

27 August 2012

**PLANNING ASSESSMENT COMMISSION DETERMINATION REPORT FOR THE
CRONULLA SHARKS CONCEPT PLAN PROPOSAL, WOOLLOOWARE
SUTHERLAND LOCAL GOVERNMENT AREA**

Concept Plan

The Planning Assessment Commission has received a concept plan proposal for mixed use development on the Cronulla Sharks site on Captain Cook Drive in Woollooware. The proposal is to redevelop the site of the existing club and eastern car park for retail, leisure and club facilities with 693 car parking spaces. The western portion of the site, currently comprising playing fields and car parking, is proposed to be developed for residential flat buildings, with approximately 600 apartments across the eight residential buildings. The existing stadium is to be retained and would sit between the proposed residential development to the west and the retail, leisure and club facilities to the east.

Director-General's Environmental Assessment Report

The proposal has been assessed by the Department of Planning and Infrastructure. The Department's assessment report considered the strategic issues of justification for a new centre and economic impacts of the proposal. The Department also considered the project specific issues of:

- parking and traffic;
- the natural environment (including the riparian zone, existing contamination, flooding, sea level rise and stormwater issues);
- built form; and
- residential amenity.

The Department indicated it is satisfied with the suitability of the site and supports the proposed combination of retail and high density residential uses. The Department found that the proposal is consistent with the *Metropolitan Plan for Sydney 2036* and recommended the concept plan be approved subject to a modification to the rate of visitor parking and prescribed future assessment requirements to be applied to the future development applications.

Delegation to the Commission

The concept plan was referred to the Commission for determination, under the terms of the Minister's delegation. The referral was received on 2 July 2012.

The Chair of the Planning Assessment Commission, Ms Gabrielle Kibble AO, nominated Mr Garry West to chair the Commission for the project. Ms Kibble and Mr Richard Thorp were the other members to constitute the Commission for the project.

Site Visit

The Commission visited the site and surrounds on the morning of Tuesday 17 July 2012.

Meetings

The Commission held a number of meetings as part of its consideration of the application. The Commission met with the proponent, Sutherland Shire Council (Council), the local State Member of Parliament and the Department of Planning and Infrastructure. The Commission also listened to the views of the community at a public meeting held in Cronulla on 26 July 2012.

Meeting with the Proponent

On Monday 23 July the Commission met with the proponent, who provided an outline of the proposal and gave some background to the site and the history of the development proposal.

In relation to the strategic context, the proponent indicated that it had sought to have the site nominated as a new centre in the draft Subregional Plan. The proponent suggested that there is an under supply of retail in the area and that the shopping centre in Cronulla is constrained by existing land uses and a lack of available sites.

The proponent acknowledged that stormwater and flooding will need to be managed through detailed design at the next stage.

In relation to game day parking, the proponent advised that it already provides a shuttle bus from Heathcote and other options for satellite parking are also available. The proponent also suggested that trading for the retail and club facilities would complement each other, with peak demand at different times.

The proponent noted that the junior rugby league grounds are private facilities, but the upgrades they propose to make to other facilities, which are currently under used, will be public.

The Commission questioned the proponent regarding the provision of affordable housing. The proponent advised that the project did not contain any formal affordable housing component, but that the mix of unit sizes and proposed price structures should help.

The proponent also advised that it could satisfy the provisions of *State Environmental Planning Policy No 65 – Design Quality of Residential Flat Development* (SEPP 65) for each of the building envelopes. This will be achieved at the design/detailed application stage.

Meeting with Sutherland Shire Council

On Monday 23 July the Commission also met with staff from Sutherland Shire Council.

Strategic and historical context

Council provided some historical context in relation to the site and then argued against the proposal on the basis of the strategic planning for the region. Council argued that the site is not currently a centre and that the proposal will not change that. Council gave a number of reasons for this view, including that the site is not close to a primary school, that development in a centre would be characterised by lower residential parking rates (which are not proposed for this site), that the playing fields don't allow adequate connectivity, i.e. the residential component is 350 m from the retail component of the project. Council also noted that ideally a centre should be developed around public transport.

