

**ANALYSIS OF MAIN POINTS MADE IN SUBMISSIONS DURING CONSULTATION PERIOD RELATING TO RIMP AMENDMENTS  
23 FEBRUARY – 23 APRIL 2007- WORKING PAPER**

<p><b>PROPOSED AMENDMENT 1</b>  <b>Rezone old tearooms site from arrival and departure precinct to commercial precinct</b></p> <p><b>There was overwhelming support for this Amendment.</b></p> <p>One hundred and fifty seven (76%) submissions approved. Only four (less than 2%) submissions objected. (The remainder did not specifically comment).</p> <p>One submission referred to it as an excellent idea.</p> <p>The issues raised in opposition to the amendment included preference for current location and cost of rebuilding.</p> <p>Specific negative comments are summarised below.</p>		
SUMMARY OF PUBLIC COMMENTS	PANEL DISCUSSION OF PUBLIC COMMENTS	OUTCOME FOR PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE RIMP 2003-2008
<p><b>PROPOSED AMENDMENT 1</b>  <b>Rezone old tearooms site from arrival and departure precinct to commercial precinct</b></p> <p>Specific comments (summarised) included:</p> <p><i>Demolition and rebuilding of Dome Café which fits in well with original sea wall and provides excellent views over Thomson Bay seems unwarranted and considerable capital expenditure; design of proposed new building for the Dome is a disappointing pastiche of pseudo historical appearance in no way up to the standard of the nearby tea rooms or 1970 villas.</i></p> <p><i>The first amendment to allow demolition and rebuilding of the Dome Café just a short distance away is a hideous waste of money and effort. The present site, purpose built to also house the Dive Shop, is generally in character with other Island buildings, having a commanding view and immediate exposure to visitors arriving by ferry or private boat.</i></p> <p><i>Wants description to remain pending specific proposition within a published management plan re. Specifics of any structure on the site of original tearooms.</i></p>	<p>The Dome building needs to be relocated for a number of reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Size of kitchens is too small for the size of operation required to adequately service Rottnest Island customers.</li> <li>• Heritage vista of the arrival precinct is dominated by the Dome building – Thomson Bay Conservation Plan lists the building as intrusive. A remodelled larger building on this site would not be approved under current RIA Guidelines or by the Heritage Council.</li> <li>• Moreton Bay fig tree is growing under the building – potential to destabilise foundations.</li> <li>• There is a contaminated site underneath the current Dome building.</li> <li>• Relocation of a building designed to meet Island needs, to the “old Tearooms site” restores original configuration of buildings in the arrival precinct.</li> <li>• Safety issue of dive tank refill compressor being located underneath current Dome building will be addressed by relocating the building.</li> <li>• Designs of the proposed new building are being revised before being submitted to the RIA Board for approval.</li> </ul> <p>The Current Dome site is not purpose built. This building was built for a Bistro for the America’s Cup Race and has been extensively remodelled since.</p> <p>There is no cost to the RIA of the new building - cost to be absorbed by the lessee.</p> <p>Detailing of the specifics of any structure is not the role of a Management Plan.</p>	<p><b>Proposed amendment 1 is accepted unchanged:</b></p> <p><b>Point 2.4.1.1 of the RIMP is amended to delete the final sentence in the second paragraph.</b></p> <p><b>Paragraph relating to the arrival and departure precinct now reads:</b>  <b>“Key elements of this precinct are the Main Passenger Jetty, Visitor and Information Centre, Accommodation Office and the Seawall.”</b></p> <p><b>(Deleted sentence: This precinct also includes the vacant land on the western side of Colebatch Avenue, between Henderson and Forrest Avenue.)</b></p>

**PROPOSED AMENDMENTS 2-8**

**Amendments 2-8 ensure the inconsistencies between the RIMP and the Taskforce Report relating to building additional accommodation are resolved.**

**Most submissions addressed Amendments 2-8 together or made general comments about the proposed hotel development at Mt Hershel.**

Overall, 146 (71%) submissions were in favour of the development, representing individuals, families, businesses and recreational organisations with considerable member base. Comments in favour of these amendments related to:

- support for financial sustainability for Rottnest;
- support for a wider choice and range of accommodation/tourist accommodation;
- support for provision of more amenities, infrastructure and facilities to improve the visitor experience and meet changing demographics and community needs;
- tourism and the benefits it can bring;
- opinion that these changes are in keeping with, or can be carried out in sympathy with, sustainable development of the Island;
- general support for the Rottnest Island Authority management of the Island.

