



## **Metro Outer Development Assessment Panel Related Information**

**Meeting Date and Time:** Tuesday, 14 October 2025; 9.30am  
**Meeting Number:** MODAP/108

### **PART B – CITY OF ROCKINGHAM**

1. Declarations of Due Consideration
2. Disclosure of Interests
3. Form 1 DAP Applications
4. Form 2 DAP Applications
  - 4.1 Lot 500 (No.434) Safety Bay Road, Safety Bay – Proposed Tavern Amendment – DAP/23/02551
5. Section 31 SAT Reconsiderations



## **Attendance**

### **Officers/Technical Advisors in attendance**

Chris Parlane (City of Rockingham)

Mike Ross (City of Rockingham)

### **Applicants and Submitters**

Paul Spittle

Aoise Noone (Planning Solutions)

Ross Underwood (Planning Solutions)

Arthur Barrett (BB Holdings WA Pty Ltd)

Shane Fragomeni (Motivo Studio)

Matthew Nolan (Lloyd George Acoustics)



## **PART B – CITY OF ROCKINGHAM**

### **1. Declarations of Due Consideration**

### **2. Disclosure of Interests**

Please note a standing declaration of interest, if the items on this agenda have been considered at the relevant local government council meeting or having attending a briefing session, the local government DAP members acknowledge that in accordance with section 2.4.5 of the DAP Code of Conduct 2025 they have declared that they had participated in a prior Council meeting or briefing in relation an item being determined at this meeting. However, under section 2.1.2 of the DAP Code of Conduct 2025, they acknowledged that they are not bound by any previous decision or resolution of the local government and undertakes to exercise independent judgment in relation to any DAP application before them, which will be considered on its planning merits.

### **3. Form 1 DAP Applications**

Nil

### **4. Form 2 DAP Applications**

#### **4.1 Lot 500 (No.434) Safety Bay Road, Safety Bay – Proposed Tavern Amendment – DAP/23/02551**

##### **4.1.1 Deputations**

Paul Spittle speaking against the application at Item 4.1. The deputation will address against the development.

Aoise Noone (Planning Solutions) speaking in support of the application at Item 4.1. The deputation will address in support of the proposed development.

The City of Rockingham may be provided with the opportunity to respond to questions of the panel, as invited by the Presiding Member.

##### **4.1.2 Additional Information**

The Presiding Member notes an addendum to the responsible authority report was published on 13 October 2025 in relation to Item 4.1.

### **5. Section 31 SAT Reconsiderations**

Nil



## Deputation Request Form

Regulation 40(3) and DAP Standing Orders 2025 cl. 3.6

**Must be submitted at least 72 hours (3 calendar days) before the meeting**

### Deputation Request Guidelines

Before requesting to present to a DAP please review the Responsible Authority Report that has been published on the DAP website and consider whether any previous comments have been adequately addressed.

Your request will be determined by the Presiding Member based on relevance to the subject application, individual merit, other requests raising the same issues and likely contribution to the DAP's consideration and determination of the application.

Deputations are not to exceed **3 minutes**, unless otherwise approved by the Presiding Member. The Presiding Member may agree to or require combined deputations where the deputations are considered complementary to each other and would assist the efficiency and effectiveness of the DAP meeting.

In accordance with Clause 3.6.2 of the *DAP Standing Orders*, your deputation request must be accompanied with a document setting out the deputation content.

Handouts or power points will not be accepted on the day.

In accordance with Clause 3.6.9 of the *DAP Standing Orders*, if your deputation request is not approved, the submitted content will be circulated to the DAP and published on the DAP website as a written submission.

Please complete a separate form for each presenter and submit to [daps@dplh.wa.gov.au](mailto:daps@dplh.wa.gov.au)

### Presenter Details

Name	Paul Spittle
Company (if applicable)	
Relationship to proposed development	A close residing member of the Safety Bay community
Please identify if you have any special requirements:	<b>YES</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>NO</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> If yes, please state any accessibility or special requirements: <small>Click or tap here to enter text.</small>

### Meeting Details

DAP Name	Metro Outer DAP
Meeting Date	14/10/2025
DAP Application Number	DAP/23/02551
Property Location	Lot 100 (No.434) Safety Bay Road, Safety Bay



### Deputation Details

I have read the contents of the Responsible Authority Report contained in the published DAP Meeting Agenda	YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>
Is your deputation in support or against the <u>proposed development</u> ?	SUPPORT <input type="checkbox"/> AGAINST <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Will your deputation involve a presentation that requires power-point facilities?	YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Will you be attending in person or via electronic means	In person <input type="checkbox"/> Online <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
I acknowledge that my deputation content <u>will be</u> published on the DAP website and circulated to the local government and applicant	YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

### Deputation Content\*

Brief sentence summarising your deputation (To be included in the Related Information part of the agenda)	<p><i>The deputation will address:</i></p> <p>The revision to above ground parking will lead to greater noise levels of patrons attending the Tavern in the form of engine noise, door slamming, voices and general noise in the evenings when the background noise levels are low. The original Transcore computations are flawed by simple maths errors. The assumptions and thinking that the changes in car parking space is not supported by any empirical basis. The reduction in floor space is contrary to health regs and other state regulations. See attached files Please note this a submission only as I am unable to appear as we are overseas at this time.</p> <p>Paul Spittle</p>
--	---

*Please provide your deputation content below or attach as a separate document. Any document must be provided in Microsoft word (.doc), PDF (.pdf), PowerPoint .pptx) or Image (.jpeg) format and be no more than 5MB.*

*If your deputation references documents that are contained within the Responsible Authority Report and/or its attachments, please consider referencing the document rather than including a duplication of documents:-*



As per attached documentation.

# SUBMISSION IN OBJECTION TO AMENDED DEVELOPMENT

## APPLICATION Proposed Tavern Lot 100(no 434) Safety Bay Road

**TO:** Chief Executive Officer

City of Rockingham

PO Box 2142

Rockingham DC WA 6967

**FROM:** Paul and Trish Spittle

**DATE:** 27/8/25

**RE:** OBJECTION TO AMENDED DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION TAVERN - LOT 100 (NO. 434)  
SAFETY BAY ROAD, SAFETY BAY

**DEVELOPMENT:** Mixed Commercial Development including Tavern (Waikiki Tavern)

### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

#### Key Objection Points:

- **Statutory Health Breaches:** Floor space reduction to 596m<sup>2</sup> cannot legally support 1,000 patron capacity under Health (Public Buildings) Regulations 1992
- **Flawed Assumptions:** Applicant characterises material changes as "negligible" without empirical evidence or expert assessment
- **Planning Non-Compliance:** Multiple breaches of TPS2, SPP 2.6, and LPP 3.3.14 requirements for amenity protection and adequate parking
  - **Community Impact:** Significant risks to coastal character, traffic safety, and residential amenity inadequately assessed
- **Legal Deficiencies:** Failure to assess cumulative impacts and reliance on conclusory assertions without supporting studies

The amended proposal materially worsens statutory compliance failures, amenity impacts, and public safety risks through legally indefensible assumptions and inadequate assessment.

### ANALYSIS OF FLAWED ASSUMPTIONS IN AMENDED DA

#### 1. ASSUMPTION OF NEGLIGIBLE DIFFERENCES

**Applicant's Position:** Amendments are "minor" and do not materially alter the development.

**Legal Counter-Argument:** This is a **non-empirical assumption** lacking measurable evidence. Under the **Planning and Development Act 2005 (WA)** and **TPS2**, decision-makers must assess material planning considerations. Dismissing changes (building orientation, floor space reallocation, parking redesign) as immaterial without empirical study risks **jurisdictional error**. Courts have found that failure to address potentially adverse planning impacts cannot be brushed aside as "negligible."

#### 2. FLOOR SPACE REDUCTION AND PATRON CAPACITY CONTRADICTION

**Applicant's Position:** Reduced floor space (219m<sup>2</sup> reduction) offsets amenity impacts while maintaining 1,000-person capacity.

**Legal Counter-Argument:** This creates **internal inconsistency** and statutory breach:

- Under **Health (Public Buildings) Regulations 1992**, capacity requires **0.85m<sup>2</sup>/person**
- 1,000 patrons requires **850m<sup>2</sup> of clear usable area**
- **Original DA3:** 815m<sup>2</sup> (already non-compliant)
- **Amended DA:** 596m<sup>2</sup> (severely non-compliant at 0.596m<sup>2</sup>/person)
- Maintaining 1,000 patrons despite insufficient floor area is a **legal fiction** exposing the decision to challenge

#### 3. STREETSCAPE AND AMENITY NEUTRALITY ASSUMPTION

**Applicant's Position:** Building reorientation toward Safety Bay Road is neutral in effect.

**Legal Counter-Argument:** No objective urban design or acoustic study supports this claim. Reorientation alters **streetscape interface**, increasing building massing, noise spill, and visual intrusion into residential outlooks. Under **TPS2** and **LPP 3.3.14**, development must actively protect neighbouring amenity. The larger frontage facing the Bay allows greater exposure to minors, school children who frequent the beach after school

and passing families to alcohol and its affects. Claims of neutrality without expert evidence constitute **conclusory assertions** which courts reject where amenity protection is statutorily mandated.

#### **4. TRAFFIC AND PARKING ADEQUACY WITHOUT ASSESSMENT**

**Applicant's Position:** Car parking remains "adequate" despite underground carpark removal and altered circulation.

**Legal Counter-Argument:** No updated **Traffic Impact Assessment** quantifies impacts. **LPP 3.3.14** mandates compliance with defined parking ratios and objective demonstration of adequacy. Reliance on "broad conclusory assurances" where statutory ratios apply constitutes **failure to properly consider mandatory relevant considerations** (High Court principle).

#### **5. SOCIAL IMPACT ASSUMPTIONS WITHOUT EVIDENCE**

**Applicant's Position:** Anti-social behaviour, noise, and beach access concerns remain unchanged.

**Legal Counter-Argument:** Relocation of access points, expansion of service areas, and parking changes increase conflict potential with residential/recreational character. The **precautionary principle in planning law** requires uncertainty about social impacts be resolved favouring community amenity protection. Ignoring uncertainties and assuming no change contradicts this duty.

### **DETAILED OBJECTION GROUNDS**

#### **1. BUILDING REORIENTATION AND STREETScape IMPACTS**

**Material Alteration with Statutory Implications:**

- Alters Malibu Road and Safety Bay Road interface
- Changes pedestrian/vehicular access creating new noise/light spill patterns
- Under **TPS2 (clause 4.2)**, development must protect adjoining landowners' amenity and locality character
- Shifting active frontages imposes different streetscape burden on residential areas

**Community Impact:** Increases visual bulk, risks overshadowing/overlooking residential properties, erodes coastal view corridors in traditionally low-scale beachside suburb.

#### **2. PARKING DEFICIENCIES AND POLICY BREACH**

**Statutory Non-Compliance:**

- **LPP 3.3.14** requires parking sufficient for peak demand without affecting residential streets
- Underground parking removal displaces vehicles into local streets
- Increases pressure on Malibu Road and cul-de-sacs
- Particularly problematic with nearby childcare centre and 1,000 person capacity

**Community Impact:** Car-dependent locality with limited public transport faces overflow parking blocking driveways, reducing foreshore access, impeding emergency vehicles, and increasing accident risks.