Council indicated that in the Sutherland Shire all centres are focused on railway stations (with the exception of Menai) and that Woollooware has the potential to become a larger centre. Council indicated that it will be able to meet its dwelling targets through the draft Local Environmental Plan. Revitalisation of Caringbah would be the key to meeting this target, which the Minister had accepted, in Council's housing strategy.

The Commission asked the Council about alternative options to meet the apparent demand for additional retail space in the region. Council indicated that there were options available at Caringbah and argued that the Sharks proposal would take vitality and agglomeration from existing centres and opportunities to grow and consolidate the existing centres would be lost. Council believes that any shopping centre at Caringbah would have difficulty competing with

the combined medical and specialty facilities proposed at the Sharks site. The Council also questioned the retail catchment figures, suggesting that it would impact on Caringbah for a number of years.

Traffic and parking

Council also raised concerns about traffic and parking. Council noted that the proposal only includes a shuttle bus service running once every 30 minutes, that it is 1.5 km to the nearest train station and that the site would be car dependent. Council also argued that the residential component would have a parking deficiency of a couple of hundred spaces and that this would cause management issues for Council in relation to its recreational playing fields adjoining the site.

Uncertainty about the adequacy of the parking provisions for the shopping centre was raised as a concern and Council advised that it was particularly concerned about traffic impacts on the surrounding road network, rather than the intersections and traffic lights connecting to the site.

Overdevelopment of the site

Council confirmed that it was not opposed to development on the site, but that it considered the scale of the proposal would generate significant impacts.

Stormwater and Flooding

The lack of detail regarding stormwater management and the impacts the development will have on the surrounds was also of concern to Council. Council indicated that since the year 2000, there have been two storm events which have flooded Captain Cook Drive.

Protection of the adjoining mangroves and the Ramsar listed wetlands

Council made a strong case for a dedicated 40 m riparian setback zone along the northern boundary of the site. Council indicated that 40 m was needed in order to provide an adequate physical barrier to light spill, noise, litter and pollution. The Council explained that they had looked at the plans in detail and were concerned that a 30 m setback would not provide adequate space to accommodate full sized trees, as the electricity transmission easement would only allow for lower storey plantings across most of the setback area. The Council confirmed that a 40 m setback would provide sufficient space for full size trees to grow between the development and the transmission lines.

Meeting with the Local Member

On 23 July 2012 the Commission also met with Mr Mark Speakman SC MP Member for Cronulla. Mr Speakman advised that he is opposed to the development and submitted a detailed objection to the proposal.

Mr Speakman argued that the proposal is noncompliant with the *Metropolitan Plan for Sydney 2036* and that it should not be classed as a town centre as it doesn't meet the criteria and goals set out in the Metropolitan Plan. Also, there is no capacity for the area to expand to become a town centre as it is surrounded by sporting, education and industrial uses.

Mr Speakman argued that if a supermarket was necessary, then it would be better characterised as a village rather than a town centre. Caringbah was nominated as an alternative to the site, as it has a number of consolidated sites suitable for supermarkets. Caringbah is also a major rail hub, and has links with bus services to areas such as Lillipilli and Dolans Bay, making it a preferable location.

Although the site is proposed to include an interim shuttle bus service, this is only required until the first public bus services the site, which could be an infrequent service, such as the one currently running between Cronulla and Kurnell.

In relation to density Mr Speakman noted the concept plan proposed 144 dwellings per hectare, which he considered excessive. As there has been no analysis of an appropriate density for the site, Mr Speakman believed low rise, medium density would be more appropriate.

Concerns were also raised that the proposal would be socially inequitable with poor public transport and amenity. Mr Speakman argued the proposal doesn't meet the fairness criteria in the Metropolitan Plan and should be rejected, or at least scaled down to a medium density village.