Overall 60 (29%) submissions opposed the amendments or made general comments against the development. Most came from individuals, families and special interest organisations. Comments opposing the amendments related to:

- favouring retention of the area for water catchment or infrastructure use;
- opposition to any change to Rottnest's current use or character;
- opposition to the concept of a luxury/tourist resort;
- concern about the potential need for more services and facilities;
- concern about environmental impacts from the development or from additional visitors, including vegetation destruction, noise, increased vehicle movements and pressure on the fragile Island environment;
- specific concerns about the design of a hotel;
- concern about the planning or lease process;
- opposition to the concept of financial sustainability.

Specific positive and negative comments relating to the rezoning and proposed accommodation development have been detailed below, linked to specific amendments.

<b>PROPOSED AMENDMENTS 2, 3 &amp; 4.</b> <b>Rezoning the Service and Operations precinct at Mt Herschel to Visitor Accommodation precinct</b>	<b>PANEL DISCUSSION OF PUBLIC COMMENTS</b>	<b>RECOMMENDATIONS</b>
<p>Overall 146 (71%) submissions supported the rezoning.</p> <p>The ten negative comments that directly relate to the rezoning issue are summarised under the heading below:</p> <p><b>Services &amp; Operations zoning should remain</b></p> <p>Ten respondents opposed the rezoning on the grounds of use of the site for services and infrastructure.</p> <p>Specific comments included:</p> <p><i>There should still be four areas of Service and Operation. (North) bituminised catchment must remain – withdrawal of a positive sustainable adjunct to water issues is not an option. Maybe able to be reduced, but definitely not removed.</i></p> <p><i>Site is perfect for the location of a second or third wind turbine. Rezoning would destroy this option. Site is degraded – fix it with a wind turbine not a building. Rottnest could export energy to the mainland. Site at present includes a water catchment area which is in disrepair. Although the Taskforce recommended the decommissioning of this water catchment area, I do not support this opinion without further research.</i></p> <p><i>Build a second or even third wind turbine and export power back to the mainland.</i></p>	<p>The panel agreed that a fourth Service and Operation precinct is still required to include the existing infrastructure located at the Mt Herschel site.</p> <p>A section of the current service and operations precinct should therefore be rezoned to be included in the Geordie, Fays &amp; Longreach Bay accommodation precinct.</p> <p>The catchment area is too costly to repair and maintain in comparison to the potable water yield. (See proposed Amendments 8 below).</p> <p>Further research is not necessary as this is a Taskforce recommendation undertaken in consultation with the Water Corporation.</p> <p>Excess power produced by the Island could not be fed back into a mainland grid without the installation of an underground power line. Excess energy produced cannot be feasibly stored on the Island. The cost of a project such as this would far outweigh any possible income received.</p> <p>The public will benefit from rental income received from what is currently a degraded bituminised site that is redundant as a water catchment area.</p>	<p><b>Panel recommends a change to proposed amendments 2 and 3 by combining them as below:-</b></p> <p><b>Point 2.4.9.1 is amended in the fourth sentence by deleting the words ” the bituminised catchment area,” after the word “contains”, deleting the words “and is the site of the proposed wind turbine.” and inserting the words “and the site surrounding the wind turbine.” after the word “tanks”.</b></p> <p><b>The sentence relating to the Service and Operations Precinct now reads:</b>  <b>“A third area located around Mt Herschel contains the desalination plants and water collection tanks and the site surrounding the wind turbine”.</b></p> <p><b>Proposed amendment 4 is accepted unchanged:</b></p> <p><b>Point 2.4.6.1 is amended to include after the word “Longreach” the following phrase “(Including the area located around Mt Herschel).</b></p> <p><b>The sentence relating to the Geordie Longreach and Fays Bay Visitor Accommodation Precinct now reads:</b>  <b>“Geordie Longreach (including the area located around Mt Herschel) and Fays Bay visitor accommodation precinct provides a unique style of accommodation, and all units have an exceptional outlook”.</b></p>

**PROPOSED AMENDMENTS 5, 6 and 7.**

**The requirement for additional accommodation is specified in the Management Plan to reflect the Government approved recommendations of the Rottnest Island Taskforce Report 2004.**

Overall 146 (71%) submissions supported the additional accommodation development.