#### **3. FLAWED TRAFFIC IMPACT ASSESSMENT**

**Fundamentally Flawed Assumptions:**

- Uses average vehicle movement models without cumulative impact assessment
- Fails to account for **tavern + childcare + beachgoer + commercial use traffic**
- 47-vehicle peak hour characterisation ignores summer tourism and evening events

**Statutory Framework:** **SPP 2.6** requires traffic/access assessment for broader coastal amenity impact.

#### **4. CUMULATIVE IMPACT ASSESSMENT FAILURE**

**Legally Untenable Approach:**

- Treats impacts as site-specific, ignoring concurrent tavern and childcare development burdens
- **Planning law requires cumulative assessment**
- **TPS2** and **SPP 7.0** emphasise contextual fit, not piecemeal assessment

#### **5. HEALTH AND SAFETY RISK UNDERSTATEMENT**

**Material Risk Underassessment:**

- **Health (Public Buildings) Regulations 1992, sections 7A and 7B** demand strict capacity ratio compliance (which amended DA fails)
- Noise spill from reoriented tavern inadequately mitigated, contrary to **EPA Guidance No. 3**
- Surface parking without controlled access increases anti-social behaviour risks



- Emergency service delays from congestion and overflow parking

## COMMUNITY CHARACTER AND STATUTORY OBLIGATIONS

### Character Impact Concerns:

- **Loss of Coastal Character:** Conflicts with Safety Bay's family-friendly beach environment identity
- **Traffic & Safety:** Peak-time congestion worsening, compromising pedestrian/cyclist safety
- **Noise & Anti-Social Behaviour:** Operations risk disorder affecting families

### Statutory Breach Summary:

- **Town Planning Scheme No. 2:** Amenity protection and orderly development
- **State Planning Policy 2.6:** Coastal amenity and landscape value protection
- **Local Planning Policy 3.3.14:** Adequate parking supply requirements
- **Health (Public Buildings) Regulations 1992:** Occupancy ratio enforcement for large licensed premises

## RECOMMENDATION

The Amended Development Application should be **REFUSED** for:

- **Public health and safety protection**
- **Statutory compliance requirements**
- **Orderly planning principles**
- **Community amenity preservation**

The combined effect of floor space deficiency, parking displacement, inappropriate building orientation, and inadequate impact assessment produces a **materially adverse outcome** legally unsustainable for the Safety Bay community.

## CONCLUSION

The Amended Development Application relies on **legally flawed assumptions** characterising material changes as "negligible" without empirical support. This approach cannot be sustained under applicable statutory frameworks and exposes the decision to jurisdictional error.

Approval would constitute **multiple binding statutory breaches** contrary to Council's duties and public interest, relying on conclusory assertions rather than proper assessment of mandatory planning considerations.

We respectfully request **City of Rockingham refuse the Amended Development Application** and uphold legitimate community expectations of orderly development, statutory compliance, and amenity protection.

**Respectfully submitted,**

Paul and Trish Spittle

Contact: 0415 700015

**Before reading this PLEASE SEE; XL file Mathematical Errors in Transcore Parking; Spreadsheet analysis of fundamental maths errors**

Extracted from Lot 100 (No.434) Safety Bay Road, Safety Bay – Proposed Mixed Commercial Development –DAP/23/02551 **MODAP/8 - 9 Apr 2024 - City of Armadale - City of Rockingham**

**Technical Note: No 1 Date: 24/01/2024**

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

The Transcore parking assessment dated 24 January 2024 contains fundamental methodological flaws, weak analysis, and speculative assumptions that make it inadequate to guide sound planning decisions. The assessment attempts to work around established planning standards through unsubstantiated theoretical modelling rather than robust, evidence-based analysis.

**KEY METHODOLOGICAL CONCERNS**

1. Reliance on Non-Empirical Basis

The report explicitly states that "the methodology adopted by Transcore is not based on any empirical data" but relies solely on "Transcore's experience and operator's advice." This weakens the credibility of the assessment, as planning decisions should be based on measurable evidence rather than untested assumptions. A credible parking study should include:

- Actual traffic counts from comparable developments;
- Empirical parking utilisation studies;
- Recognised research methodologies;
- Transparent validation of assumptions.

2. Speculative Reliance on Public Foreshore Parking

The assessment assumes availability of 79–89 parking bays at Waikiki Foreshore Reserve without any right or guarantee of access. This creates several concerns:

- No formal entitlement: The applicant has no proprietary right to foreshore parking;
- Public purpose conflict: Foreshore parking is intended for recreational users, not commercial patrons;
- Variable availability: Seasonal, weather-dependent, and event-related fluctuations reduce reliability;
- Planning principle: Using public infrastructure to meet private development requirements undermines community access.

A development should demonstrate adequate on-site parking without reliance on uncertain public assets.

3. Arbitrary Demand Assumptions

Tables B1 and B2 present percentage demand figures without supporting evidence, methodology, or validation. Examples include:

- Medical Centre shown at 100% capacity at 4:00 PM on Friday;
- Child Care Centre at 100% demand at both 8:00 AM and 5:00 PM;
- Recreation Private use fluctuating between 20% and 100% without explanation;
- Tavern reaching 100% demand at 8:00 PM when most other businesses are closed.

These figures appear to lack a clear empirical foundation or explanation.

4. Implausible Cross-Utilisation Claims

The report claims that "cross trades between various land uses" and "ride sharing/walking by nearby residents" could reduce demand by at least 30%. However:

- Combining medical appointments with child care drop-offs is uncommon;
- Evening tavern use has little overlap with daytime medical/retail activity;
- The local catchment is not highly walkable;

- No evidence supports the assumption of a 30% reduction.
- 5. Statistical and Analytical Weaknesses
  - Peak demand coincidence: At 8:00 PM on both Friday and Saturday, the demand is almost entirely driven by tavern and restaurant activity, showing substantial overlap, not separation.
  - Conservative assessment claim: The report calls itself conservative, but in reality it is optimistic—assuming perfect separation of peak times, relying on public parking, and excluding staff/visitor parking.
  - Margin of error: With only 2–7 surplus bays claimed during peak periods, there is no tolerance for seasonal demand, special events, breakdowns, or loading conflicts.

#### 6. Planning Requirements

Under Town Planning Scheme No. 2 (TPS2), the requirement is 391 bays, while only 167 are proposed. This represents a shortfall of 57%. TPS2 standards are minimum benchmarks, and the assessment does not provide sufficient justification to support such a large departure. The Metro Outer Joint Development Assessment Panel previously requested "robust justification" for parking provision, but this assessment does not provide that standard.

### RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Independent empirical parking study of comparable developments should be required.
2. A full traffic flow analysis for Safety Bay Road, including pedestrian and emergency access, is needed.
3. Seasonal variation, particularly during peak foreshore use, must be addressed.
4. The applicant should demonstrate provision of the full 391 bays on-site, or provide compelling evidence-based justification for any variation.
5. Community amenity impacts from potential overflow into residential areas and the foreshore should be considered carefully.

### CONCLUSION

The Transcore parking assessment relies too heavily on assumptions, unsupported figures, and reliance on facilities beyond the applicant's control. As a result, it does not provide a reliable basis for decision-making. A revised, empirically-based study that fully addresses planning requirements and community impacts should be required before further consideration of the proposal.

NB: Please see file; errors in Transcore parking assessment.xlsx

Subject: Parking Assessment and Management Plan (PCMP)

See footnote for the conclusion

Project: Lot 100 Safety Bay Road, Safety Bay

Parking  
Surplus/  
Error  
Total Parking  
Demand  
variance

Table B1

Percentage of parking demand temporal analysis Typical Friday

Time	Shop/ Pharmacy	Medical Centre	Café	Restaurant	Consulting rooms	Recreation Private	Tavern	Child care	Total %	Shortfall
6:00	0%	0%	10%	0%	0%	30%	0%	10%	50%	
7:00	0%	0%	50%	0%	0%	80%	0%	50%	180%	
8:00	10%	20%	80%	0%	20%	100%	0%	100%	330%	
9:00	30%	40%	100%	0%	40%	50%	5%	70%	335%	
10:00	40%	80%	80%	10%	80%	40%	5%	20%	355%	
11:00	40%	70%	80%	20%	70%	30%	30%	10%	350%	
12:00	50%	50%	60%	50%	50%	50%	60%	10%	380%	
13:00	40%	50%	50%	60%	50%	40%	60%	10%	360%	
14:00	40%	60%	30%	50%	60%	30%	60%	10%	340%	
15:00	40%	50%	20%	20%	50%	60%	30%	50%	320%	
16:00	30%	100%	10%	10%	100%	70%	20%	80%	420%	
17:00	30%	50%	0%	30%	50%	80%	40%	100%	380%	
18:00	10%	10%	0%	50%	10%	100%	60%	10%	250%	
19:00	0%	0%	0%	90%	0%	40%	80%	0%	210%	
20:00	0%	0%	0%	80%	0%	20%	100%	0%	200%	

Require  
ments  
Based  
Provided  
Surplus/s (+/-)

Please see below screen shots that show and explain formulas used for checking Totals across tl

Table B3

Total of parking demand temporal analysis Typical Friday

Time	Shop/ Pharmacy	Medical Centre	Café	Restaurant	Consulting	Recreation Tavern	Child Care	Total Demand	Parking Surplus/ Shortfall
6:00	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	2	6
7:00	0	0	4	0	0	6	0	12	22
8:00	1	15	6	0	5	8	0	24	59
9:00	3	30	7	0	10	4	11	17	81
10:00	4	60	6	3	20	3	11	5	111

Analysis

Total Parking Demand Error	Calculation variance
5	-1
22	0
59	0
82	1
112	1

											OFFICIAL			
11:00	4	53	6	5	18	2	65	2	154	65	155	1		
12:00	5	38	4	13	13	4	131	2	208	11	210	2		
13:00	4	38	4	15	13	3	131	2	209	20	210	1		
14:00	4	45	2	13	15	2	131	2	214	15	214	0		
15:00	4	38	1	5	13	5	65	12	142	86	143	1		
16:00	3	75	1	3	25	6	44	19	174	37	176	2		
17:00	3	38	0	8	13	6	87	24	178	24	179	1		
18:00	1	8	0	13	3	8	131	2	165	46	166	1		
19:00	0	0	0	23	0	3	174	0	200	29	200	0		
20:00	0	0	0	20	0	2	218	0	240	7	240	0		
21:00	0	0	0	13	0	1	153	0	166	80	167	1		
												11	Total	

Table B2 Percentage of parking demand temporal analysis Typical Saturday

	Shop/ Time	Medical Pharmacy	Café Centre	Restaurant	Consulting rooms	Recreation Private	Tavern	Child Care	Addition of %	
	6:00	0%	0%	10%	0%	0%	30%	0%	0%	40%
	7:00	0%	0%	50%	0%	0%	40%	0%	0%	90%
	8:00	10%	0%	80%	0%	0%	50%	0%	0%	140%
	9:00	30%	0%	100%	0%	0%	60%	5%	0%	195%
	10:00	40%	0%	80%	10%	0%	100%	5%	0%	235%
	11:00	40%	0%	80%	20%	0%	90%	40%	0%	270%
	12:00	50%	0%	60%	50%	0%	60%	70%	0%	290%
	13:00	40%	0%	50%	60%	0%	50%	70%	0%	270%
	14:00	40%	0%	30%	50%	0%	50%	70%	0%	240%
	15:00	40%	0%	20%	20%	0%	60%	40%	0%	180%
	16:00	30%	0%	10%	10%	0%	60%	30%	0%	140%
	21:00	0%	0%	0%	50%	0%	10%	70%	0%	130%
Require ments Based on TPS Provided Surplus/s (+/-)		9	75	7	25	25	8	218	24	391 167 -224