Public Meeting

On 26 July 2012 the Commission held a Public Meeting at the Rydges Hotel in Cronulla. The Commission held the meeting in three sessions. All sessions were well attended. Ninety four people spoke across the three sessions, a list of speakers is included in Appendix 1 to this report. Due to the number of speakers who registered, approximately five people who tried to register after the close of registrations were unable to be accommodated. These people were offered a chance to make their comments in writing and some people took that opportunity.

Speakers at the public meeting included the Honourable Graham Annesley MP, Minister for Sport and Recreation and the adjoining local State Member of Parliament, the Mayor and two other councillors, representatives for groups such as the Cronulla Dunes and Wetlands Society and the Botany Bay Protection Alliance, as well as local resident action groups and local residents. The Commission also heard from a large number of members, players, staff and suppliers to the Sharks - Cronulla Sutherland Leagues Club.

At the meeting people spoke both for and against the proposal, raising a wide range of issues. Some people noted both the benefits and the issues of concern.

In favour of the application people spoke about:

Housing

- it was suggested that there is a lack of housing options in the area, particularly for younger people, both in terms of rental accommodation and options for first home buyers;
- the housing proposed was said to offer young people an opportunity to live or invest in the area and would also provide options for people looking to downsize.

Need for another retail centre

- many residents spoke in support of the proposed shopping centre, noting there was a shortage of full-line supermarkets in the area and complaining of the congestion and lack of parking at existing centres;
- some people indicated they currently have to travel outside the area to do their weekly shopping as there is insufficient choice and/or parking in the local shopping centres.

Upgrade of Club facilities

- some people looked forward to being able to use the new facilities associated with the club, particularly the dining, amenity of the deck areas and views across the bay.

Employment generation

- many current staff spoke in support of the club and the employment and community contributions it provides;

- other speakers spoke about potential local employment opportunities for young people;
- speakers also noted the uncertainties and closures in some local manufacturing facilities, as well as an announcement about changes to operations at the Caltex facilities at Kurnell.

Social contributions and community services provided by the Club

- in relation to sport, particularly for football, but also other sports such as waterpolo;
- financial support and grants; and
- also as a service for the elderly, for example with the provision of cheap, accessible social activities.

Other reasons in support

Speakers also supported:

- the proposal for a medical centre, noting there is a lack of local medical centres;
- the contributions it would add to the economy;
- the suitability of the site, noting its relatively distant from sensitive receivers and congestion would be manageable, unlike a more central location such as Cronulla;
- positive competition for local businesses;
- the improvements that would be made to the riparian zone and foreshore access;
- support for urban consolidation, rather than urban sprawl and its associated impacts on agriculture and wilderness areas;
- reduced dependence on alcohol and gaming machines;
- the continuation of the Sharks football team and Club as a community identity and brand for the Shire.

Many speakers also raised objections or issues of concern, these included:

Impacts on the mangroves adjoining the site and the Ramsar listed wetlands, especially:

- the site should provide a minimum 40 m setback riparian zone;
- the buildings would be too close to the Mangroves;
- impacts of the boardwalks and picnic area within the buffer zone;
- uncertainties regarding potential impacts from flooding, stormwater and contamination on site.

Overdevelopment of the site, including:

- the bulk, height and density;
- inconsistent with the local context and the surrounding foreshore and bay;
- view impacts for nearby residents;
- development on the site should be restricted to 4 storeys;
- precedent for the surrounds, noting that there is no development of this size on the bay;
- concerns the development would have a character similar to the Gold Coast;
- that the town centre is unjustified and would be disconnected;
- overshadowing of adjoining playing fields/open space;

Loss of open space and sporting facilities, noting:

- that the Junior fields site was sold to the Club at a discounted rate, was to be maintained in operation and has been upgraded at various times using Council grants;
- that with increased density, the area will need more open space and sporting facilities, not less;
- that the area is characterised by a strong sporting culture and lifestyle and the playing fields are integral to sustaining this;
- loss of playing fields should be offset by creation of new playing fields – upgrades to existing ones is insufficient.

