

BACKGROUND TO YELLAGONGA ENVIRONMENT CENTRE FEASIBILITY STUDY

Since the early 1990's, a number of government agencies, educational institutions and the community have prepared various proposals for an Environment Centre in the Yellagonga Regional Park (YRP). The Yellagonga Regional Park Management Plan 2003-2013, prepared by the Department of Environment and Conservation (DEC) in liaison with the Cities of Wanneroo and Joondalup, gave consideration to the development of an environment centre within the YRP and highlights two sites of potentiality being Luisini Winery and Reserve 43290, (formerly known as Lot 1).

Subsequently the City of Joondalup and City of Wanneroo both agreed to allocate \$15,000 each to undertake a feasibility study to assess the potential for, and location of, an environment centre within the YRP. The DEC also contributed \$35,000 towards the study.

The purpose of the Feasibility Study was to consider community needs and aspirations with respect to establishment of an environment centre for the YRP. The study was to take into account the natural, cultural and historic heritage of the YRP and produce a report including a detailed justification for the type of centre and the potential location and uses of the centre. Detailed financial analysis was undertaken on the various options.

The initial phase of the Feasibility Study included the assessment of whether or not a facility was required for the purposes proposed and if so, to identify several site options within the YRP where the potential facility could be located. Initially, seven sites were examined. Following detailed situational analysis of the sites, the results were presented and each site was ranked as follows: Unsatisfactory, Satisfactory or Preferred. The sites and rankings are provided below.

- Reserve 43290 (formerly Lot 1, Joondalup): **Preferred**
- Scenic Drive Wanneroo: **Preferred**
- Perry's Paddock Wanneroo: **Preferred**
- Neil Hawkins Park: *Satisfactory*
- Luisini Winery: *Satisfactory*
- Ocean Reef Road: *Unsatisfactory*
- Duffy Terrace Joondalup: *Unsatisfactory*

From the rankings, two sites were excluded from the final phase of the Feasibility Study. (Ocean Reef Road and Duffy Terrace).

The outcome of the completed Feasibility Study and the associated participative phase indicated that of the five sites identified as being preferred or satisfactory, Reserve 43290 (formerly known as Lot 1) was the most suitable site for an environment centre. The second site that could accommodate most desirable aspects for a centre was at Scenic Drive Wanneroo. The two sites also offer a good aesthetic environment with respect to access to Lake Joondalup.

It should be noted the Community Reference Group at its meeting of 15 November 2006 nominated its overall preferred site as Reserve 43290 (formerly known as Lot 1).

**Report:
A Qualitative Evaluation of
Resident Responses to the
Proposed Yellagonga
Environment Centre Feasibility
Study**

Report:

A Qualitative Evaluation of Resident Responses to the Proposed Yellagonga Environment Centre Feasibility Study

This report was commissioned as an independent method for analysing community feedback on a feasibility study jointly undertaken by the City of Joondalup (CoJ) and the City of Wanneroo (CoW).

The intention of the feasibility study was to investigate the needs, benefits and support for an Environment Centre that would provide within the broad context of environmental sustainability: education, interpretation, visitor, cultural and community services in a manner that is sensitive and responsive to the community's values, needs and vision(s). The study included a preferred final concept masterplan and feasibility analysis that will enable the CoJ and CoW to make an informed decision on the proposed facility.

On the public release of the final report, community submissions were invited from residents of both CoJ and CoW. In total, 45 independent submissions were received in the form of letters to each local government, online surveys and email correspondence.

This report will seek to provide an understanding of the respondents' views by identifying the major themes arising from the community feedback using a process of qualitative data analysis. Findings are reported by Council area as well as by gender and overall response (positive/negative). Themes arising from each of the response categories are provided. In addition, as an appendix to this report, there is a table that provides detailed notes on all submissions.