Table

**B4****Total of parking demand temporal analysis Typical Saturday**

OFFICIAL

Time	Shop/ Pharmacy	Medical		Recreation				Child Care	Total Parking demand	Parking Surplus/ Shortfall	Parking			
		Centre	Café	Restaurant	rooms	Private	Tavern				Demand	Calculation		
													Error	variance
6:00		0	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	3	221	3	0	
7:00		0	0	4	0	0	3	0	0	7	209	7	0	
8:00		1	0	6	0	0	4	0	0	11	192	11	0	
9:00		3	0	7	0	0	5	11	0	25	168	26	1	
10:00		4	0	6	3	0	8	11	0	31	154	32	1	
11:00		4	0	6	5	0	7	87	0	109	67	109	0	
12:00		5	0	4	13	0	5	153	0	179	15	180	1	
13:00		4	0	4	15	0	4	153	0	179	15	180	1	
14:00		4	0	2	13	0	4	153	0	175	36	176	1	
15:00		4	0	1	5	0	5	87	0	102	100	102	0	
16:00		3	0	1	3	0	5	65	0	76	117	77	1	
17:00		3	0	0	8	0	6	109	0	125	77	126	1	
18:00		1	0	0	13	0	6	174	0	193	26	194	1	
19:00		0	0	0	23	0	2	218	0	243	3	243	0	
20:00		0	0	0	25	0	2	218	0	245	2	245	0	
21:00		0	0	0	13	0	1	153	0	166	80	167	1	
Provided											167	9		Total
Surplus/ shortfall (+/-)											-224			

MODAP/8 - 9 Apr 2024 - City of Armadale - City of Rockingham													
Technical Note: No 1 Date: 24/01/2024													
Project No: 123.049													
Subject: Parking Assessment and Management Plan (PCMP)													
Project: Lot 100 Safety Bay Road, Safety Bay													
See footnote for the conclusion													
Table B3 Total of parking demand temporal analysis Typical Friday													
Time	Shop/ Pharmacy	Medical Centre	Café	Restaurant	Consulting rooms	Recreation Private	Tavern	Child care	Total %	Parking Surplus/ Shortfall	Parking Demand Error	Calculation variance	
6:00	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	2	198	22	0	
7:00	0	0	4	0	0	0	6	0	12	198	22	0	
8:00	1	15	6	0	5	8	0	24	59	153	59	0	
9:00	3	30	7	0	10	4	11	17	81	130	82	1	
10:00	4	60	6	3	20	3	11	5	111	109	112	1	
11:00	4	53	6	5	18	2	65	2	154	65	155	1	
12:00	5	38	4	13	13	4	131	2	208	11	210	2	
13:00	4	38	4	15	13	3	131	2	209	20	210	1	
14:00	4	45	2	13	15	2	131	2	214	15	214	0	
15:00	4	38	1	5	13	5	65	12	142	86	143	1	
16:00	3	75	1	3	25	6	44	19	174	37	176	2	
2:00	5	38	4	13	13	4	131	2	208	11	210	2	
3:00	4	38	4	15	13	3	131	2	209	20	210	1	
4:00	4	45	2	13	15	2	131	2	214	15	214	0	
5:00	4	38	1	5	13	5	65	12	142	86	143	1	
6:00	3	75	1	3	25	6	44	19	174	37	176	2	
7:00	3	38	0	8	13	6	87	24	178	24	180	2	
8:00	1	8	0	13	3	8	131	2	165	46	166	1	
9:00	0	0	0	23	0	3	174	0	200	29	201	1	
10:00	0	0	0	20	0	2	218	0	240	7	241	1	
11:00	0	0	0	13	0	1	153	0	166	80	167	1	

Conclusion to mathematical errors in the Transcore parking study

**CONCLUSION: FATAL FLAWS IN TRANSCORE PARKING ASSESSMENT**

**Legal Challenge to Proposed Tavern Liquor license - 434 Safety Bay RDI** submit that the Transcore parking assessment dated 24 January 2024 contains methodological deficiencies, computational errors, basic mathematical errors and insufficient analysis that renders it wholly inadequate.

**CRITICAL METHODOLOGICAL AND COMPUTATIONAL FAILURES FUNDAMENTAL MATHEMATICAL ERRORS UNDERMINING ASSESSMENT INTEGRITY** Critical Fire spreadsheet contains basic summation errors across multiple rows, demonstrating a concerning lack of professional competence and quality control:

- **Friday variance:** 11 parking bays mathematical error
- **Saturday variance:** 9 parking bays mathematical error
- **Total computational deficiency:** 20 parking bays
- These are not minor discrepancies but fundamental computational failures that **materially undermine the integrity and accuracy of the entire** basic arithmetic cannot be performed correctly, the reliability of complex demand modelling becomes untenable. Such computational errors compel rejecting the assessment as professionally inadequate and legally insufficient.

he horizontal axis



---

10:07 AM  
28-Jul-25

Comments Share

Add-ins

Analyze Copilot Data

Add-ins

M	N	O
nt Plan (PCMP)		
Parking		
mand		
error	variance	
210	2	
210	1	
214	0	
143	1	
176	2	
179	1	
166	1	
200	0	
240	0	
167	1	
=SUM(N32:N47)		
SUM(number1, [number2], ...)		

s fundamental

nding: The Transcore  
:

tire assessment. When  
constitute grounds for



## Deputation Request Form

Regulation 40(3) and DAP Standing Orders 2025 cl. 3.6

**Must be submitted at least 72 hours (3 calendar days) before the meeting**

### Deputation Request Guidelines

Before requesting to present to a DAP please review the Responsible Authority Report that has been published on the DAP website and consider whether any previous comments have been adequately addressed.

Your request will be determined by the Presiding Member based on relevance to the subject application, individual merit, other requests raising the same issues and likely contribution to the DAP's consideration and determination of the application.

Deputations are not to exceed **3 minutes**, unless otherwise approved by the Presiding Member. The Presiding Member may agree to or require combined deputations where the deputations are considered complementary to each other and would assist the efficiency and effectiveness of the DAP meeting.

In accordance with Clause 3.6.2 of the *DAP Standing Orders*, your deputation request must be accompanied with a document setting out the deputation content.

Handouts or power points will not be accepted on the day.

In accordance with Clause 3.6.9 of the *DAP Standing Orders*, if your deputation request is not approved, the submitted content will be circulated to the DAP and published on the DAP website as a written submission.

Please complete a separate form for each presenter and submit to [daps@dplh.wa.gov.au](mailto:daps@dplh.wa.gov.au)

### Presenter Details

Name	Aoise Noone
Company (if applicable)	Planning Solutions
Relationship to proposed development	Applicant
Please identify if you have any special requirements:	<b>YES</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>NO</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> If yes, please state any accessibility or special requirements: <a href="#">Click or tap here to enter text.</a>



### Meeting Details

DAP Name	Metro Outer DAP
Meeting Date	14/10/2025
DAP Application Number	DAP/23/02551
Property Location	Lot 500 (434) Safety Bay Road, Safety Bay

### Deputation Details

I have read the contents of the Responsible Authority Report contained in the published DAP Meeting Agenda	YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>
Is your deputation in support or against the <u>proposed development</u> ?	SUPPORT <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> AGAINST <input type="checkbox"/>
Will your deputation involve a presentation that requires power-point facilities?	YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Will you be attending in person or via electronic means	In person <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Online <input type="checkbox"/>
I acknowledge that my deputation content <u>will be</u> published on the DAP website and circulated to the local government and applicant	YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

### Deputation Content\*

Brief sentence summarising your deputation (To be included in the Related Information part of the agenda)	<i>The deputation will address:</i> Speaking in support of the proposed development
--	--

*Please provide your deputation content below or attach as a separate document. Any document must be provided in Microsoft word (.doc), PDF (.pdf), PowerPoint .pptx) or Image (.jpeg) format and be no more than 5MB.*

*If your deputation references documents that are contained within the Responsible Authority Report and/or its attachments, please consider referencing the document rather than including a duplication of documents:-*

# DAP Presentation Summary

<b>To:</b>	Metro Outer DAP	<b>From:</b>	Planning Solutions
<b>Attention:</b>	DAP Presiding Member	<b>Job No:</b>	9467
<b>Copy to:</b>	DAP Secretariat	<b>Date:</b>	10 October 2025
<b>Subject:</b>	DAP/23/02551 – Form 2 Application (Tavern Amendment) Lot 500 (434) Safety Bay Road, Safety Bay		

Planning Solutions acts on behalf of BB Holdings (WA) Pty Ltd in support of the proposed development. Our client owns and operates licenced establishments throughout the metropolitan area and is acquiring the whole of the recently subdivided Lot 500, which comprises the tavern approved by the Metro Outer Development Assessment Panel (**DAP**) on 9 April 2024. Lot 500 contains Parcels 3 and 4 of the original approval.

We are pleased to receive the City of Rockingham's (**City**) Responsible Authority Report (**RAR**) and officer recommendation for **unconditional approval**. We thank the City's officers for their thorough consideration and assessment of the proposed amendments. The following members of the project team are available to answer any questions:

- Ross Underwood – Planning Solutions
- Arthur Barrett – BB Holdings (WA) Pty Ltd
- Shane Fragomeni – Motivo Studio
- Matthew Nolan – Lloyd George Acoustics

We are supportive of the recommendation and have no objections to the officers recommendation.

## PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

This application seeks to modify the development plans regarding the layout of the approved tavern only, and a portion of the carpark. The reconfiguration results in the tavern addressing Safety Bay Road and the coastal aspect. The internal layout has been modified, and the building footprint has reduced in size by 219m<sup>2</sup>. There is no change to the approved operation of the tavern, or the car parking provision throughout the mixed commercial site.

The proposed amendments have been carefully designed to ensure the development does not have an adverse impact on the adjoining residential development, and broader community, as demonstrated through the supporting consultant reports addressing waste, noise and traffic matters.

## PUBLIC SUBMISSIONS

We note that the amendments were positively received by the community, receiving 52 submissions in support (i.e. 60%). Many of the submissions in support outlined their preference for the amended design, noting its strong interaction with the street and interface with the coast.

Submissions outlining concerns were sufficiently addressed through the submission of further information, addressing matters relating to the operation of the tavern and amenity.

## CONCLUSION

The proposed development is consistent with the planning framework and is supported by the City's officers. The RAR presents a recommendation for **approval**, without further or amended conditions, which we request the Metro Outer DAP adopt.

We would be pleased to answer any questions from the DAP members at the meeting scheduled for 14 October 2025.