**A selection of positive comments are outlined on the next pages grouped under following headings:**

'Support for management of the Island'  
'There is demand for additional accommodation'

Overall 60 (29%) submissions opposed the additional accommodation development.

**A selection of negative comments are grouped on the pages after the positive comments under the following headings:**

'Rottnest should remain unchanged'  
'Rottnest should not be a luxury resort/destination for interstate and international tourists'  
'The kind of people attracted to a resort will demand additional facilities and services – will set a precedent'  
'Environmental impacts/Sustainability'

Specific impact issues included:

'Vehicle movements'  
'Noise and loss of amenity for Longreach Bay visitors  
and boaties'  
'Not enough research'  
'Design features of proposed hotel'

'Planning'

Planning concerns included the planning process and:

'Lease issues'  
'Viability'

SUMMARY OF PUBLIC COMMENTS	PANEL DISCUSSION OF PUBLIC COMMENTS	OUTCOME FOR PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE RIMP 2003-2008
<p><b>Support for management of the Island</b></p> <p>Specific comments included:</p> <p><i>Full support for RIA and Minister for Tourism. Concerned at Rottnest Society, very small interest group attempting to interfere and cause unnecessary delays – claims it is champion of keeping Rottnest the way it was intended to be when it was first established in the early 20<sup>th</sup> Century. Continued to perpetuate the myth that there was never any intention for development to extend beyond the current Thomson Bay settlement. This is factually incorrect.</i></p> <p><i>In 1907 Governor of WA, Admiral Bedford, states that the Island should be a public park for the enjoyment of the people forever and no one should be able to own any part of it; <b>Accommodation should be erected to keep pace with demand</b>; the natural beauty of the Island should be disturbed no more than is absolutely necessary. Provides additional information about the history of the Island’s development – 1832-1969.</i></p> <p><i>The RIA has in the last few years rejuvenated and rebuilt a decaying island resort that in the opinion of the OAG was best closed down. The Board has been able to successfully execute a plan that creates a balance between the need for financial sustainability and maintenance of its unique beauty. Makes Rottnest attractive to a much wider range of users including international visitors.</i></p> <p><i>Believe the Island can support responsible and sustainable development while maintaining Rottnest ethos.</i></p> <p><i>All proposed amendments have support provided any new developments give due regard to maintaining the overall casual relaxed atmosphere and addressed in responsible sustainable manner.</i></p>	<p>The Panel took into account the comments of a respondent who had researched the original intention of Governor Bedford when the Island was first withdrawn from public ownership for the people of Western Australia:</p> <p>“In 1907 Governor of WA, Admiral Bedford, states that the Island should be a public park for the enjoyment of the people forever and no one should be able to own any part of it; <b>Accommodation should be erected to keep pace with demand</b>”.</p>	<p><b>Proposed amendments 5, 6 and 7 are accepted unchanged. Due the removal of proposed amendment 3 above the reference in point 6.5.3.3 to point 6 is changed to point 5.</b></p> <p><b>Point 2.4.6.2 is amended to include an additional dot point which reads under the heading Geordie, Longreach and Fays Bay Visitor Accommodation Precinct - Issues:</b></p> <p><b>“The Rottnest Island Taskforce appointed by the Minister for Tourism in 2003 identified the Mt Herschel site as able to be used for an additional accommodation project”.</b></p> <p><b>Point 2.4.6.3 is amended to include an additional dot point which reads under the heading recommendations:</b></p> <p><b>“Build additional accommodation on the Mt Herschel site”.</b></p> <p><b>Point 6.5.3.3 is amended to insert a new dot point after the first dot point to read under the heading Amount of Accommodation – Recommendations:</b></p> <p><b>“Build additional accommodation on the Mt Herschel site”.</b></p>