Transport, traffic and parking, including

- that the project would be car dependent and is distant from rail;
- inadequate parking provisions, including:
 - for the residential development and the associated visitor parking provisions;
 - for the retail and club facilities, noting other shopping centres and clubs in the region have significantly higher parking provisions – based on rates at other centres the project is hundreds of spaces short of the requirements;
 - associated congestion, traffic impacts and conflicts with existing users of offsite parking, e.g. at the school, the nearby residential areas and the adjoining playing fields;
 - Game Day Parking and the feasibility of the alternative parking/travel options proposed.
- Traffic congestion and safety, concerns:
 - development should aim to get cars off the road, rather than adding more;
 - the area is already congested during peak periods;
 - there would be cumulative traffic impacts from other development along Captain Cook Drive;
 - traffic safety concerns;
 - the additional congestion could obstruct the evacuation of Kurnell in the event of an industrial emergency;
- Inadequate transport and facilities, including
 - uncertainties around the level of servicing and long term viability of a shuttle bus, or any public bus services;
 - distance to the nearest train station – a 1.6 km walk to Woollooware Station;
 - concerns that there is inadequate bus access and car parking at Woollooware Station;

Suitability and constraints of the site, including:

- Acid Sulphate Soils;
- Legacy of issues associated with historical uses of the site such as the landfill and management of methane emissions and asbestos contamination;
- Flooding, climate change and sea level rise.

Health Risks from Electromagnetic Radiation associated with the transmission lines running through the site, noting that building materials have no mitigating effect on magnetic fields.

Other issues of concern included:

- amenity impacts for the residents of Woollooware;
- the need to comply with *State Environmental Planning Policy No 65 – Design Quality of Residential Flat Development* (SEPP 65);
- uncertainties and deferral of detailed management measures and plans;
- impacts on infrastructure requirements and local services, including availability of child care places, capacity at local schools, capacity of roads, water, sewer and electricity, etc.; and
- that the proposal represents a poor strategic outcome.

Following the public meeting the Commission agreed there were a number of outstanding issues it wanted to discuss with the Department of Planning and Infrastructure.

On 3 August 2012 the Commission met with senior staff from the Department of Planning and Infrastructure. The Commission asked the Department about the proposed requirement for a shuttle bus service, noting that funding and management of the service may be difficult to maintain, particularly if this responsibility fell to the body corporate for the residential buildings. The Department agreed that it would look at this issue further.

The Commission noted that a number of speakers at the Public Meeting had raised concerns about the level of parking to be provided. The Commission considered that one

speaker made a compelling case for more parking for the club and retail component. The Department noted the project was only at concept plan stage and that further work would be done at the next stage in order to ensure sufficient parking was available. The Commission raised concerns that it could not see where additional parking could be accommodated should these future studies find a parking shortfall. The Department agreed to discuss this with the proponent.

The Commission also noted that Council and a number of speakers at the public meeting raised concerns about the proposed 30 m riparian setback along the retail and club portion of the site. The Commission noted that the Department had originally specified that a 40 m setback was required, but that this had not followed through into the recommendation to the Commission. The Department advised that it considered a 30 m setback was sufficient in the circumstances, noting that it was a significant improvement on the current situation. The Commission was not satisfied with this response and the Department agreed to discuss this with the proponent. See further comments on the importance of the riparian setback on page 8, under "Commissions Comments".

Additional information from the Department and the Proponent

On Friday 17 August 2012 the Department provided a written response to the issues which the Commission had raised with the Department. The Department's response included a supplementary report from the proponent, with some revised plans.