Yours faithfully



**AOISE NOONE**  
**SENIOR PLANNER**

Schedule of Submissions - Amendment to Development Approval - Proposed Tavern - Lot 100 (No.434) Safety Bay Road, Safety Bay -  
20.2025.250.1

PUBLIC SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS				
No.	Name	Address	Support / Object/Other	Comment
1	Mr Mark Hiscock	Malibu Road SAFETY BAY WA 6169	Support	Looks much better than the original plan, using the view of ocean as much as possible, what a wonderful pub this will be once its built. I live in the Lumia estate and as far as I know everyone is for the development.
2	Mrs Simone Moloney	Leisure Way 6169 SAFETY BAY WA 6169	Support	Agree with changes will be wonderful.
3	Ms Tracey Larkings	Fawdon street SAFETY BAY WA 6169	Support	Multi level tavern with roof top bar facing Safety Bay Road to enjoy the views. Under croft car parking.
4	Mr James Middleton	Alfred Close SAFETY BAY WA 6169	Support	Brilliant - much better use of the space, brings the tavern to the for shore that than jammed into a corner as previously proposed. All people focus on is parking but the tavern will be walkable for so many people. Looking forward to it.
5	Mrs Michelle chatfield	Churchill Ave SHOALWATER WA 6169	Other	Updated design does improve the view for patrons but the design remains seriously underwhelming for a beachside development. 48 bays for 1000 patrons is manifestly inadequate, the beach car park is full in spring and summer with beach goers and this lack of parking will impact beach users who have a right to park there, not against the development but feel this a substandard design for premium beach front commercial space, parking limitations need to be resolved before approval.
6	Mr Paul Rajecki	Penguin Road SHOALWATER WA 6169	Support	More than happy with the new proposal.
7	Mr Jordan Fee	Gloucester Crescent SHOALWATER WA 6169	Support	what a great idea, the revised layout would better suit the layout of the land with more options for seating facing the ocean. cheers, looks good again i would like emphasis how great this will be for the area and finally get some good development happening in the space of food choices
8	Mr Paul Odriscoll	Seacrest Street SAFETY BAY WA 6169	Support	This is such a better layout making full use of the amazing views from the tavern front and a more street appealing frontage.
9	Ms Hayley Ford	Penguin Road	Support	Brilliant idea making the frontage towards Safety Bay road. The views are worth reducing the footprint.

Schedule of Submissions - Amendment to Development Approval - Proposed Tavern - Lot 100 (No.434) Safety Bay Road, Safety Bay -  
20.2025.250.1

		SAFETY BAY WA 6169		
10	Mr David Clark	Safety Bay Road SAFETY BAY WA 6169	Support	Proposed tavern site plan is a much better layout making most of the ocean view it has and looks to be more parking
11	Mr Travis Constantine	Safety Bay Road SAFETY BAY WA 6169	Support	Excellent proposal, full support, we really hope this proceeds
12	Ms Wendy Donegan	Ernest Street SAFETY BAY WA 6169	Other	The only concern we have is the closing time Thursday to Saturday of 1am. We feel this is too late and will only create excessive noise patrons and staff leaving that early in the morning.
13	Mr John Fairweather	Malibu Road SAFETY BAY WA 6169	Support	<p>Regarding the proposed changes to the approved site plan for the tavern on Safety Bay Road, I am very supported of the change.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Patrons of the pub will have more opportunities to look out over the ocean.</li> <li>2. It will not leave a vacant lot between the old site and the apartments to the south.</li> <li>3. I always thought that the underground parking was a potential problem as it would likely become a gathering spot for undesirables. I would rather have a car parked above ground where it is being overlooked.</li> </ol> <p>As a resident of Lumia Estate, adjacent to lot 100, I have spoken a few times to the site supervisor, Fabric Properties and the builders. I have monitored the building progress and the structures that we can see at this time. All this leads me to think that the results will be highly satisfactory and a benefit to the community.</p>
14	Mr Richard Lindsay	Malibu Road SAFETY BAY WA 6169	Object	I'm particularly concerned about the noise aspect. I reviewed the noise component of the report and noted it had 100m reference distance which doesn't seem far enough to me. I cannot understand how the premises is rated for 1000 patrons when there is only parking for approximately 50 vehicles, are patrons going to be using the Waikiki beach parking? I appreciate that the operating hours are not being amended, but with this amendment they have been clearly identified. Thursday to Saturday open to 1am is not necessary. 11pm closing is more acceptable. In the very original submission for lot 100 there was much more provision for temporary accommodation that requirement appears to be lost.
15	Mr Heath Bennett	Wavelea Street SAFETY BAY WA 6169	Other	I'm generally supportive of the proposal to reconfigure the layout and reduction in building footprint. I am concerned with parking, based on 1,000 patrons. The beach carpark across the road is already heavily utilised, almost impossible to obtain a bay in summer without adding hundreds of cars trying to access the tavern. Traffic management will be challenging. I would also question why a tavern needs to be



Schedule of Submissions - Amendment to Development Approval - Proposed Tavern - Lot 100 (No.434) Safety Bay Road, Safety Bay -  
20.2025.250.1

				open at 8am on Sunday? I'd also prefer an earlier closing time from 1am Thursday to Saturday, i think this will be incredibly disruptive to nearby properties and occupants.
16	Mrs Amy O'Meagher	Charthouse Road SAFETY BAY WA 6169	Support	I think we need to do all that we can to encourage this application to go ahead. This is prime real-estate that has sat vacant for too long. In addition to the proposed parking there should be changes to allow more street parking as well.
17	Mr John Gibney	Gallagher Way CARDUP WA 6122 Safety Bay Road SAFETY BAY WA 6169	Object	<p><b><u>Submission 1</u></b></p> <p>I hereby completely oppose the proposed amendment that has been put forward for this tavern development on Safety Bay Road. As much as the community are looking forward to a new tavern on this site, the proposed realignment and at-grade open car park will have a negative impact on adjoining residents...I own an apartment at Surfside next door...Given the tavern's evening hours of operations, there will be an addition of more light pollution and noise from the carpark...We were all happy with the original proposal since an underground car park was involved and there was some space between the tavern and our complex....This new proposal places the tavern pretty much right on our boundary...There will be noise!!!....Pubs are not quiet places and the amenity of residents right next door and behind will be compromised, despite the apparent findings of the acoustic report...As a resident I am completely unhappy with this amendment. Pub car parks are not generally quiet either with patrons coming and going at all hours...Surfside residents had their AGM this Saturday and many were unaware of this proposed amendment and were also really unhappy about the short notice and time frame to reply...Although dated the 20th, my notice only arrived in the post on Friday the 28th and we are expected to respond by the 5th... This doesn't seem appropriate given this proposed amendments impact on our complex...which will be significant compared to the original proposal....So please keep to the original place or build it somewhere else...This tavern is surrounded by residential development so it must not have a detrimental effect on it's neighbours ...of which now there are many!</p> <p><b><u>Submission 2</u></b></p> <p>I hereby wish to oppose the proposed amendment to the tavern development on Safety Bay Road. I own an apartment at Surfside, the residential complex adjacent to this new tavern development. As much as our community are looking forward to this new tavern there is concern that the proposed amendment to plans will have a detrimental effect on our complex and its peaceful amenity, namely noise...The original proposal with the carpark under the tavern does not pose these concerns to the same degree..</p> <p>The At-grade carpark at the rear will result in more light pollution,visually impacting on my apartment at night..and noise! Pub carparks are not quiet! (Despite the findings of the apparent acoustic report)...Additionally, the realignment of the tavern building brings it right up to the boundary of our complex....Pubs are noisy places!....and their car parks too....patrons come and go at all hours and it's not just car doors opening and closing that we will hear! How could it even be considered that the noise wouldn't change to surrounding residents from a carpark tucked under the tavern VS an open one just the other side of their fence? ...The original plan provided a sensible buffer around the tavern from pre</p>

Schedule of Submissions - Amendment to Development Approval - Proposed Tavern - Lot 100 (No.434) Safety Bay Road, Safety Bay -  
20.2025.250.1

				<p>existing residential development (many people live very close to this proposed tavern!)...the original alignment allowed for future development of something less noisy than a pub on our boundary too...</p> <p>As a neighbouring property owner I fully embrace the redevelopment of the old Waikiki site with all that is coming, including the new proposed tavern! ....but absolutely not with this new amendment...Please built it how it was planned initially on the site or else don't built it at all...It is not fair to allow a new development to be built to the detrimental impact on its existing neighbours! ...It has already a capacity of 1000 people so the noise impact is considerable enough without allowing a last minute change that will make the noise impact much worse! I really feel for the folk that live even closer....</p> <p>Additionally, the time frame to respond to this amendment is really poor...Surfside had it's AGM this Saturday the 30th and most owners were unaware of this proposed amendment...</p> <p>Despite the letter from council being dated the 20th August, I didn't receive this until Friday the 28th and your deadline to respond is the 5th September...Doesn't really give folk much time to consider something that will make a much greater impact on our complex! ...I think this is shabby for sure and the reaction at our meeting wasn't favourable to this amendment proposal either.</p> <p>The majority of owners at Surfside had not received any notice so we're really happy that we had our meeting when we did! It does feel like this has been set up to just "slip" by without anyone noticing...None of the neighbours will be happy with these proposed changes...and really why would they be? More noise and bright lights in their backyard ...It should not be reasonable to expect a change in play at this stage of the development...</p>
18	Mr Amandine Malardeau	Vaux Street ROCKINGHAM WA 6168	Object	<p>I am writing to formally express my concerns regarding the proposed extension for Parcel 4 in the development application for the tavern. This extension raises significant issues that could negatively impact both the quality of life for future tenants and the overall integrity of the surrounding environment. There are significant concerns regarding noise disturbances. The current assessment primarily focuses on the noise from car doors; however, it is crucial to consider the wider range of sound pollution. The movement of vehicles in and out of the area, along with general traffic noise, may continue to be disruptive well into the early hours, with reports indicating disturbances occurring until 1 AM. A 7-meter wall may not adequately reduce this noise, especially during peak activity hours. Therefore, the consideration of an underground car park should be revisited. Additionally, the proposed building design in Parcel 4 will obstruct existing views, which is a key aspect of the property's appeal. This change is likely to diminish both the aesthetic and functional value of living spaces for residents, as well as potentially impact the character of the neighbourhood. It is crucial to reconsider the design aspects in light of these factors. I urge you to conduct a more comprehensive analysis regarding noise abatement measures and to explore alternative solutions that could better protect resident comfort and enhance the overall living experience. In your Table 2, the matters (n) to be considered and the provided responses lack adequate measures to prevent noise disturbances for the Surfside apartments building. The city of Rockingham should not accept the proposed amendments, as the major changes would negatively affect the well-being of our tenants at Surfside Apartments. Given the importance of these issues, I urge you to consider my concerns and advocate for amendments that prioritise the well-being</p>