SUMMARY OF PUBLIC COMMENTS	PANEL DISCUSSION OF PUBLIC COMMENTS	OUTCOME FOR PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE RIMP 2003-2008
<p><b>There is demand for additional accommodation</b></p> <p>Forty six submissions expressed specific support for a wider choice and range of accommodation or provision of more amenities, and facilities. Specific comments included:</p> <p><i>Will add to accommodation offering and increase RI appeal to local and international visitors. Long overdue</i></p> <p><i>Likes hotel development – low profile, sustainability theme and sympathetic architectural design. Will not affect current choices – something for everyone.</i></p> <p><i>State Sporting Assoc (Yachting WA) represents 25,000 members of yachting and sailing clubs. Fully supports proposed amendments. Will provide a viable alternative facility for recreational boating members of the clubs.</i></p> <p><i>Boat owner and regular visitor. Amendments have full support provided new developments give regard to maintaining casual relaxed atmosphere and addressed in sustainable manner.</i></p> <p><i>Development and demographic growth in WA require corresponding growth in infrastructure and facilities to meet demands. RIMP should provide controlled sympathetic development of broad range of facilities incl. accommodation style and capacity to meet pop. Growth and market expectations.</i></p> <p><i>Supports proposed amendments to the RIMP. Believes the Island can support responsible and sustainable development while maintaining the Rottnest Ethos. Many day visitors would love to have the opportunity to stay overnight in peak season and have been unable to do so as all available accommodation is already booked up more than a year in advance. Also enhances choices that already exist.</i></p> <p><i>Development will be an asset for visitors.</i></p> <p><i>Addition of facility as proposed is a must for future evolution of the Island. No reason for locals to suffer – benefits for services and products inevitable and advantage all users.</i></p> <p><i>Hotel is part of adapting to changing population demographics and needs.</i></p>	<p>The panel noted that:</p> <p>A number of businesses supported the amendments to allow continued financial viability of island as well as improving amenity and facilities for all visitors.</p> <p>A number of individuals and businesses supported the amendments to enable additional accommodation that would provide a greater range of accommodation and conferencing facilities.</p> <p>The large number of people that were represented by the letter from the Board of Yachting WA – 25 000.</p>	<p>See recommendations above for proposed amendments 5, 6 and 7.</p>

SUMMARY OF PUBLIC COMMENTS	PANEL DISCUSSION OF PUBLIC COMMENTS	OUTCOME FOR PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE RIMP 2003-2008
<p>Forty-two submissions specifically mentioned support for tourism/development of tourist accommodation. (Of the 146 submissions in favour of the Amendments 2-8 of RIMP who might also be assumed to support this due to their expressed support for the amendments.)</p> <p>Specific comments included:</p> <p><i>Tourism brings huge benefits and contributes to sustainable management. Hope West Australians welcome more tourists with the legendary friendliness people associate with WA.</i></p> <p><i>Support changes necessary to amend zoning and use of land at Mt Herschel to tourism use to allow for change of use from disused bitumised water catchment area to a 120 room tourist accommodation facility.</i></p> <p><i>Believe it is an essential development so as to allow the island to be accessed on an overnight basis by visitors to the State who are not able to take advantage of ballot system used to allocate bungalow accommodation.</i></p> <p><i>Demand for getaway corporate meetings, small conferences and pre/post touring options in unique locations is strong.</i></p>		<p>See recommendations above for proposed amendments 5, 6 and 7.</p>

SUMMARY OF PUBLIC COMMENTS	PANEL DISCUSSION OF PUBLIC COMMENTS	OUTCOME FOR PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE RIMP 2003-2008
<p><b>Rottnest should remain unchanged</b></p> <p>Twenty-five submissions included comments opposing change in the character or 'ethos' of the Island.</p> <p>Specific comments included:  <i>Anything that will change the basic nature of Rottnest should absolutely be avoided. Basic nature is: children and teens – outside, active and interaction with environment; enjoying freedoms that we as children took for granted. Place has a slightly dishevelled ambience – this adds to relaxed holiday atmosphere.</i></p> <p><i>Our family and friends love Rottnest and are horrified that there is a proposal to build a luxury resort on the Island. 5 star resorts have no place on Rottnest. Ignores uniqueness of Island.</i></p> <p><i>A sophisticated resort is incongruous with the relaxed, informal and egalitarian atmosphere presently enjoyed and valued by holiday makers.</i></p>	<p>The panel recognised that a number of submissions from the public did not address the proposed RIMP changes but commented on perceived changes to the Rottnest experience.</p> <p>Inappropriate development will not be allowed to occur on Rottnest Island. The Island's Sustainability Guidelines set out strict guidelines for current and future development.</p> <p>The panel felt that Western Australians from all socio-economic backgrounds are entitled to have their needs met by the accommodation range on Rottnest.</p> <p>The guidelines under which Expressions of Interest were sought for a new development on Rottnest clearly underlined the importance of maintaining the existing Rottnest holiday experience and "ethos".</p>	<p><b>See recommendations above for proposed amendments 5, 6 and 7.</b></p>