Overview of Submissions

A total of 45 independent submissions were received. In the analysis these were divided between positive and negative comments. Twenty-five respondents were classified as positive towards the concept and/or the preferred location of Lot 1. An additional 19 negative comments were received with one submission being classified as a mixture of positive and negative comments. The final submission was not classified as the respondent was referring to the previous steering committee report. It should be noted that one of the negative submissions provided a petition with 31 names strongly opposing the Lot 1 site. Four of the signatories to this petition also submitted individual responses making for 27 unique signatories. Three respondents provided multiple submissions.

Submissions were invited from residents of the City of Joondalup (CoJ) and the City of Wanneroo (CoW). Overall a total of 29 submissions were received from the City of Joondalup, 13 from the City of Wanneroo, one respondent

reported paying rates to both shires and so was not classified as being from either, one response was received from the National Trust with the final respondent not providing an address for classification purposes.

The responses were also evaluated by gender. Females accounted for the largest proportion of responses (n=21, 46.6%). Males made up 33% (n=15) with couples accounting for a further 15% (n=7). The remaining respondents (n=2) were not classified.

Positive Submissions

A total of 25 positive submissions were received for the proposed Environment Centre to be located at Yellagonga. Of these submissions, female respondents far outweighed both males and partners residing at the same address (n=13, 52%). Males provided 24% (n=6) of the responses, couples 16% (n=4) with the remaining respondent not being identified with relation to gender.

Seventeen positive submissions were submitted by residents of the City of Joondalup (four male, nine female, three couples, and one not identified). A further seven positive submissions were received from residents of CoW (two male, four female, one couple). The final positive submission was provided by the *National Trust*. These patterns of responses were mostly consistent with the overall sample although females were more positive overall.

Of those who supported the proposed Environment Centre, the views and comments were remarkably similar and fell into four broad categories. The paragraphs below provide an overview of the dominant themes.

Overall Positive Reasons for Support:

- The predominant reason for voicing support for the proposed Environment Centre was the educational benefits it would provide to the greater community. *"[I]t will provide an essential tool for the education of our school students and community members in the importance of looking after those natural area and those organisms that live within them...[in] a facility designed to give them the best experience without destroying that which they wish to study..."* (email, female, Kingsley).

The inclusion of the Centre was also viewed as one that would attract people from a wider area to learn about the native flora and fauna. One respondent noted that the establishment of an Environment Centre would *"provide a place to educate the younger generations as well as the older"* and went on to note *"as someone who conducts regular bird walks ... there is a lot of interest to learn about the lake and it's associated flora and fauna."* (email, female, Wanneroo). Furthermore, the proposed Centre was seen as a place where school children (and others) could come to learn about the cultural heritage of the region.

- Environmental issues were closely linked with the educational theme as a positive aspect. Eleven respondents felt that having an Environment Centre would contribute to the environmental sustainability of the area by providing visitors with education and increased appreciation for the fragile environment. As one respondent commented *“[T]he wetland system is a feature of the twin cities regions...society is in need of information about the diversity of like and how we can help manage it.”* (email, male, Greenwood).

Positive reference was made to the Environmental Centres at Herdsman Lake and Piney Lake and the benefit they provided to the local communities. *“In the world today when the catch cry seems to be ‘save energy/save water’ a place similar to Piney Lakes Centre would become a focus point within our city...”* (H Chester, female, Kingsley)

- The proposed Environment Centre was viewed as an asset that would provide a benefit to the local community by enhancing the existing park (n=10). One respondent commented that *“[I]t would be great to have this [Environment Centre] at Yellagonga, especially if it were linked into a walk path...”* (email, female, Duncraig). Others echoed this sentiment and noted that existing facilities would be enhanced by the inclusion of an Environment Centre. In addition, one respondent (couple) noted that proper development of the area would result in a decrease in anti-social behaviour. This particular respondent, who lives across from the proposed Lot 1, Lakeside location, noted that *“...this particular stretch of land requires to be developed it will enhance that area as it is now quite often used by young hoons for drag racing.”* (P & A Rietveld, Joondalup).
- The final group of responses provided general support for the concept (n=7). These respondents provided no concrete reason for providing positive support, although several did provide comments along the lines of *“we are pleased that the Centre is finally being built.”* (M Thorpe & G Sullivan, Joondalup) and *“the community has waited a long time for this project and now is the time to move forward.”* (B Terry, Wanneroo)

Negative Submissions

A total of 18 negative submissions were received. Of these, an equal number of males and females (n=8 each) provided negative feedback on the proposed Environment Centre. The remaining three negative submissions were submitted jointly by partners residing at the same address.