In relation to the Shuttle Bus, the Department indicated that the proponent had suggested entering into an enforceable agreement with the Director-General for provision of the shuttle bus service, until a public service is established. The Department preferred not to change its recommended conditions regarding the shuttle bus, but suggested it could amend them to add the Leagues Club as a responsible party for the provision of the shuttle bus, should the Commission consider this appropriate.

The proponent's revised plans provide for an increased riparian setback along the retail and club portion of the site. Approximately half (65 m) of the retail/club foreshore frontage would be redesigned to provide a 40 m setback to the foreshore, the remaining ~70 m would have a 31 m setback. The proponent argued that the loading dock requirements in terms of size, access and separation from the intersection make it impossible to provide a 40 m setback at this point. The proponent has argued that the average depth of the foreshore setback would be 45.6 m, and that this meets the requirements of the Office of Water's "Guidelines for riparian corridors on waterfront land".

With regard to parking, the proponent's revised plans provided for an extra 75 spaces, by adding at grade parking between the tidal creek and the western grandstand for Club employees and by adding public parking on the roof of the proposed medical centre. The Department notes that the at grade parking would need to be further considered, in relation to stormwater impacts, in the future applications, should this option be pursued.

The Department had indicated that the proponent was prepared to meet with the Commission in relation to the revised plans and additional information. Consequently the Commission arranged to meet with the proponent to further discuss the issues of parking and riparian setbacks.

Second Meeting with the Proponent

On 23 August 2012 the Commission met with representatives for the proponent to discuss the additional information that had been provided. The proponent confirmed it was able to secure an agreement from the Club, for the Club to be responsible for the provision of a bus service to the site together with the future owner of the retail centre.

The proponent explained that the requirements for the loading dock, in terms of safe separation distance from the intersection, as well as truck swept paths, significantly constrained any option to increase the setback from the foreshore. Consequently the proponent was not willing to commit to providing a 40 m setback.

The proponent also explained that shopping centre parking trends indicate that turnaround times are reducing, so the guideline parking rates are higher than the predicted parking demand for the centre. Notwithstanding this the proponent has committed to providing in excess of the RMS parking guidelines.

Commission's comments

The Commission has carefully considered the proposal, including the issues raised in submissions and those raised at the public meeting, both for and against the proposal.

Adjoining mangroves and Ramsar wetlands

The Commission notes the special significance of the adjoining foreshore wetlands which form part of the Towra Point Nature Reserve, incorporating listed Ramsar wetlands. A number of objectors raised concerns about potential impacts on the adjoining mangroves and nearby Ramsar wetlands.

Riparian setback and buffer requirements

The Council strongly recommended that a 40 m riparian buffer zone should be established should the proposal proceed. Agencies submissions from the Office of Environment and Heritage, the Department of Primary Industries – Fisheries and the NSW Office of Water all raised concerns about the adequacy of the proposed buffer, noting that the buffer should have a minimum width of 40 m.

The Commission discussed this with the Department and subsequently with the proponent and as already noted, the proponent agreed to increase the buffer on the western half of the retail and club site. However, the proponent was not willing to commit to providing a 40 m buffer along the entire length of the site as it was concerned this might make the proposed loading dock unworkable. The proponent maintained it could only provide a 31 m buffer between the loading dock and the foreshore.

The Commission has considered the proponent's concerns but believes some further improvements to the design would be possible. The Commission believes that any departure from the 40 m buffer recommended by Council and a number of government agencies must be minimised. Consequently the Commission has specified that the 40 m buffer may be reduced by no more than 5 m for no more than the 70 metre length of the loading dock, on the retail portion of the site. The Commission is satisfied this will provide adequate space for the loading dock while improving the functionality of the proposed foreshore buffer zone.

Impacts from associated road works

The Commission notes that the plans show a road (marked Woollooware Road North) and cul-de-sac adjoining the site. This road and turning circle do not exist at the moment. The Commission notes that the turning bay will need to be carefully designed and considered at the development application stage, to minimise, and if possible avoid, any intrusion into the 40 m foreshore setback zone.