SUMMARY OF PUBLIC COMMENTS	PANEL DISCUSSION OF PUBLIC COMMENTS	OUTCOME FOR PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE RIMP 2003-2008
<p><b>Rottnest should not be a luxury resort/destination for interstate and international tourists</b></p> <p>Forty submissions specifically stated opposition to the concept luxury/tourist facilities on Rottnest.</p> <p>Specific comments included:</p> <p><i>Don't need a hotel and don't want to cater for international tourists.</i></p> <p><i>A world class tourist attraction is totally incompatible with all that Rotto is – and all we want it to be in the future.</i></p> <p><i>4 or 5 star resort style accommodation on Rottnest. Will place significant strain on resources and is inconsistent with social and environmental values of the Island.</i></p> <p><i>Development flies in face of reserve listing – concern other private developments may follow. Keep luxury hotels on mainland.</i></p> <p><i>A/conditioning, spa baths and swimming pools not appropriate for Rottnest.</i></p> <p><i>People who desire resorts are extremely well catered for now. Resort type accommodation is everywhere – Rottnest Island style – is only on Rottnest.</i></p> <p><i>Should be kept for local families as stipulated in Section 12 of the RIA Act.</i></p> <p><i>The State Government should guarantee the future of Rottnest as a unique but ecologically fragile resource to be preserved for all of the people of WA to admire and enjoy now and into the future.</i></p>	<p>The panel felt that a refusal to cater for international tourists disregards the benefits to Western Australians of a robust tourism industry. In addition, the revenue from leasing what is currently a disused catchment area will enable the Authority to maintain current accommodation and maintain current prices, especially at the budget end of the current accommodation range.</p> <p>Rottnest Island has been recognised by Government as one of Western Australia's significant tourism icons.</p> <p>The proposed development is the equivalent of a four star rating.</p> <p>Current breakdown of visitors is unlikely to be substantially changed by the addition of a new accommodation facility on Mt Herschel.</p> <p>According to research carried out by Market Equity in 2006, the current mix of intrastate, interstate and international tourists is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 75% - Perth metropolitan area</li> <li>• 6% - regional Western Australia</li> <li>• 19% - Interstate and overseas</li> </ul> <p>The panel felt that changes to the zoning of Mt Herschel for additional accommodation does not contravene the Act in that it provides for holiday facilities, will not impact flora or fauna and will assist in the financial sustainability of the Island further allowing the RIA to restore the environment to the extent that resources allow (ie the functions of the RIA Act).</p>	<p><b>See recommendations above for proposed amendments 5, 6 and 7.</b></p>