Schedule of Submissions - Amendment to Development Approval - Proposed Tavern - Lot 100 (No.434) Safety Bay Road, Safety Bay -  
20.2025.250.1

				of both future occupants and the community as a whole. Thank you for considering my input during the development review process.
19	Ms Shirley Nelville	Malibu Road SAFETY BAY WA 6169	Object	<p><u>Submission 1</u></p> <p>I would like to object to the proposed trading hours stated in the amendment. My days of concern are Thursday to Saturday: 10 am to 1 am. I cannot see any valid reason why patrons should still be consuming alcohol: Thursday until the early hours of Friday morning, being 1.00 am Friday until the early hours of Saturday morning, being 1.00 am Saturday until the early hours of Sunday morning being 1.00 am My opinion, 12.00 pm Thursday to sat Saturday is a fair and reasonable closing time. This is a quiet beachside residential suburb and the early Friday to Sunday mornings closing will impact on the surrounding residents. I am sure many of the patrons will be walking to their various homes where they reside and I suggest it won't be done quietly. Also the departing vehicle traffic in the early mornings will also be a very noisy problem. All of the above will impact on families with young children and our more mature residents.</p> <p><u>Submission 2</u></p> <p>More noise for those living close by and the reduction of the area of the tavern by 219m2 and still having a 1,000 patron capacity makes the tavern comparable to a pub in the central metro area. This when at capacity will lead to anti- social behaviour. Safety Bay is a residential beachside suburb with limited foreshore parking and now will have local beachgoers and many beachgoers from surrounding suburbs competing with: The approved tavern site plan which has been given approval to access 88 parking bays of already limited foreshore beachside parking opposite the proposed tavern site on Safety Bay Road. The proposed businesses in the development will also be competing for parking bays. One of the proposed businesses is a child care centre with parents and carers trying to pick up their toddlers during busy times after their working day and the eager tavern patrons looking to relax. The proposed parking situation which is already sparse will not only be dangerous but result in overflow parking along Safety Bay Road and neighbouring streets. Safety Bay is welcoming an increasing number of young families into the area as some residents move on and older residents down size. My concern is the danger and ability for pedestrians (me being one of the many) not only to access the Safety Bay Road/Malibu Road Roundabout but navigate to the SBR/MR Roundabout with the several entrances and exits from the development onto Malibu Road. I presume the speed limit will be greatly reduced on Malibu Road for obvious reasons. This is a beachside residential suburb. NOT the Rockingham foreshore which has a completely different demographic.</p>

Schedule of Submissions - Amendment to Development Approval - Proposed Tavern - Lot 100 (No.434) Safety Bay Road, Safety Bay -  
20.2025.250.1

20	Mr Paul Graham	Spyglass Court SAFETY BAY WA 6169	Object	Do not want this to go ahead the parking is in the incorrect place should be under the hotel as planed
21	Mr David Young	Penguin Road SAFETY BAY WA 6169	Other	Is it possible to have a couple of no standing signs out the front of the units at 436 Safety Bay Road, Safety Bay as I feel some patrons may take advantage of the grass area and verge for parking?
22	Mr Stevie Bell	Bluebill Lane BALDIVIS WA 6171	Support	<b><u>Submission 1</u></b> I live/own an apartment at 436 safety bay road and absolutely agree with the planning and go ahead of this tavern. This is a much needed development for the area. <b><u>Submission 2</u></b> Absolutely a much need investment for the area. I own an apartment at 436 safety bay road.
23	Mr Joel Monacelli	Safety Bay Road SAFETY BAY WA 6169	Other	My wife and I are owners next door, we believe the basement carpark is essential for the noise, emissions and most importantly our safety, and the safety of others in the community. We do not however, have issues with the perspective of the tavern changing. Thanks you.
24	Miss Nicole Bidgood	Malibu Road SAFETY BAY WA 6169	Support	As a resident of Safety Bay and residing on Malibu Road, I am eagerly waiting for the Tavern to be built. I am not concerned about overcrowding (a ridiculous notion), parking issues, late night hours (I welcome them). The new establishment is in the best interest of the surrounding residents. I hope this email helps.
25	Mr Clint Nash	Edith Road SAFETY BAY WA 6169	Object	<b><u>Submission 1</u></b> I strongly oppose the cancellation of under ground carparking. The underground carparking must be included there is no where to park already on a Saturday and Sunday. Plus the constant increasing volume of traffic using safety bay road to access garden island. This is a no brainer they must use under ground parking this is what the plan was approved with. Do it once do it right <b><u>Submission 2</u></b> I strongly oppose and object to the cancellation of under ground carparking. The underground carparking must be included there is no where to park already on a Saturday and Sunday. Plus the constant increasing volume of traffic using safety bay road to access garden island. This is a no brainer they must use under ground parking this is what the plan was approved with. Do it once do it right. I also objection to the 1am closing time. The other amendments I am happy with. Thanks

Schedule of Submissions - Amendment to Development Approval - Proposed Tavern - Lot 100 (No.434) Safety Bay Road, Safety Bay -  
20.2025.250.1

26	Anonymous	-	Object	<p>I strongly oppose the cancellation of under ground carparking .</p> <p>The underground carparking must be included there is no where to park already on a Saturday and Sunday. Plus the constant increasing volume of traffic using safety bay road to access garden island. This is a no brainer they must use under ground parking this is what the plan was approved with.</p> <p>Do it once do it right</p>
27	Mr Wayde Nash	Waikiki (no address provided)	Object	<p>I strongly oppose and object to the cancellation of under ground carparking .</p> <p>The underground carparking must be included there is no where to park already on a Saturday and Sunday. Plus the constant increasing volume of traffic using safety bay road to access garden island. This is a no brainer they must use under ground parking this is what the plan was approved with.</p> <p>Do it once do it right</p> <p>I also object to the 1am closing time.</p>
28	Ms Natalie Connor	Waikiki (no address provided)	Object	<p>I strongly oppose and object to the cancellation of under ground carparking.</p> <p>The underground carparking must be included there is no where to park already on a saturday and sunday.</p> <p>Plus the constant increasing volume of traffic using safety bay road to access garden island is a nightmare already.</p> <p>This is a no brainer they must use under ground parking this is what the plan was approved with.</p> <p>Do it once do it right.</p> <p>I also object to the 1am closing time. There is a reason the site was approved and it isn't approved to be then modified for the worse, for short and long time local residents.</p>
29	Mrs June Boyd	Transom Lane WAIKIKI WA 6169	Support	<p>I am writing, as a local who lives in Waikiki, to show my support for the Tavern which is being built on this site.</p> <p>I understand there has been a proposal to amend the underground parking.</p> <p>I support the underground parking be kept. This seems like a large Tavern and sufficient parking is necessary. Although, I believe many locals, myself included, would be walking to this Tavern.</p> <p>I 100% support the position of the Tavern be facing the Bay with the opening being on Safety Bay Road. Hoping there will be seating and outside dining facing the Ocean view. I believe this is how the original design should have been. Makes so much sense to showcase the oceanview.</p> <p>Some community members feel the 1am closing time on weekdays may be an issue. I'm not sure the Tavern would ever have any clients in attendance at that time on a weekday so I don't see it as a concern.</p> <p>As a local I support this Tavern being built and eagerly await its completion.</p> <p>Please RCC let's get this Tavern built and opened ASAP, it's so long overdue.</p>
30	Mr Andrew Milne	Penguin Road	Support	<p>I would like to confirm my support for the redevelopment proposal of the Waikiki Hotel and the change in design to have the hotel make the most of the ocean views.</p>

Schedule of Submissions - Amendment to Development Approval - Proposed Tavern - Lot 100 (No.434) Safety Bay Road, Safety Bay -  
20.2025.250.1

		SHOALWATER WA 6169		This is well overdue and much needed for the area. As a Shoalwater Resident, the distance will be slightly too long to walk comfortably, but we would look to ride a bicycle along the foreshore to the hotel so consideration of sufficient bicycle parking could be beneficial given parking could be limited during peak periods.
31	Miss Nicole Day	Fendam Street WARNBRO WA 6169	Support	I am a long term resident of the area my partner more so as he has lived here for 32 years. We have absolutely NO ISSUE with a tavern in this area, in fact we are excited as it will bring new jobs, a venue for family's and friends to gather. And like many we find it extremely disappointing that you are doing everything you can to stop this happening when so many people are excited for the tavern.
32	Mr Christopher Clark	Eighty Road BALDIVIS WA 6171	Object	There are 2 inherent problems with this venture. 1. There is a massive parking deficiency, 55 bays is a large shortfall. There is minimal street parking in the vicinity and the public parking over the road, during the summer months is always full for beach go-ers. This section of Safety bay road and Malibu road are busy thoroughfares and do not allow for street parking . 2. Usable / patronage floor space is too small for proposed 1000 persons. As a guide, the absolute bare minimum space required is 1m2 per person, the updated plans state 815m2 which I'm assuming includes the kids play area, toilets and hallways which aren't 'usable' or patronage spaces. This falls short of being spacious enough for the desired capacity. Another thing to consider with the capacity size is; Rockingham is also of a mixed socioeconomic status, suggesting, generally, in Rockingham there is more disadvantaged than the national average. There is a higher percentage of lower income family homes compared to the greater Perth area. Which leads me to believe we do not have the financial viability or population size to sustain a venue of this size capacity. It's a great model and this development is long over due, however I believe the capacity need to be addressed to a more appropriate number and the shortfall of parking needs to be addressed.
33	Mr Mark Hiscock	Malibu Road SAFETY BAY WA 6169	Support	The new tavern looks amazing especially now they have turned it, so it has full ocean view, I also think using more space and removing the underground parking was a great idea, Cant wait for it to get built so we can all enjoy, Been a long time since the old Waikiki pub.
34	Mr Gary Picot	Safety Bay Road SAFETY BAY WA 6169	Object	to whom it may concern, the proposed amendment to tavern does not allow for enough parking spaces . il own unit at 436 safety bay rd and in the summer months already beach goers fill the visitor parking to the exclusion to my guests i feel not enough parking for the tavern will make the problem worse
35	Ms Madeleine Carter	Michael Road WAIKIKI WA 6169	Support	Completely in favour of the development and think the new design makes more sense to utilise the view for patrons rather than the carpark. Definitely a win for the area. I would suggest a crosswalk/ zebra crossing and 40 zone to mitigate the risk of patrons using the beach carpark and crossing the road.
36	Mr Connor Gregory	Warnbro Beach Road WAIKIKI WA 6169	Support	I would like to support this amendment, the new site plan makes much more sense with maximising the ocean view.

Schedule of Submissions - Amendment to Development Approval - Proposed Tavern - Lot 100 (No.434) Safety Bay Road, Safety Bay -  
20.2025.250.1

37	Mr Malcolm Buckland	Owen Road SAFETY BAY WA 6169	Object	Hi, I am writing to express my concerns regarding the parking changes suggested. The removal of underground parking will impact on the parking in the already limited parking On the foreshore. Parking on the foreshore is already stretched and will in my opinion cause a dangerous situation.  The underground parking should remain as per the original design.  Malcolm Buckland Resident of the Rockingham area since before the original hotel was demolished. Now of Owen Road.
38	Mr Ryan Jeffrey	Malibu Road SAFETY BAY WA 6169	Support	Cannot wait for it to be completed - looks great and as a resident directly backing onto the complex, it is great to see the site being developed after building my house over 10 years ago. It's been a long wait!
39	Ms Sally Lewis	Bequia Place SAFETY BAY WA 6169	Support	I would like to submit my support for the proposed changes as I like how it takes into account the views of the location.
40	Mrs Leah O'Driscoll	Seacrest Street SAFETY BAY WA 6169	Support	This fantastic i dont known many people who are not excited for this
41	Mr Glen Chandler	Atara Approach ROCKINGHAM WA 6168	Support	I am writing regarding the proposed Safety Bay Tavern development. I believe it is about time Rockingham had a venue located on the waterfront rather than around the shopping centre. At present, Rockingham feels disconnected, with hospitality and nightlife venues scattered across different areas (mainly around the shopping center). Despite being surrounded by beautiful coastline, the majority of our nightlife does not take advantage of this natural setting. A waterfront venue would not only strengthen the local identity but also create a more vibrant and connected community space. The Safety Bay Tavern represents an opportunity to align Rockingham's development with its coastal character and provide a central, attractive destination for both residents and visitors. I strongly support this initiative and encourage the council to consider the long-term benefits of positioning more venues along the waterfront.
42	Ms Sarah-Anne McLernon	Wolff Lane BALDIVIS WA 6171	Support	Love the proposed new plan much better than the old. The view would be so lovely and much more welcoming and inviting to visitors. The building would also blend in better with the sea front and wont remind locals of the former ugly deli building that use to be there 20+ years ago.
43	Ms Leonnie Foley	Salton Street SECRET HARBOUR WA 6173	Support	I think this is a great idea and much needed for the area
44	Mrs Lisa Pember	Galleon Court SAFETY BAY WA 6169	Support	Approve the changes and look forward to this progressing.

