with views etc to leave as mixed business.</li> <li>▪ Concerned that mixed use areas will fail because there is not sufficient demand (for both options)</li> <li>▪ Mixed use is the way to go (general comment)</li> <li>▪ Support a concentrated block of mixed use, not a continuous strip.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Too much mixed use near Port Coogee – overall there is too much mixed use.</li> </ul> <p>Both options</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Need defined corridor for power infrastructure in worst case scenario for switchyard and regional high tension lines.</li> <li>▪ Question whether you need such a great quantity of mixed use – Why is it equal to residential?</li> <li>▪ How to manage compatibility of land uses within a mixed use area.</li> <li>▪ For both options height should be reduced as you move towards the coast. Maximise height east of Cockburn Road</li> </ul>

**Mixed business areas**

Option 1	Option 2
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Preference for option 1. Possibly less</li> <li>▪ Question need for cold store to remain in current location given there is sufficient mixed business within the locality.</li> <li>▪ Self contained suburb is good from a transport perspective</li> <li>▪ Prefer how mixed use land is allocated in this plan</li> <li>▪ Clarification on mixed business</li> <li>▪ Preferable to Option 2</li> <li>▪ Not interested in attracting other odour creating businesses</li> <li>▪ Do not want noxious industries or industrial</li> <li>▪ Would prefer mixed use around cold stores site</li> <li>▪ General surprise at extent of mixed business retained. Thought group had decided on residential</li> <li>▪ Want mixed use in Emplacement Crescent</li> <li>▪ Shouldn't be so much mixed business around cold store (should only be three lots).</li> <li>▪ Should be sleeved with mixed use.</li> <li>▪ Why is zoning being decided based on culture of one business? What if it goes?</li> <li>▪ If there is opportunity to put mixed use around cold store with memorials etc, or transition through time could be incorporated in the text.</li> <li>▪ Land interfacing with the cold stores is sympathetic with surrounding uses and not impacting on businesses.</li> <li>▪ Preferred buffer with mixed residential on south side of Gaston way and surrounding the mixed business area</li> <li>▪ Better potential for mixed use to provide local employment ( comment only)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Difficult to see how this works</li> <li>▪ How would it be regulated</li> <li>▪ If mixed business is to protect existing businesses it needs to be bigger area</li> <li>▪ Support the buffer areas in this option.</li> </ul>

## Public Open Space

Option 1	Option 2
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ If POS could be co-located around power station then development of this land could be alternative to development on west of railway</li> <li>▪ Maximises coastal reserve (access for more people as regional)</li> <li>▪ Open space should be located to help buffer the mixed business area.</li> <li>▪ School should be located further back from Cockburn Road</li> <li>▪ Support central east/west green corridor. Question need for both of the southern links.</li> <li>▪ Access from Emplacement Crescent to Beeliar Park required</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ If POS could be co-located around power station then development of this land could be alternative to development on west of railway</li> <li>▪ Like the school linking in with landscape corridor.</li> <li>▪ POS works better in Option 2. Better links to Beeliar</li> <li>▪ Concern about bridges if double stacked freight.</li> <li>▪ Flow through connection of linear parks from Beeliar through to coast are good</li> <li>▪ Possible need for more open space near Rockingham Road / Cockburn / Hampton.</li> <li>▪ Not enough POS in this option</li> <li>▪ The pump station should be coloured yellow not green as it is a public utility.</li> <li>▪ Better location of POS</li> <li>▪ Expand POS around school and create functional space for active sport</li> <li>▪ Preferred coastal strip</li> <li>▪ Green Links preferred on this option</li> <li>▪ Walking trails should go through green links</li> <li>▪</li> </ul>