Twelve negative submissions were submitted by residents of the City of Joondalup (six male, four female and two couples). One resident who submitted a negative submission stated payment to both the CoJ and CoW.

Six negative submissions were received from residents of the CoW (two male, three female and one couple).

From the negative responses, twelve indicated they were opposed to the proposed location as it directly impacted their view and their preferred lifestyle through an increase in traffic and noise pollution (nine were residents in the immediate vicinity of Lot 1, Lakeside Dr. with many noting long-term residency; three respondents were opposed to Scenic Dr. on the same grounds). One resident expressed concern over the impact on property values should the proposed Environment Centre go ahead.

Three representatives from organisations (Friends of Yellagonga National Park, Director of Natural Area Management and Services, Chairman of Joondalup Community Coast Care Forum, Inc.) provided negative feedback on the proposal. The primary reason for non support of the Environment Centre was because they questioned whether the centre could be self-sustaining in the long run and the impact this would have on the financial viability. Each of these submissions suggested alternative environmental projects where the money could be spent (see below for alternative recommendations/suggestions).

Within the negative comments, there was a degree of support for the overall concept. However, the location was the main issue raised (n=12), this was largely driven by the close proximity of the respondent to the suggested site.

Overall Negative Reasons for Non-Support:

- Increased traffic was one of the most common reasons for not supporting the development at Lot 1 Lakeside Drive. Eight submissions mention the issue of traffic conditions and the subsequent increase in noise and disturbance to the natural wildlife. There was an expectation that traffic would increase due to the hospital expansion and this would only be compounded by the proposed development. The following comment represents the feelings by a number of respondents *"Serenity is going to be bulldozed forever"* (GT & MM Bucknall, Joondalup).
- There was negative reference to Neil Hawkins Park with regards to vandalism, car hooning, graffiti and general anti-social behaviour. Several respondents noted that they expected the same *"drug users and hoons"* to avail themselves of the new proposed facilities. Mention was made of the provision of *"public use area for mischief making"* by people and the effect the increased litter would have on natural wildlife.
- The development will interfere with the natural flora and fauna of the A class reserve. This was viewed both from the property value perspective, in that long term nearby residents felt that *"our beautiful view (which was the main reason for purchasing our block) of the lake, bushland and native flora and fauna would be replaced by concrete, car parks and buildings"* (J Ward, female, Joondalup). Other respondents noted that it was important to maintain the natural bush setting and landscape.

- The financial viability and sustainability of the proposed centre was questioned by nine submissions. The feasibility study financial projections were questioned as being too low. Reference to the Herdsman environment Centre as not being self sustaining was used as an example of the potential outcome for the proposed development. This was seen as a potential drain on City resources. One submission suggested that a *“blow out to 9 million when all costs are taken into account. Look at all the cost blow outs of every City of Joondalup project.”* (K Zakrevsky, male, Mullaloo) and reference by three submission to the impact on rates if the costs do exceed estimates.
- Some expressed concern that the support required from volunteers may not eventuate, causing a cost blow out of the estimates. It was noted that volunteers were already short on the ground and that people were already committed and could not extend themselves further. The Joondalup Community Coast Care Forum stated that they contacted a number of conservation volunteers in their network and found that *“the community support is generally not actually there at present, except maybe from one group (Friends of Yellagonga Regional Park) who operate in this area.”* Interestingly, the submission from the above noted organisation expressed similar concerns. The use of the proposed centre for a meeting place for local volunteer groups was also discounted.