Future management requirements

Being adjacent to such a sensitive and important natural environment, the Commission notes the construction and operation of the development will need to be carefully managed to minimise disturbance of the existing riparian zone and to ensure the successful establishment and maintenance of the vegetated buffer zone to be provided.

The Commission notes that the Department has included a number of requirements for management of issues such as contamination, stormwater, flooding and acid sulphate soils, as recommended by various government agencies. The Commission supports the inclusion of these requirements and has also added a requirement relating to the management of shopping trolleys. The Commission considers that there is a real risk of shopping trolleys disturbing the adjoining mangroves, unless some management measures are included. The Commission notes that there are a number of mechanisms available which could be implemented to prevent shopping trolleys from leaving the shopping centre and that trolley and litter management will be important for ongoing protection of the mangroves and the environment generally.

Transport, traffic and parking

Many submissions and speakers at the public meeting raised concerns about the traffic and parking impacts of the proposal, as well as the lack of public transport to the site. The site is approximately 1.5 km from the nearest train station and a lack of closer public transport services would create a car dependent development inconsistent with strategic planning for Sydney. Reliance on private vehicles would also increase the traffic impacts and parking demands of the site.

Bus Services

The Commission agrees that bus services need to be in place from the commencement of operation of the first development under the concept plan in order to ensure that travel patterns and habits are established to take advantage of the full range of transport options. The proponent and the Department have recommended that this can be achieved through the provision of a shuttle bus to nearby railway stations. The Commission heard from a number of people who raised concerns about the suitability and viability of this proposed shuttle bus service. The Commission agreed that there were a number of uncertainties regarding the shuttle bus and explored this further with both the Department and the proponent.

To overcome the uncertainties, the proponent has suggested that the Leagues Club could be made responsible for the provision of the bus. The Commission understands that the Club has agreed to this solution and consequently is satisfied that an agreement to provide a bus service can be secured for the site. Details of the bus service arrangements will need to be provided with the future applications for development of the site, however the Commission considers that as a minimum the bus should service Woollooware Railway Station.

Traffic

The Commission is satisfied that the bus service will serve to minimise traffic impacts and that traffic from the site can be adequately accommodated and managed on the surrounding road network through the various upgrade and management measures to be implemented through the future development applications.

Parking

In relation to parking, the Commission notes that a number of people raised concerns that the proposed parking provisions would be inadequate, both for the residential and retail/club uses. The Commission has considered the proposed residential parking provisions (including visitor parking) and is satisfied with the Department's findings and recommendations regarding residential parking, which includes an increase to the rate of visitor parking spaces to be provided.

The Commission was not satisfied that the proposed retail and club parking provisions were sufficient to cater for all of the demands of the club, as well as the shopping centre. The Commission raised this with the Department and the proponent. The proponent explained

that the parking rates would exceed the Roads and Maritime Services guideline requirements, but nonetheless the proponent agreed it could increase the parking provisions to 770 spaces (for the club and shopping centre). The Commission is satisfied with this increase to the number of parking spaces and has included this revised figure in the terms of approval.

Game Days

Some people also raised game day traffic, transport and parking issues. The Commission has considered this issue, but understands that game days occur on a relatively small number of days each year. The Commission is satisfied that additional bus services and satellite parking will compensate for the loss of onsite parking that is currently available to spectators on game days.

Strategic Context

The Commission notes that Council, and a number of others, raised concerns about the strategic context and proposed classification of the site as a town centre. Mr Mark Speakman SC MP and the Council raised concerns that the proposal does not fit the definition of a town centre as set out in the *Metropolitan Plan for Sydney 2036*. The Commission agrees that the proposal does not fit neatly into any of the centre types listed in the Metropolitan Plan and that the proposal may be better characterised as a village. The location of the stadium, in the centre of the site, also represents a challenge for the development, in terms of establishing links and connections between the residential and shopping precincts. Nonetheless, the Commission is satisfied that with some ingenuity the sites constraints can be overcome and that the sites natural amenity and sporting facilities can be used to an advantage, to support a sense of local community.