Schedule of Submissions - Amendment to Development Approval - Proposed Tavern - Lot 100 (No.434) Safety Bay Road, Safety Bay -  
20.2025.250.1



45	Mr Daniel Kimberley	Seahaven Street SAFETY BAY WA 6169	Support	Great decision! Now just build it!!! Plenty of car spaces and people need to stop looking. It's a pub/restaurant don't drink and drive
46	Mr Wayne Stanton	Reveley Street WAIKIKI WA 6169	Support	100% it should be ocean facing, we've got some of the best beaches in Perth and should take advantage of this. This may also project any loud sounds/noises away from residential housing towards the street if this is a concern for the houses close by. Let's build something that everyone in Rockingham can be proud of.
47	Mrs Shannon Foy	Pimento Circle PORT KENNEDY WA 6172	Support	New proposal with full water facing options makes more sense to ensure this rare ocean facing land can be enjoyed by many. Let's make our safety bay tavern a venue that attracts a multitude of visitors so we can show people the true beauty of our local area.
48	Mr Irving Carey	Cumbria Avenue WAIKIKI WA 6169	Support	It's a good idea, please approve this.
49	Mrs Raelene Johns	Tasman Place WAIKIKI WA 6169	Support	<p><u>Submission No.1</u></p> <p>I would like to express my full support for the proposed location of the new tavern along Safety Bay Road. This site makes perfect sense, as it would take full advantage of the stunning views of Warnbro Sound. Our coastline is one of the area's greatest natural assets, and it is only logical to create opportunities for both locals and visitors to enjoy it in a welcoming, social setting. Despite having such a beautiful beachfront, there are currently very few venues that allow people to truly experience and appreciate this part of the coast. It's rare to find such a unique stretch of coastline anywhere in the world, and we should be proud to showcase it-not hide it. A local, street-facing tavern would not only activate the area but also provide a walkable, community-oriented space for residents to meet, relax, and connect. This type of venue would add significant social and economic value to the community, and I believe it would be warmly embraced by locals and visitors alike.</p> <p><u>Submission 2</u></p> <p>We would like to express our full support for the proposed location of the new tavern along Safety Bay Road. This site makes perfect sense, as it would take full advantage of the stunning views of Warnbro Sound. Our coastline is one of the area's greatest natural assets, and it is only logical to create opportunities for both locals and visitors to enjoy it in a welcoming, social setting.</p> <p>Despite having such a beautiful beachfront, there are currently very few venues that allow people to truly experience and appreciate this part of the coast. It's rare to find such a unique stretch of coastline anywhere in the world, and we should be proud to showcase it—not hide it.</p> <p>A local, street-facing tavern would not only activate the area but also provide a walkable, community-oriented space for residents to meet, relax, and connect. This type of venue would add significant social</p>





Schedule of Submissions - Amendment to Development Approval - Proposed Tavern - Lot 100 (No.434) Safety Bay Road, Safety Bay -  
20.2025.250.1

				and economic value to the community, and we believe it would be warmly embraced by locals and visitors alike.
50	Ms Marnie Mcilwaine	Safety Bay Road SAFETY BAY WA 6169	Object	I would like to voice my concern at the proposed 1am closing times. This is a very residential built-up area a 12pm curfew would be slightly more appropriate. Considering the length of time it will take patrons to vacate the area after the doors close at 1am.
51	Mr Mark Eaton	Tasman Place WAIKIKI WA 6169	Support	I believe this is a great step forward for our community, this is long overdue and needs to go ahead asap.
52	Mrs Deborah Jeffrey	Hughes Court SAFETY BAY WA 6169	Support	This proposal needs to go ahead with full ocean views as quickly as possible. Our beautiful coastline and beaches need something. Very little along our beachfronts for locals and tourists. All for this proposal .....
53	Mrs Shirleyanne Garrod	Jaywick Close SAFETY BAY WA 6169	Support	I live in the area and actually think the tavern will be a great asset to the area . Obviously parking is a concern for the area and thus should be addressed Regards Shirley Garrod Jaywick
54	Ieke Verkuil & Marnix van Winkelhoff	Malibu Road SAFETY BAY WA 6169	Object	<p>I am writing to formally express my concerns regarding the proposed trading hours for the new tavern to be constructed on Malibu Road / 100 Safety Bay Road.</p> <p>According to the proposal, the tavern would be permitted to trade until 1:00 am. I believe such late trading hours are not appropriate for a residential area, as they may lead to increased late-night noise, attract lingering patrons, and pose a heightened risk of antisocial behaviour and disturbances within the surrounding neighbourhood.</p> <p>As outlined in the attached evidence, no other major pub, brewery, or tavern in the City of Rockingham currently trades beyond 12:00 am. Allowing this establishment to remain open until 1:00 am would make it the latest-trading venue in the city, which I consider unsuitable for its residential location.</p> <p>I respectfully request that the proposed trading hours be reconsidered and adjusted to better reflect what is appropriate and consistent with the area.</p> <p>Thank you for your time and consideration.</p>



Schedule of Submissions - Amendment to Development Approval - Proposed Tavern - Lot 100 (No.434) Safety Bay Road, Safety Bay - 20.2025.250.1

				<div><div>VAT 116</div><div>4.2  (919) · \$20–40</div><div>Pub</div></div> <div><div>Opening hours ^</div><div><div>Thursday</div><div>11am–10pm</div></div><div><div>Friday</div><div>11 am–12 am</div></div><div><div>Saturday</div><div>11 am–12 am</div></div><div><div>Sunday</div><div>11 am–9 pm</div></div><div><div>Monday</div><div>11 am–9 pm</div></div><div><div>Tuesday</div><div>11 am–9 pm</div></div><div><div>Wednesday</div><div>11 am–11:30 pm</div></div></div> <div><div>Cheeky Monkey Brewing Co Rockingham</div><div>3.9  (330) · \$20–40</div><div>Gastropub</div></div> <div><div>Opening hours ^</div><div><div>Thursday</div><div>11am–8pm</div></div><div><div>Friday</div><div>11 am–9 pm</div></div><div><div>Saturday</div><div>11 am–9 pm</div></div><div><div>Sunday</div><div>11 am–8 pm</div></div><div><div>Monday</div><div>11 am–8 pm</div></div><div><div>Tuesday</div><div>11 am–8 pm</div></div><div><div>Wednesday</div><div>11 am–8 pm</div></div></div>
--	--	--	--	--

Schedule of Submissions - Amendment to Development Approval - Proposed Tavern - Lot 100 (No.434) Safety Bay Road, Safety Bay - 20.2025.250.1

				<div><div><div>The Warnbro Tavern</div><div>4.3  (1.2K) · \$20–40</div><div>Pub</div></div><div><div>Opening hours ^</div><div><div>Thursday</div><div>11am–10pm</div></div><div><div>Friday</div><div>11 am–11 pm</div></div><div><div>Saturday</div><div>11 am–11 pm</div></div><div><div>Sunday</div><div>11 am–10 pm</div></div><div><div>Monday</div><div>11 am–10 pm</div></div><div><div>Tuesday</div><div>11 am–10 pm</div></div><div><div>Wednesday</div><div>11 am–10 pm</div></div></div></div> <div><div><div>The Swinging Pig</div><div>4.4  (1.4K) · \$20–40</div><div>Bar</div></div><div><div>Opening hours ^</div><div><div>Thursday</div><div>10am–10pm</div></div><div><div>Friday</div><div>10 am–11 pm</div></div><div><div>Saturday</div><div>10 am–11 pm</div></div><div><div>Sunday</div><div>10 am–10 pm</div></div><div><div>Monday</div><div>10 am–10 pm</div></div><div><div>Tuesday</div><div>10 am–10 pm</div></div><div><div>Wednesday</div><div>10 am–10 pm</div></div></div></div>
--	--	--	--	---

Schedule of Submissions - Amendment to Development Approval - Proposed Tavern - Lot 100 (No.434) Safety Bay Road, Safety Bay - 20.2025.250.1

				<div><div><div>Whistling Kite</div><div>4.3  (1K) · \$\$</div><div>Bar</div></div><div><div>Opening hours ^</div><div><div>Thursday</div><div>11am–11pm</div></div><div><div>Friday</div><div>11 am–12 am</div></div><div><div>Saturday</div><div>11 am–12 am</div></div><div><div>Sunday</div><div>11 am–10 pm</div></div><div><div>Monday</div><div>11 am–10 pm</div></div><div><div>Tuesday</div><div>11 am–10 pm</div></div><div><div>Wednesday</div><div>11 am–11 pm</div></div></div><div><div>VAT 116</div><div>4.2  (919) · \$20–40</div><div>Pub</div></div><div><div>Opening hours ^</div><div><div>Thursday</div><div>11am–10pm</div></div><div><div>Friday</div><div>11 am–12 am</div></div><div><div>Saturday</div><div>11 am–12 am</div></div><div><div>Sunday</div><div>11 am–9 pm</div></div><div><div>Monday</div><div>11 am–9 pm</div></div><div><div>Tuesday</div><div>11 am–9 pm</div></div><div><div>Wednesday</div><div>11 am–11:30 pm</div></div></div></div>
55	Mr Paul Moore	Alfred Close	Support	I wish to make it known that I fully support the development as described in the recent letter drop.