Comparison between Respondents of City of Joondalup and City of Wanneroo

A total of 25 positive responses were received with the majority (n=17, 68%) coming from the City of Joondalup. Females made up the largest group of respondents from both cities. There was no difference in patterns of responses between the two geographical areas, with residents from both citing education, environmental issues, benefit to the community and cultural awareness/knowledge as key aspects of their support. Two residents from Wanneroo specified support for the Scenic Drive location (with one resident having lived in that location for 15 years) with the remaining six supporting the Lot 1, Lakeside location. All of the responses from Joondalup were for the Lot 1 location (nb. Positive responses that did not specify a location (n=14) were assumed to be for Lot 1, Lakeside because of the respondent's location and/or references made in comment).

As previously stated twelve negative submissions were received from City of Joondalup residents and six from the City of Wanneroo residents. The Wanneroo resident submissions varied. Three CoW respondents were negative toward the Scenic Drive location, living near that address. These residents actually suggested that the Lot 1 Lakeside Drive would be a preferred location. On the other hand, one respondent from the City of Joondalup noted *“Let Wanneroo have it!”* (M. Newbold, male, Joondalup).

Respondent Recommendations/Suggestions

Of the positive submission, only three provided additional suggestions. These were:

- incorporate walk path/picnic area/fenced dog area
- ensure Acid Sulphate testing is carried out, and
- establish an Environment Centre at Luisini Winery for the short-term until purpose built facility is complete.

Overall from the 18 negative submissions, ten included alternative suggestions. These were:

- reconsider proposed site location
- Perry Paddock as preferred site
- not opposed to concept in general, just Lot 1 lakeside Drive location (no alternative location suggested)
- idea is great (considerable financial questions posed and viability needs to be addressed)
- reconsider location of site (Lot 1, Lakeside Drive)
- supports concept (suggests sustainability is questioned and further analysis is suggested)
- Luisini Winery as more viable option
- need to consult with commercial community to commit to use of facility
- do smaller version first at Scenic Drive rather than Luisini Winery, and
- better suited at Lot 1 as parking could be 'hidden' in natural bushland.

Summary

This report has identified the major themes arising from the respondents. The majority of the respondents provided favourable support for the Yellagonga Environment Centre. Although support was provided for both Lot 1 Lakeside Drive and Scenic Drive, Lot 1 received the most mentions as the favoured location.

The majority of respondents (n=25, 55%) provided positive responses. These were brief and for the most part did not provide alternatives. This is to be expected as they were providing support. Of those who did provide further suggestions, they were more along the lines of "wish list" than concrete recommendations.

As would be expected, negative submissions provided a richer source of information and in some cases what were perceived as social and financial considerations. It should be noted that a significant percentage of the negative responses (n=12, 63%) were received from residents living close to the proposed sites (Lot 1 or Scenic Drive). The comments made by these respondents were on a more personal and immediate basis rather than focusing on the potential impact for the greater community. However, as was noted above, the majority of respondents were favourable toward the concept and the proposed location as specified in the feasibility study.

Summary Table of Resident Submissions

Name	Suburb	Site	Pos/Neg	Reason(s)	Suggestions	Officers Comment
GT & MM Bucknall	Joondalup- long term resident – 7 years at address	Lot 1 Lakeside Dr	Negative	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * “serenity is going to bulldozed forever” * Traffic noise unacceptable to native wildlife * (negative reference to Neil Hawkins park – assuming similar outcome) 	* Reconsider site	A traffic Impact study will determine if traffic is an issue and what can be done to ensure noise levels are acceptable
BM Ross x 2	Joondalup – long term resident – 12 years	Lot 1 Lakeside Dr	Negative	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Sacrifice of peace/serenity * Anti-development * (negative reference to Neil Hawkins park – vandals, diminishing wildlife) * Traffic noise due to increase in visitors * Old residents in opposition to proposed location (cite use of Duffey Terrace as being unsuitable due to proximity to residential area). Provided petition with 31 signatures opposing Lot 1 site 	* Perry Paddock as preferred site	Traffic impact and environmental impact studies will be undertaken to ensure that these issues are addressed
Jean Ward	Joondalup – long term resident – 9 years	Lot 1	Negative	Noise from hospital (set to increase), arena, beautiful view will be ruined due to building of carpark		A key design criterion could be to minimise impact.