SUMMARY OF PUBLIC COMMENTS	PANEL DISCUSSION OF PUBLIC COMMENTS	OUTCOME FOR PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE RIMP 2003-2008
<p><b>The kind of people attracted to a resort will demand additional facilities and services – will set a precedent</b></p> <p>Specific comments included:</p> <p><i>Conference attendees will not come to Rotto to appreciate the unique things it has to offer, but will demand facilities and attractions incompatible with the nature of the Island.</i></p>	<p>Comments relating to the “kind of people” that would be attracted to the Island by a zone change allowing additional accommodation on Mt Herschel were considered by the Board to be possibly discriminatory, certainly highly subjective.</p> <p>The panel recognised that there could be a potential for increased demand for more upmarket facilities and services. However, inappropriate development will be curtailed by the Sustainability Guidelines with which any new development must comply.</p> <p>The panel also recognised that there will be and have been changes in expectations of the public from time to time.</p>	<p><b>See recommendations above for proposed amendments 5, 6 and 7.</b></p>
<p><b>Environmental impacts/Sustainability</b></p> <p>Forty-one of the negative submissions raised concerns about potential impacts on the island environment.</p> <p>Specific comments included:</p> <p><i>Mt Herschel is an A Class Reserve.</i></p> <p><i>Huge impact of crowds of tourists on wildlife, plants, history.</i></p> <p><i>Have seen nothing to counter reservations in current RIMP about possible negative impact on Rottnest.</i></p> <p><i>Any additional accommodation at Fays, Geordie and Longreach must conform to existing design principles and amenity of area without disturbing existing vegetation.</i></p> <p><i>If the pristine environment disappears, people will go elsewhere. It's the environment that attracts!</i></p> <p><i>Do cashed up tourists really want to see brown or yellow trees and dead quokkas (due to climate change). Limestone headlands are breaking down.</i></p> <p><i>Impact of extra visitors on environment of 90,000 additional visitors each year.</i></p> <p><i>With our ongoing lack of rainfall, and more people tramping over the sandhills, things can only get worse.</i></p> <p><i>Does development meet HSD guidelines (Coastal Planning Policy 2.6).</i></p>	<p>The proposed zoning change to allow additional accommodation at Mt Herschel complies with the description of the uses of the Rottnest Island A Class Reserve as outlined in the RIA Act: Section 11 (subsection 2)</p> <p><b>11. Functions of Authority</b></p> <p>(2) The control and management of the Island is vested in the Authority for the purpose of enabling it:</p> <p>(a) to provide and operate recreational and holiday facilities on the Island;</p> <p>(b) to protect the flora and fauna of the Island; and</p> <p>(c) to maintain and protect the natural environment and the man-made resources of the Island and, to the extent that the Authority's resources allow, repair its natural environment.</p> <p>A change of zoning at Mt Herschel to allow for additional accommodation will provide holiday facilities; not impact on flora and fauna and will include the rehabilitation of 16 hectares from degraded bitumen to native vegetation.</p> <p>Revenue from the site will increase the Authority's resources to repair the natural environment.</p> <p>The panel noted that the reference to an additional 90 000 visitors is incorrect. Based on the projected annual average of 69% occupancy for 290 beds for an average of 3 night stays the estimated annual increase in visitors is 24 500. This figure relates to the current marketing target increase for the Island.</p> <p>Environmental and social impacts of any additional developments will continue to be managed by the RIA through initiatives such as the Coastal Walk Trail, interpretation activities and signage currently being implemented by the RIA.</p> <p>The tender process placed significant emphasis on environmental sustainability and the preferred proponent was selected on this basis.</p> <p>The development has regard for the coastal set back guidelines outlined in the Coastal Planning Policy.</p>	<p><b>See recommendations above for proposed amendments 5, 6 and 7.</b></p>

SUMMARY OF PUBLIC COMMENTS	PANEL DISCUSSION OF PUBLIC COMMENTS	OUTCOME FOR PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE RIMP 2003-2008
<p><b>Vehicle movements</b></p> <p>Specific comments included:</p> <p>Many more vehicles would clutter the roads</p> <p>Extra traffic on Thomson's Bay- Geordie Bay road.</p>	<p>The RIA is currently carrying out a vehicle rationalisation which will reduce the overall amount of vehicles on the Island. The review also addresses environmentally friendly forms of transport.</p> <p>It is not expected that the development will significantly increase traffic movements in the settlement area.</p>	<p>See recommendations above for proposed amendments 5, 6 and 7.</p>
<p><b>Noise and loss of amenity for Longreach Bay visitors and boaties</b></p> <p>Specific comments included:</p> <p><i>Noise generated would undoubtedly disturb people staying in Longreach units, particularly at night (as does the noise of the desalination plant).</i></p> <p><i>Impact on peace at Geordie/Longreach for boaties and visitors.</i></p>	<p>Any additional accommodation would be subject to existing RIA regulations relating to noise abatement and curfews. The panel also considered that Liquor Licensing Laws would ensure that there would be no undue noise.</p> <p>The panel was informed that there have been no complaints about the desalination plant installed in 1995 or wind turbine since its installation in December 2004.</p> <p>The boating community (25,000 represented by Yachting Western Australia) have indicated that an additional accommodation facility at Mt Herschel has their support.</p>	<p>See recommendations above for proposed amendments 5, 6 and 7.</p>
<p><b>Not enough research</b></p> <p>Specific comments included:</p> <p><i>Comprehensive research required to establish what type of accommodation might be appropriate for Mt Herschel site in accordance with the Act.</i></p> <p><i>Need independent feasibility study incorporating consequences of lessee failure, and determination of what people want.</i></p> <p><i>Will bring up to 90,000 extra overnight visitors annually without research to determine impacts.</i></p> <p><i>What and where is the evidence that the establishment of a boutique hotel at Mt Herschel will solve issues of financial sustainability for the RIA, particularly given the hotel would be developed by a private corporation? If such evidence exists, has it been independently reviewed and verified? Has the public had an opportunity to view it? If the hotel becomes a white elephant (as other island hotels have done), who will bear the cost?</i></p> <p><i>Further research required on impact on electrical network; high voltage feeder; power station redesign; new sewerage pumping station; water gravity feed; target saving of 430 000 litres of diesel/greenhouse gases).</i></p>	<p>The panel noted that comprehensive research was carried out for the Taskforce in 2004 into the kind of accommodation that would be appropriate for Rottnest Island.</p> <p>The panel noted that the reference to an additional 90 000 visitors is incorrect. Based on the projected annual average of 69% occupancy for 290 beds for an average of 3 night stays the estimated annual increase in visitors is 24 500.</p> <p>There is currently no model of carrying capacity that is transferable to Rottnest in considering how many people the Island's environment can sustain. However, anticipated increased numbers (24 500) are in line with marketing targets for the Island and are not considered to represent a significant increase in impact.</p> <p>As noted previously, impact on the environment of visitors to the Island is being managed by the RIA through the development of a coastal walk trail and other initiatives as part of its management plan.</p> <p>Independent and statistically valid research informed the decisions of the Taskforce regarding the need for and appropriate types of additional accommodation on the Island.</p> <p>A Taskforce funded utilities master plan is being developed. Infrastructure upgrades were identified as required regardless of the proposed accommodation development. The master plan includes reference to the requirements of the development.</p>	<p>See recommendations above for proposed amendments 5, 6 and 7.</p>