Other issues

The Commission notes that many other issues were raised in submissions and at the public meeting. The Commission is satisfied these issues can be adequately resolved through the development applications and detailed design to be provided in the next stages. In particular, the Commission considers that good design will be essential to resolving some of these issues, not just in relation to conformance with *State Environmental Planning Policy No 65 – Design Quality of Residential Flat Development* (SEPP 65), but in all aspects of the proposal.

Commission's Determination

The Commission has considered the Director-General's Assessment Report and associated documents including the submissions, the recommended terms of approval and the supplementary information from the Department and the proponent. The Commission also held a number of meetings and heard from 94 people at the public meeting held in Cronulla.

After careful consideration, the Commission has made some modifications to the concept plan and added to the future assessment requirements that will apply (as described in this report). With these amendments and additional requirements in place, the Commission is satisfied with the proposal and consequently has approved the concept plan.

Garry West
Member of the Commission

Gabrielle Kibble AO
Member of the Commission

Richard Thorp
Member of the Commission

Appendix 1

Speakers at the Commission Meeting of Thursday 26 July 2012

Morning Session

1. The Hon Graham Annesley MP
2. Cathryn Ambrose
3. Matthew Reed
4. John Woodger
5. Alan Bates
6. Dianne Thompson
7. Malcolm McClelland
8. Mervyn Lees
9. Chris Gough
10. Paul Gallen
11. Ben Ross
12. Peter O'Driscoll
13. Ian Ford
14. Annette Hogan
15. Brendan FitzPatrick
16. Helen Taylor
17. Elaine Garner
18. Peter Moroney
19. Fran Molloy
20. Paul Reeves
21. Gus Liu
22. Keith Payne
23. Adam Newman
24. Jim Towart
25. Syd Coomes
26. Marilyn Urch
27. Cr Kent Johns
28. Brad Foyle
29. James Manley

Afternoon Session

30. Ian Sinclair
31. Jennifer Russell
32. Matt Crews
33. Matt McInnes
34. Damian Irvine
35. Cr George Capsis
- Deputy Mayor
36. Patrick Moseley
37. John Watkins
38. Patrick Bolland
39. Glenn Coleman
40. Cr Carol Provan
- Mayor
41. Warwick Kent
42. David Vago
43. Alan Wilson
44. Robyn Jacques
45. Jason Horse
46. Matthew Irvine
47. Dianne Ward
48. Shane Flanagan
49. Sandy Tracey
50. Jamie Maclachlan
51. Robert Willis
52. Jardian Ormsby
53. Josh Park
54. Peter Geraghty
55. Pat Barlow
56. Stephen Buchanan
57. Steve Mason
58. Grant Johnson
59. Loreen Green
60. Darryl Weller

61. Anthony Howard
62. Charles Johnston
63. Craig Douglas
64. Kerry Coomes
65. Naomi Waizer
66. Todd Murphy
67. Rob Bunt
68. Keith Ward
69. Stephen Green
70. Mark Hockey

Evening Session

71. Michael Garbutt
72. Jack Moroney
73. Graham Cassidy
74. Peter Saville
75. Adam Burke
76. Tony Dale
77. Belinda McFarlane
78. Terry Mortimer
79. Graeme Geldart
80. Melanie Dale
81. Glen Thompson
82. Clint Bonney
83. James Sims
84. Brendan Barnhill
85. Nathan Parkes
86. Christian Payne
87. Jason Samuel
88. Peter Abbott
89. Neil Toner
90. Tara Clements
91. Rhett Kentwell
92. Jon Berkley
93. Callum Hockey
94. Alan Taylor