Name	Suburb	Site	Pos/Neg	Reason(s)	Suggestions	Officers Comment
Mick Newbold x 4	Joondalup	Lot 1	Negative	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * A-class regional reserve not suitable * Impact on flora and fauna * Impact on local traffic conditions (location of car/bus park and entry/exit roads into park) – serious accident potential, potential traffic congestion at peak times * Car hoon activities * Neil Hawkins Park referred to negatively * Potential location a target for vandalism, graffiti, substance abuse activities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Not opposed to concept * Queries answered by CoJ 	<p>Traffic impact and environmental impact studies will be undertaken to ensure that these issues are addressed</p> <p>Security measures will be taken in to account during the development phase</p>
A & J Ostrowski	Joondalup – long term resident – 7 years	Lot 1	Negative	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Noise pollution due to traffic flow * Ambulances, hoons * A-class reserve * Car parks and buildings will disrupt flora and fauna * Anti-social behaviour will result 		<p>Traffic impact and environmental impact studies will be undertaken to ensure that these issues are addressed</p> <p>Security measures will be taken in to account during the development phase</p>
K McLeod	Madely (pays rates to both Joondalup and Wanneroo)	Lot 1	Negative	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Not in proposed location * Not properly assessed - queries financial projections in feasibility study (bicycle and produce) * Views land as sacred site, use would violate 	* Idea is great	<p>Detailed design and a detailed business strategy will review costings</p> <p>Indigenous people will be consulted and sacred sites will be assessed</p>

Name	Suburb	Site	Pos/Neg	Reason(s)	Suggestions	Officers Comment
A Lloyd	Beldon	Lot 1	Positive	* Great idea, full support		No comment
Anon	Duncraig	Lot 1 *	Positive	* Positive reference to Herdsman Lake * Environmental awareness	* Link with walkpath, picnic area and fenced dog exercise area	No comment
Anon	Wanneroo	Lot 1 *	Positive	* Great idea * Positive reference to Herdsman and Yanchep * Great educational benefit for young and old * Good location because relatively cleared and good view of lake		No comment
Anon	Kingsley	Lot 1 *	Positive	* Key focus for local, regional and global environmental issues * Asset to park * Educational benefits * Important to cultural heritage		No comment
Anon	Mullaloo	Lot 1 - *	Positive	* Educational asset * Value to education and environment enormous		No comment
Anon	Sorrento	Lot 1 *	Positive	* Educational * Promote environmental awareness		No comment

Name	Suburb	Site	Pos/Neg	Reason(s)	Suggestions	Officers Comment
C King	Joondalup	Lot 1	Negative	* Against any development of park		This comment is not in accord with the YRP Management Plan 2003-2013, which does support development in certain areas.
L Potter x 2	Joondalup – long term resident	Lot 1	Negative	* Property devalued as result of development * Bought land on understanding that Class A reserve could not be built on * Lakeside Dr busy with speeding cars and hooligans * Will leave area if approved	* Please reconsider location of site	Property devaluations cannot be substantiated, there is no evidence that this will occur in fact it may increase value to proprietors. A traffic impact study will be conducted to address traffic issues where necessary
B Terry	Wanneroo	Lot 1	Positive	* Community has waited long time * Time to move forward		No comment
J & M Napier-Winch	Joondalup	Lot 1	Positive	* Full support * Environmental awareness * Learning about Australian heritage – particularly for younger generations		No comment
Anon	Greenwood	Lot 1 *	Positive	* Relationship with environment * Education on managing environment		No comment