Schedule of Submissions - Amendment to Development Approval - Proposed Tavern - Lot 100 (No.434) Safety Bay Road, Safety Bay -  
20.2025.250.1

		SAFETY BAY WA 6169		I am a long-term resident of Safety Bay and have long awaited the development of that site.
56	Mrs Donna Dahlstrom	Hull Court WAIKIKI WA 6169	Other	Please consider building it close to the ocean as our beach this side has the best views. Please consider a building which incorporates different areas for seating and eating/drinking. With those views you could incorporate outside "takeaways" also. The BP needs to be moved so parking space provided. Such a beautiful spot and such a waste of planning for decades. Think of the view, think of the view please.
57	Mr Brett Simpson	Coronata Drive WARNBRO WA 6169	Other	Please can we have an entertainment area that celebrates the beautiful beaches/coastline we have instead of having the best views as a carpark - the old Waikiki hotel/old Rockingham hotel
58	Mr Michael Kanara	Malibu Road SAFETY BAY WA 6169	Object	Hello there, i have lived on Malibu Road for 28 years and i do not want a new tavern to be built full stop! I enjoy the peace and quiet and don't want the noise. I remember when the old tavern was there and we used to get drunken patrons walk down the street and hang around my area late at night. I dont want that again. If there is a petition to stop a tavern from being built i will sign it. Thank you.
59	Mrs Lisa Smith	David Road WAIKIKI WA 6169	Other	Feedback on proposal development. 1. Maximise views and tourism dollars. - consider 2 storey design to maximise views. Visitors come for coastal outlooks, not views of cars, carparks and toilet blocks. Ocean views directly increase tourism dollars and encourage longer stays. 2. Site layout and parking. - relocate or redesign parking, avoid placing bays at front unless the building is elevated to 2 storeys. Bottom storey to be undercover parking and small shop fronts, 2nd storey pub. - This will also increase the interior size of pub by removing front parking. - a reconfigured layout will enhance first impressions and improve visual appearance for visitors. First impressions are critical in attracting both tourists and locals. - 48 carpark bays in nowhere near enough for 1000 patronage. Public transport is limited. This will lead to beach parking across the road being utilised for pub patrons thus reducing beach access for families driving to beach. The carpark already parks out in summer - without a pub. A bottom storey carpark would go towards minimising a potentially contentious issue. 3. Creating a flexible year round experience. - a 2nd storey outdoor alfresco area with bifold or retractable doors would provide an adaptable dining space. - this design allows guests to enjoy the open air during favourable weather whilst ensuring comfort and protection from coastal winds when required. - a versatile all season venue encourages repeat visitation and supports local employment by maintaining consistent patronage. 4. The current proposed design looks like a 70's motel. Do better.

Schedule of Submissions - Amendment to Development Approval - Proposed Tavern - Lot 100 (No.434) Safety Bay Road, Safety Bay -  
20.2025.250.1

				Whilst I 100% agree in theory with converting the entire block to absolute frontage, the current design contains major flaws that risk undermining its success. Without addressing the above key elements, the development is likely to fall short of community expectations and become both a local and tourism failure.
60	Mr Matt Wren	WAIKIKI	Object	Reject the amendments, leave it with underground car parking, makes more sense, leave more space above and around, why are we trying to make everything smaller all the time and still cram more people into a tighter space, doesn't need to stay open until 1 am, this will just encourage more alcohol to be consumed and loud inconsiderate people leaving there after 1am causing additional noise and inconvenience to locals and road users. Don't want to be a killjoy, but let common sense prevail here.
61	Ms Cathryn Brown	Safety Bay Road WAIKIKI WA 6169	Support	We have one chance to make this site truly spectacular and an attraction for locals and tourists. There are not many places in Rockingham where you can have such awesome views of the ocean. A tavern upstairs and coffee shop downstairs would be amazing. Please don't let this plan get strangled in Red Tape. We need it now!! Not another 15-20 years.
62	Mr Paul Spittle	Tropicana Way SAFETY BAY WA 6169	Object	<p>Please find 3 attached files in submission to the above;</p> <p>1. 6th sub re amended Tavern Lot 100.docx</p> <p>There is an executive summary at the beginning of the document of the main concerns and detailed arguments follow, please consider all and add to resident and community concerns.</p> <p>The files below show the simple fundamental mathematical errors in the Transcore traffic assessment and support the file above;</p> <p>6th sub amended file.docx.</p> <p>This analysis was presented at;</p> <p>The meeting DAP/23/02551 MODAP/8 - 9 Apr 2024 - City of Armadale - City of Rockingham Technical Note: No 1 Date: 24/01/2024, Project No: t23.049</p> <p>These errors were not picked up by the principal bodies that consider these proposals. They indicate basic assessment errors and assumptions that are not supported by empirical evidence. Similar assumptions and non empirical assessments are contained in the amended DA submission.</p> <p>We believe that the analysis and assessments by Transcore provide poor representation of the real facts and point to a large degree of unprofessional work.</p> <p>Transcore evidence should be treated as null and void and must be mentioned in Rockinghams Councils comments on the amended DA.</p> <p>2. 2nd Car Parking Analysis1.docx</p> <p>3. Errors in Transcore traffic survey.xlsx</p> <p>Please see attachments below:</p>
63	Mr Daniel Saunders	Penguin Road SAFETY BAY WA 6169	Other	I agree that the tavern should run parallel with the beach to maximise the view of the coast however i feel the basement parking should remain as this frees up land for more retail or residential property. This should also have the effect of elevating the tavern so that it overlooks the traffic on Safety Bay

Schedule of Submissions - Amendment to Development Approval - Proposed Tavern - Lot 100 (No.434) Safety Bay Road, Safety Bay -  
20.2025.250.1

				Road for uninterrupted views. There also needs to be easy access for pedestrians from the beach side of Safety Bay Road in the form of a crosstalk, bridge or underpass.
64	Mr Darren Clifton	Tempest Place WAIKIKI WA 6169	Support	I think the amendment is a good choice and am happy to see the development proceed.
65	Mrs Kathryn Hyde	Kent Street ROCKINGHAM WA 6168	Support	The new proposal is much better and will attract more patrons because of its outlook. The way it should be.
66	Mrs Susan Ebert	Arcadia Drive SHOALWATER WA 6169	Other	My thoughts on the replacement Tavern are as follows, happy that common sense has had the building now facing the ocean rather than side on to it, however it looks to be quite a minimal building for such an important site and venue. Decisions on these proposals should only be allowed once local council has decided on the needs of the people of the area, our coast line is the main attraction and should be utilised at every decision made. Parking is a main area that has been neglected by anyone who has been involved in the development of Rockingham for many years.
67	Mr Luken Foy	Pimento Circle PORT KENNEDY WA 6172	Support	This makes sense to have the tavern facing the water and I'm quite shocked it was ever not.
68	Mr Reece Bartlett	Armada Close PORT KENNEDY WA 6172	Other	Waikiki hotel for the name 2 story should be able to see the ocean otherwise just another waste of money like the rockingham council likes to do with everything keeping the place on the dark ages or just totally stuffs it up Needs plenty of parking spots rockingham forshore has no parking were they want you to park is miles away is a prime example
69	Ms Julie Bailey	Robert Street COMO WA 6152	Object	Ridiculous design, looks like a Dr Surgery. Why wouldn't it be 2 story, capsule on the views , beautify the site ....typical Rockingham ... You should take a leaf out of all other ocean view sites across WA and only allow a modern , attractive upscale building that people will actually go to. This is pathetic and it will fail to add any value to that unique location. Very disappointed in the shire again !!!! Don't expect much from them any more though, they keep disappointing ratepayers. Rockingham should take a leaf out of Mandurahs book .
70	Mr Randall Parker	Waterfront Parkway SHOALWATER WA 6169	Support	As a local resident of nearly 50yrs I fully support this development. The only comment is that the elevation must be such that it takes advantage of the view across the ocean and outer reefs.
71	Mrs Taylor Peel	Waikiki Road SAFETY BAY WA 6169	Support	I am writing for my approval of the amendment of the layout and orientation of the tavern. It makes much more sense to capture as much of the beautiful view as possible. Rockingham is lacking bars/ taverns with ocean views. This would be a huge improvement on the original plan.

Schedule of Submissions - Amendment to Development Approval - Proposed Tavern - Lot 100 (No.434) Safety Bay Road, Safety Bay -  
20.2025.250.1

				<p>As a resident who lives just up the road, I am very excited to be able to walk down for lunch or dinner with my family. I feel lucky to have such amenities and the beach so close to my home.</p> <p>My one recommendation is to update the existing playground on the beach side opposite the tavern to be able to accomodate the increase in patrons.</p> <p>A cross walk is also desperately needed in that area as it is not safe for me and my two small children to ride across safety bay road to the beach, as there is a lot of traffic.</p>
72	Mr Dave & Camilla Taylor	Dolphin Road SAFETY BAY WA 6169	Object	<p>We are David and Camilla Taylor, owners and occupiers of 23 Dolphin Road, a corner block with Malibu road. We have considerable frontage with Malibu road and are well within audible distance from the corner of Malibu and Safety Bay road.</p> <p>We are strongly opposed to the development for up to 1,000 patron capacity. Apart from perhaps one dozen likely patrons who could reach the venue on foot there would be a requirement for parking up to 500 motor cars. This is ridiculous. However many internal spaces are provided there would be an overflow immediately to the beachfront car park across the road. This is a serious danger for traffic accidents.</p> <p>We consider that 1,000 capacity is far too great for that site. We suggest that a coffee shop with a drinks licence until sunset would be more appropriate.</p>
73	Miss Anna Richardson	Jib Close WAIKIKI WA 6169	Support	<p>We live up the road from the proposed Tavern site and my family have lived in the same area for 37 years, this building project is much needed and wanted for the local area. We are all for the tavern and shop amenities that are being built, the land has been left to ruin for to long and been an eye sore to visitors and locals.</p> <p>Rockingham has been left for to long while other suburbs are building and growing for the best.</p> <p>We truly hope this build goes ahead and doesn't kept getting stopped by people who don't want to see Rockingham grow.</p>
74	Mrs Susan Smith	Shaw Street SAFETY BAY WA 6169	Support	<p>I wish to express my full support for the new Tavern in Waikiki. As a resident if Safety Bay I would be more than happy to frequent this tavern and be proud to show our visitors that we are NOT a Nanny State Sue Smith</p>
75	Mrs Susanne Wheatley	Ernest Street SAFETY BAY WA 6169	Support	<p>Hello, yes pleased the Tavern is being turned around to have the broader building facing the ocean, just like the original Waikiki Hotel. Please make sure there is plenty of parking.</p> <p>We live in Ernest Street. Happy with the proposed amendment.</p>
76	Mr Geoffrey Wilson	Calm Court SAFETY BAY WA 6169	Other	<p>The change in alignment makes a lot of sense .... It maximises the view to ocean.</p> <p>But, I don't believe there is sufficient on-site parking. There should be no, or limited reliance on using the beach car park across the road from planned development. The beach parking is often more than 50% full throughout the year. In summer it is usually over 80% full. This will leave little capacity for the tavern to rely on the beach parking to be used by patrons.</p> <p>My comments are made as a resident who lives within 1km of the development &amp; also a regular user of the beach car park.</p>



Schedule of Submissions - Amendment to Development Approval - Proposed Tavern - Lot 100 (No.434) Safety Bay Road, Safety Bay -  
20.2025.250.1