SUMMARY OF PUBLIC COMMENTS	PANEL DISCUSSION OF PUBLIC COMMENTS	OUTCOME FOR PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE RIMP 2003-2008
<p><b>Design features of proposed hotel</b></p> <p>Specific comments included:</p> <p><i>Overall size, height, number of rooms, high energy use; contravenes Act.</i></p> <p><i>Should be built along the same design lines as Geordie, Fays &amp; Longreach.</i></p> <p><i>Cuboidal monstrosity towering above Longreach.</i></p> <p><i>Not right accommodation model, too big for location.</i></p> <p><i>Footprint is too big and not confined to present bitumen area. Will appear as four stories from the Bay.</i></p> <p><i>Broadwater project inappropriate to needs and resources – size, visual impact and disregard for sustainability – energy and water use.</i></p>	<p>Public comment on the concept plans, including design features, was sought during a prior 4 week comment period.</p> <p>Comments received have been analysed and forwarded to the preferred proponent together with the comments of the Government Architect. (See Attachment 1 for a list of the recommendations resulting from the public comment period on the development design.)</p> <p>Existing design principles of accommodation at Fays, Geordie and Longreach has a much greater footprint and requirement for water and kitchens than the proposed development.</p> <p>The development is planned to occur on a bituminised site with margins of disturbed vegetation. With the exception of installing access to the beach, the design does not involve removal of native vegetation.</p> <p>The tender process placed significant emphasis on environmental impacts and a preferred proponent selected on the basis of use of grey water; low-rise design elements and other regard to eco-tourism principles.</p>	<p><b>See recommendations above for proposed amendments 5, 6 and 7.</b></p>
<p><b>Planning</b></p> <p>Eighteen submissions raised issues related to planning processes, hotel lease, financial issues, and viability of the proposed development.</p> <p>Specific comments on the planning process included:</p> <p><i>Clearly it is “planning” in reverse. I object to the RIMP being rearranged to suit the development. Poor governance and manifestly unsafe practice to “put the cart before the horse” and change the management plan approved and signed off in 2003 after long and careful consultation.</i></p> <p><i>Taskforce made recommendations only. Goes against the Act to change the RIMP.</i></p>	<p>The recommendations Taskforce Report released in May 2004 were endorsed by Government and funded through the Department of Treasury. In the development of the Report the Taskforce consulted widely with community and Government stakeholders.</p> <p>Once the Report was endorsed by Government the RIA was directed by the Minister for Tourism to implement the Report.</p> <p>The Act states:-</p> <p><b>15. Minister may direct Authority</b></p> <p>(1) The Minister may give to the Authority in writing</p> <p>(a) directions of a general character as to the performance of its functions; or</p> <p>(b) directions requiring it to perform any of its functions in a specified manner, but, without limiting section 18(3), any such direction shall not be inconsistent with this Act or a management plan referred to in section 17(1).</p> <p>In carrying out the Taskforce recommendations, the Authority has complied with its directions from the Minister for Tourism. The proposed changes to the RIMP address inconsistencies between the Taskforce Recommendations and the RIMP.</p>	<p><b>See recommendations above for proposed amendments 5, 6 and 7.</b></p>