Name	Suburb	Site	Pos/Neg	Reason(s)	Suggestions	Officers Comment
Anon	Kingsley	Lot 1 *	Positive	No comments		No comment
Anon	Kingsley	Lot 1	Positive	* Benefit to the community * Survival of the environment (Lake Goollelal mentioned)		No comment
Anon	Kingsley	Lot 1 *	Positive	* Focus on preservation of natural area * Tool for local schools and community members (excursion facility) * Raise awareness of value of regional parks		No comment
M. Lewington	Wanneroo	Lot 1 *	Positive	* Education programs * Cultural heritage of region * Asset to park		No comment
Anon	Kinross	Lot 1	Positive	* Improve links between natural and built environments * Increase environmental awareness		No comment
Anon	Edgewater	Lot 1 *	Positive	* Asset to park		No comment
Anon (volunteer coordinator of environment group at Glengarry primary school)	Duncraig	Lot 1 *	Positive	* Resource for school children		No comment
J Hawkes (volunteer of Friends of	Carine	Lot 1	Negative	* Negative reference to Henderson and Herdsman Environment Centres – not self-sustaining and		The significant amount of funding will be sourced from Federal and State

Name	Suburb	Site	Pos/Neg	Reason(s)	Suggestions	Officers Comment
Yellagonga Regional Park)				drain on city resources * Reference to environment centre at Luisini Winery * Potential duplication of services * Money better spent on other environmental concerns of lake condition		Government. By giving all groups a centre that is well resourced a far more coordinated approach to on ground projects across the Cities can be achieved and the environment centre can provide such a focus.
M Thorp & G Sullivan	Joondalup	Lot 1	Positive	* Pleased finally happening		No comment
H Chester	Kingsley	Lot 1 *	Positive	* Positive reference to Piney Lakes Environment Centre * Educational – for school children * Environmentally friendly * Energy self-sustaining example		No comment
K Zakrevsky	Mullaloo	Lot 1	Negative	* Financial concerns – suspects blow-out of project “This project is likely to blow out to 9 million when all costs are taken into account. Look at all the cost blow outs of every CoJ project!” * Notes potential for withdrawal of funding by state and federal govt – burden falls to ratepayers * May be difficulties managing centre due to joint responsibilities between CoJ and Wanneroo	* Supports concept	The significant amount of funding will be sourced from Federal and State Government. By giving all groups a centre that is well resourced a far more coordinated approach to on ground projects across the Cities can be achieved and the environment centre can provide such a focus

Name	Suburb	Site	Pos/Neg	Reason(s)	Suggestions	Officers Comment
M Norman (Chairman, Joondalup Community Coast Care Forum)	JCCF	Lot 1	Negative	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Insufficient analysis of real use of building for environmental education * Insufficient community and volunteer support – people committed elsewhere in terms of volunteering * Existing community groups have own operations to facilitate, will not use the facilities here * Interpretative facility not feasible as no scientists or display staff (already have WA Museum, Kings Park Botanic Garden and Herbarium, AQWA and Scitech) * Schools more likely to use for excursions * Costly * Not local govt issue * Organic food growing not feasible (would require substantial volunteer commitment) * Financial concerns * Income generation questioned 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Money could be spent elsewhere * Need to put more funding into natural area management * Luisini winery complex viewed as more viable option * Supports smaller scale project of restoring the original hoUse at Lot 1 	<p>The next phase for the developing the centre is recommended to be business plan, which will focus on the operational aspects of the centre.</p> <p>The provision of a well resource centre for volunteers may likely encourage more residents to become volunteers.</p> <p>The significant amount of funding will be sourced from Federal and State Government. By giving all groups a centre that is well resourced a far more coordinated approach to on ground projects across the Cities can be achieved and the environment centre can provide such a focus.</p>
P Powell		Lot 1	Negative	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Traffic, car parks and cafes will interfere with natural state 		Traffic impact and environmental impact studies will be undertaken to ensure that these issues are addressed