				<p>The removal of underground parking without providing additional onsite bays will merely force more patrons to park across the road!!</p> <p>Then the public who already use that beach parking will have insufficient bays available. Plus, in my opinion there wasn't nought parking before anyway.</p>
77	Ms Kirsty Laurie	Harley Close SAFETY BAY WA 6169	Other	I support reorienting it to face the ocean. But it sounds like there won't be enough parking. Maybe the basement parking will still be required.
78	Ms Samantha Harrison	ROCKINGHAM WA 6168	Other	Just trying to work out why this won't be two storey you say you want beach views yet you'll just be see it's a minor coast line but first you'll see cars, then a toilet block and then the beach. Not very scenic in my opinion, you have the chance to have prime oceanic views of the Waikiki beach and a single storey is not going to give you that.
79	Mr Jan Szczygiel	Sevilla Terrace PORT KENNEDY WA 6172	Support	I would strongly recommend the approval of the approved changes. The more tavern that faces the water front the better. As a council I would also be urging the developers to push for a double story venue to maximise views. About time the council pushed for development in rockingham that enhances rockingham's natural assets.
80	Mrs Tracy Fryer	Galata Avenue BALDIVIS WA 6171	Support	Please build it facing the ocean so it allows for an outdoor eatery beer garden behind the building out of wind and sea breeze. It would be good to see this take place soon as it's been 15 years since the old tavern was taken down and the locals have missed having a place to walk to whilst enjoying the beach. It would bring in much revenue for the local area. Hopefully it will have a nice modern aesthetic and adequate parking.
81	Mr David Haggard	Watts Road SHOALWATER WA 6169	Support	Much better proposal, why would you not take in the beautiful views across the bay. We used to finish our safety bay windsurfing marathons at the old Waikiki hotel let's hope we can do the same again.
82	Mr Corey Sheridan	Jesmond Street SAFETY BAY WA 6169	Support	Great amendment I think this is a better design for the community
83	Mr Daniel Smalley	June Road SAFETY BAY WA 6169	Support	I feel it should be forward facing the beach. This will bring in more patrons and tourist to the venue and the area that would want to enjoy a meal and beverage facing the beautiful bay we all love so much.
84	A B Johnston	Safety Bay Road SAFETY BAY WA 6169	Object	<p>As a resident on the ground floor at 436 Safety Bay Rd, Safety Bay, I would like to register my objections to the recent change to the proposed tavern - Lot 100 (#434) Safety Bay Road.</p> <p>I would like to request we revert to the original proposal which had allowed for a basement carpark. Removing the basement carpark and only having street level parking will increase the vehicular noise directly affecting my apartment and therefore impacting on my sleep as the operating hours are until 1am.</p>

Schedule of Submissions - Amendment to Development Approval - Proposed Tavern - Lot 100 (No.434) Safety Bay Road, Safety Bay -  
20.2025.250.1

85	Mr Glenn F Askew	Frederick Street SHOALWATER WA 6169	Support	I believe we need more fun venues to go to in our area, this Tavern replaces the old pub, a great loss for the community. Please do not delay it proceeding, I've waited many years for it's replacement. Great for employment great for a relaxing drink and meal by the bay.
86	Mr Tommi Harbeck	Edgewater Road SAFETY BAY WA 6169	Support	I would like to show my support for the amendment to the Safety Bay Tavern. I would like to go further by suggesting that the Tavern be two story to truly capture the views and atmosphere that the position allows.
87	Mr Peter Mitchell - <b>LATE SUBMISSION</b>	Safety Bay Road WAIKIKI WA 6169	Object	How did developer permission to land grab and to remove foot path along safety bay road so pedestrians have to walk on the road. at peak times morning and afternoon it has potential for a fatal accident The reduction in site parking need to be reviewed re reduction patron capacity Its absurd to include the beach side parking as part of redevelopment its full in summer its full with workers from building site weekdays now. Site now includes the child daycare, so and increase in congestion at drop off and pick up at Malibu and safety bay road Would appear someone did not factor in cars turning into BP garage.
88	<b>Ms Dannii Devenny - LATE SUBMISSION</b>	June Road SAFETY BAY WA 6169	Other	Hi I was wondering what the plans for the new proposed tavern will look like? I have been told by the safety bay community to email in some suggestions because I think we as a community haven't been amazed with some of the final results (mainly all the playgrounds). I was wondering will the tavern be facing the beach for the views? Would there ever be opportunities for a 2 storey build to really get all the views? Is there plenty of indoor and outdoor seating for year round use? Has the wind been considered? Is there ways to block out the wind without taking away all the views? Will it be built with some details as opposed to being just a square building? Will there be opportunity for a kids area? I find this always brings families in year round if it offers kids areas? Will the parking and crosswalks be improved around the area? I'm very excited for this tavern it will be great for the community and by the sounds of it a lot of people are excited, we just want it done and not rushed.
89	Mrs Chris Yelland - <b>LATE SUBMISSION</b>	Safety Bay Road SAFETY BAY WA 6169	Support	I have recently seen a document circulating, complaining about the new tavern being build on the corner of Malibu Road and Safety Bay Road. I would like to let whoever is responsible for any decisions on this to know that I am in wholehearted agreement with the revised proposal. This development has been a long time in coming and I look forward to it being completed.
90	Mr Stephen Bianchini	Malibu Road SAFETY BAY WA 6159	Other	We forward the below comments for your inclusion to the Metro Outer Development Assessment Panel 1. Reconfigure the layout of the Tavern and re-orientate

Schedule of Submissions - Amendment to Development Approval - Proposed Tavern - Lot 100 (No.434) Safety Bay Road, Safety Bay -  
20.2025.250.1

				<p>The drawings and details provided are insufficient for detailed specific commentary. Generally the amended details are ambiguous and difficult to sufficiently understand to provide comments for MODAP submission. Amended drawings do not provide</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• sufficient detail for area analysis.</li> <li>• Clarity to interface with existing approved commercial development of Parcels 1, &amp; 2. A reduction was noted in car parking bays for Units 7 &amp; 8.</li> <li>• Clarity to "Future Development". Would appear several carparking bays will be removed for traffic crossovers. Maybe access for drive-through bottle shop.</li> <li>• The amended frontage along Safety Bay Road appears too close to the front boundary. Generally any commercial developments along Safety Bay Rd are well back from the front boundary and provide better sight distances and clarity for drivers. Frontal landscaping should be encouraged.</li> <li>• The amended alignment will directly block the SW sea breeze to homes behind. Especially if higher boundary fences are required. These higher boundary fences will also extend up and diminish the effect of windows, making the outlook darker for No. 19 Malibu Rd residents and SurfSide residents.</li> <li>• The higher boundary fences will be out of proportion to the small compact homes, the walls will be enormous.</li> <li>• The realignment of road access easement for No. 19 residents will be via congested car parks.</li> <li>• The amended closer proximity to the ocean will add to concerns for pedestrians crossing Safety Bay Rd. Even more concerning is mixing alcohol consumption with swimming. WA statistics for swimming death fatalities have recorded the highest level in 10 years. More than half among people residing in socio-economically disadvantaged areas.</li> </ul> <p>2. Reduce the building footprint by 219m<sup>2</sup> and modify internal layout</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Difficult to determine accurately if area increased or decreased. However any reduction in area is normally associated a decrease in amenity for patrons.</li> </ul> <p>3. At grade 48 car parking area in lieu basement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• At grade will be more noisy than basement. Car noise incl doors' closing, car motors, screaming tyres, and departing patrons unruly behaviour will not be appreciated by neighbouring residents late at night.</li> </ul> <p>4. Patrons numbers (1000) and hours of operation have not changed</p> <p>Mon – Wed 10am – 10pm Thrs – Sat 10am – 1.00am Sun - 8am – 10pm</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1000 patrons</li> </ul> <p>1000patrons/218 car parking bays = 4.5 patrons/car 1000patrons/163 car parking bays = 6.1 patrons/car</p>
--	--	--	--	--

Schedule of Submissions - Amendment to Development Approval - Proposed Tavern - Lot 100 (No.434) Safety Bay Road, Safety Bay -  
20.2025.250.1

				<p>At any ration the result is ridiculously impracticable. Any self respecting hotel developer would realise this will create multiple negative impacts toward the facility. The development needs more car parking bays for patrons and staff.</p> <p>With 70 staff working the Tavern, these employees need some where to safely park. The employer needs to be aware of staff welfare. Believe based on TPS2 5m2 per parking bay, parking minimum guidelines, this is totally inadequate for 1000 patrons. There is no public transport system operating locally into the evenings. Limited public transport is limited to bus routes;</p> <p>Route 553 - Via Malibu Rd to Rockingham Station finishes 6.53pm Mon-Fri No service weekends Walk 75m</p> <p>Route 552 - Via June Rd to Rockingham Station finishes 9.13pm Mon-Fri 10.14pm Sat &amp; 5.36pm Sun Walk 400m</p> <p>Route 557 Via Charthouse Rd to Warnbro Station finishes 7.34pm Mon-Fri 6.34pm Sat &amp; Sun Walk 500m</p> <p>Concern with external flood lighting required until 1.00am plus throughout the overall development to permit patrons to exit the facility will create extensive disruption to residents.</p> <p>The car parking required for the commercial businesses Parcels 1 &amp; 2 is 173 bays. The total car parking bays provided in the initial development submission with basement parking is 177 bays. That is 4 bays surplus to Parcel 1 &amp; 2 requirements – excludes 1000 Tavern patrons parking! Tavern patrons eg tradesmen – one patron per car - may arrive for a drink from 4.00pm onwards. Just off peak for Parcels 1 &amp; 2 car bay users. There is no way tradesmen with ute and trailer will fit in the limited car parking bays if available.</p> <p>Not enough car parking.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hours of operation</li> </ul> <p>Mon – Wed 10am – 10pm Thrs – Sat 10am – 1.00am Sun - 8am – 10pm</p> <p>Originally Mon – Sat 6am -12.00 midnight, Sun 10am- 12.00midnight</p> <p>Meals finish 9.30pm</p> <p>Both operation time slots are excessive and incongruous with the surrounding community. The community comprise retirees and workers. Workers do not need access to alcohol till 1.00am. With 4 beers they would still be under the influence of alcohol going to work that morning. Imagine the dangerous situation they place themselves, other road users and pedestrians, school kids, their workmates, and expensive machinery in for the sake of alcohol availability till 1.00am. Also limited food till 9.30pm.</p> <p>Doubt the wisdom of Tavern management with proposed hours of operation.</p> <p>Someone needs to be accountable for providing approval for extended excessive hours of alcoholic trade.</p>
--	--	--	--	---

Schedule of Submissions - Amendment to Development Approval - Proposed Tavern - Lot 100 (No.434) Safety Bay Road, Safety Bay -  
20.2025.250.1

				<p>Who is responsible!</p> <p>The opportunity for patrons to participate in extensive late night alcohol consumption has resulted in poor judgement by affected drivers. Because of alcohol delayed messages between brain and reaction time, drivers consider themselves capable of overcoming more dangerous and thrilling activities. Result is tragic deaths on our roads, in our City of Rockingham suburbs.</p> <p>Two road accident deaths June 2010 along Safety Bay Rd around midnight: car accident death June 2018 Safety Bay Road around midnight: motorbike death Aug 2022 corner Safety Bay and Malibu Roads: plus other accidents involving life threatening injuries.</p> <p>Late night early morning alcohol trading is responsible for too many accidents, domestic violence, home invasions, anti-social behaviour, car and property thefts. Recommend against extended trading hours.</p> <p>5. Conclusion</p> <p>This amended approval request has been presented to City of Rockingham in a very hastily prepared manner. Insufficient detail, limited through analysis, adoption of earlier supporting documentation that “consequently, Transcore concludes the traffic impact of the proposed amendment is considered marginal, and is supportive of the proposed amendment.” Ex CI 3.2.1.</p> <p>“considered marginal” is an insufficient non technical term that is indeterminate in value. Not acceptable analysis!</p> <p>“tavern walls 6.7m high set back from boundary 1.5m” would present extensive shadowing to the adjacent properties. Unacceptable shadowing for considerable length of walls. Ex cl 4.1.1.</p> <p>Please consider the above and include as necessary in City of Rockingham’s Responsible Authority Report submission to MODAP.</p> <p>Please note that we request our personal details not to be placed on public records.</p>
--	--	--	--	---