SUMMARY OF PUBLIC COMMENTS	PANEL DISCUSSION OF PUBLIC COMMENTS	OUTCOME FOR PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE RIMP 2003-2008
<p><b>Lease issues</b></p> <p>Specific comments included:</p> <p><i>Leasing arrangements have in the past resulted in pathetic returns to RIA and huge profits to leaseholders.</i></p> <p><i>Rumoured 40 year lease –extraordinary. Minister’s power to extend should be stopped by the Board immediately.</i></p> <p><i>Severe lack of information on this resort that is available to the general public, and no concept of lease agreements or financial arrangements.</i></p> <p><i>Likely length of lease – 40 years. Successive RIA boards and managements have had problems with managing long leases.</i></p>	<p>The terms of the lease are currently “commercial in confidence” and are not therefore available for public comment.</p> <p>The lease term will be determined based on commercial sustainability in keeping with the capital investment injected into the project.</p>	<p><b>See recommendations above for proposed amendments 5, 6 and 7.</b></p>
<p><b>Viability</b></p> <p>Specific comments included:</p> <p><i>Unlikely to attract any more visitors in winter.</i></p> <p><i>Winter Visitor Numbers (does viability depend on winter visitors? If so – to what extent? What safeguards for taxpayers (if development fails).</i></p> <p><i>No evidence to suggest that interstate or overseas visitors would patronize a luxury hotel rather than similar on mainland.</i></p> <p><i>What research exists to overcome barriers to winter gales/big seas? Safeguards to taxpayers?</i></p>	<p>Issues of commercial viability were considered by the respondents to the Expressions of Interest. The number and quality of respondents indicates that there is a strong business case for additional accommodation on Mt Herschel.</p> <p>No tax payer funds will be invested into the building of any additional accommodation at Mt Herschel.</p> <p>The independent and statistically valid research conducted to inform the Taskforce indicated the need for and appropriate types of additional accommodation on the Island.</p>	<p><b>See recommendations above for proposed amendments 5, 6 and 7.</b></p>

<b>PROPOSED AMENDMENT 8.</b> <b>Remove the recommendation to develop and implement a bitumen catchment maintenance program</b>	<b>PANEL DISCUSSION OF PUBLIC COMMENTS</b>	<b>RECOMMENDATIONS</b>
<p>Specific comments included:</p> <p><i>There should be no move to decommission the water catchment.</i></p> <p><i>Why would you take away the water catchment when the climate is getting drier.</i></p> <p><i>North bituminised catchment must remain – withdrawal of a positive sustainable adjunct to water issues is not an option. May be able to be reduced but definitely not removed.</i></p>	<p>Less than 10% of potable water currently comes from the water catchments on Mt Herschel. Rottnest receives less rainfall than Perth and the cost of repair and maintenance of the catchment out weighs the benefit of the water received.</p> <p>Should there be a requirement for additional water to desalination, there is capacity in the aquifer, use of which has dropped to around 20 000 KL following switch to desalination as the Island main water source.</p> <p>Cost of restoring catchments prohibitive – see Taskforce Recommendation 56: Remove bituminised catchments.</p> <p>The RIA is currently investigating the installation of a third train for the Islands desalination plant thereby further increasing the capacity and yield from this water source.</p>	<p><b>The proposed amendment 8 is accepted unchanged.</b></p> <p><b>The final dot point in 10.2.1.3 and recommendation 225 are deleted.</b></p> <p><b>This removes the following sentence from the heading Potable Water – Recommendations “Develop and implement a bituminised catchment maintenance program to ensure maximum possible yield from the remaining bituminised catchment”.</b></p>