Name	Suburb	Site	Pos/Neg	Reason(s)	Suggestions	Officers Comment
D Hancock (Managing Director, Natural Area Management & Services)	Kingsley	Lot 1	Negative	* Not financially sustainable	* Need to consult with commercial community re commitment to facilities	The significant amount of funding will be sourced from Federal and State Government. By giving all groups a centre that is well resourced a far more coordinated approach to on ground projects across the Cities can be achieved and the environment centre can provide such a focus
B Kroczeck	Joondalup	Lot 1	Negative	* Damage natural environment due to increased traffic * Questions estimated loss – impact on rates (higher) * Not needed as people visit park now		Traffic impact and environmental impact studies will be undertaken to ensure that these issues are addressed
C Vann	Wanneroo	?		Provide information about a previous concept for an environment centre		No comment
L Tilley	Wanneroo (?)	Lot 1 *	Negative	* Will interfere with bush * Against development		An environmental impact study will be undertaken as part of the project
L Sarich	Wanneroo	Scenic Drive	Positive	* Will make greater use of existing equipment (playground) * Enhancement to existing park * No impact on local environment		No comment

Name	Suburb	Site	Pos/Neg	Reason(s)	Suggestions	Officers Comment
T Johnson	Wanneroo	Scenic Drive	Negative	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Will disrupt fauna * Increased litter * Potential to destroy environment * Increase in management costs * Negative environmental impact on flora and fauna 		An environmental impact study will be undertaken as part of the project. Litter can be managed.
C Curry	North Beach	Lusini Winery	Positive	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Supports idea * Will build on already planned facilities * Will have benefit of having increased drawing power * Encourage wider range of people to visit * Good partnership between National Trust and City of Wanneroo 		No comment
Anon	Greenwood	Lot 1 *	Positive	* Support idea	* MUST have acid sulphate soils testing and acid soil management plan	Acid sulphate soils (ASS) and Potential acid sulphate soils (PASS) testing will be incorporated in the project

Name	Suburb	Site	Pos/Neg	Reason(s)	Suggestions	Officers Comment
G Curtis	Sinagra (Bibbulmun Entrance)	Lot 1 Scenic Drive	Negative /Positive	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Cost of vandalism * Insufficient patronage – burden for council * Recommendations of original steering committee not addressed (ie, research facility) * Need more bi-partisan approach * Access for vehicles easier than for Lot 1 * Perry's Paddock not an option (no reason) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Do smaller version first at Scenic Drive rather than Luisini winery 	Security issues will be addressed in the development phase. The Lot 1 Joondalup proposal has a research facility incorporated into the broad concept.
A Stubber	Waneroo		Negative	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Money should be spent on on-ground conservation works and education * Negative reference to other environment centres as unsustainable * Centre will depend on volunteer help which is already stretched in area * Doubtful if schools will use due to competitive sites * "Realistically the large amounts of money that is proposed for construction could be put to far better use by local and state governments to meet long term environmental outcomes." 		The significant amount of funding will be sourced from Federal and State Government. By giving all groups a centre that is well resourced a far more coordinated approach to on ground projects across the Cities can be achieved and the environment centre can provide such a focus.

Name	Suburb	Site	Pos/Neg	Reason(s)	Suggestions	Officers Comment
I & J Thompson	Wanneroo – live across from proposed site	Scenic Drive	Negative	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *Disrupting their outlook * Devaluing property * Already has large traffic issue on weekends * Parking hectic 	* Better suited at Lot 1 because parking could be better 'hidden' in natural bushland	<p>Loss of Views can be addressed by architectural design at the Lot 1 site as outlined in the feasibility study report ref. 8.5.1 (page 86)</p> <p>Property devaluations cannot be substantiated in fact there is the case that enhanced development may increase values.</p> <p>A traffic impact study will be conducted to address traffic issues where necessary</p>
P & A Rietveld	Joondalup	Lot 1	Positive	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Development would enhance * Decrease hooning and drag racing 		No comment
K & S Reader	Wanneroo – 15 years on Scenic Dr	Scenic Drive	Positive	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Viewed as asset * Pre-existing facilities * User friendly * Educational facility for local schools 		No comment
J Newberry	Joondalup	Lot 1	Negative			No comment
National Trust		Lot 1	Positive	* Develop as environmental education centre	* Lusini winery recommended for short term	No comment

