

No.	Name	Address	Summary of submission	Comment	Modification to Draft DSP
1	Robert Corey	Lot 113 Butcher St MUNDIJONG WA 6123	I moved to Mundijong 15 yrs ago for the rural lifestyle, you only have to look at parts of Armadale and Byford to see how this has been destroyed, do not allow this to happen here.	DSP Area is zoned for Urban Development.	No
2	Colin & Marina Saring	PO Box 295 MUNDIJONG WA 6123	We have a concern regarding the realignment of the freight railway. The draft DSP map shows the realignment dissecting through multiple farmlet properties which are either for sale or have existing dwellings on them. We realise the map is only a sketch but please keep in mind the impact of the realignment of the rail would have on the owners of these lifestyle properties. Could you consider moving the freight rail inside the Tonkin Highway reserve where land has already been set aside, or deviate the line to affect less; smaller landowners by aligning it say further south and then run parallel to Kargotich Rd, west?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Re-alignment of Freight Railway is an important principle of DSP but no detailed assessment yet undertaken. Any proposal to relocate the Freight Rail will need to consider the impact to existing properties and will be subject to extensive community consultation. The DSP indicates the principle of moving the freight rail and substantial work is required to determine the feasibility of such a proposal. Further detailed assessment should be pursued in conjunction with DoP (ICC) as soon as possible. 	No
3	Ruth Igglesden	100 Paterson St MUNDIJONG WA 6123	Retain the railway line from Mundijong to Jarrahdale (Alcoa spur line) in view of its historical and tourist potential - for holiday or weekend steam train/train trips to Jarrahdale, with precinct F maximising the historical aspects of the old Mundijong townsite. Possible funding opportunities for this via Alcoa or railway groups. A list of ideas for the Mundijong Church (Uniting) include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A picnic park Overnight camping area Church to be part of a historic walk around Mundijong Musical events (in church and grounds) Art of historical exhibitions Get to gethers and information for people new to the district. Themed weddings. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no proposal to remove the rail line to Jarrahdale as part of the DSP. Detailed uses for specific sites within Precinct F would be examined as part of a Local Structure Plan. 	No
4	RK & DM Jones	Lot 153 Livesey St MUNDIJONG WA 6123	As our two hectare property falls in Precinct F of the DSP, we are concerned that the Shire is not going to make any provisions for a LSP for many years. This causes a very real problem for people like us who are planning for retirement; our property will be left in limbo with the "Urban Development" zoning restricting potential for the property to be marketed to buyers who would like to keep horses on the land. No one is going to want to purchase a two hectare property where the keeping of livestock is a prohibited use. It is grossly unfair for this zoning to apply for the next 15 to 20 years or until a developer buys out the small landowners in the area when they will then be required to prepare their own LSP. We urge the Shire to consider the effect that this will have on the numerous smaller landowners who are planning for retirement and want to be able to sell their property at a fair market price. This will only happen if the Shire considers changing the policy for the Urban Development zone to permit previous land use activities to continue until such future time as a LSP is undertaken.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Shire has not committed to funding for preparation of Local Structure Plans (LSPs) in Mundijong Whitby (M/W). In the interim the Shire is preparing an interim policy to guide development in M/W prior to an LSP being in place. Landowners comments have been considered as part of preparation of the interim policy. 	No
5	Guy Dillon	Lot 111 Keirnan St MUNDIJONG WA 6123	The proposed multi-use corridor from Galvin Rd to Manjedal Brook surrounds 3 dwellings and extensive infrastructure. Not only will private land be lost (future compensation required), passage of services only metres from houses will interfere with privacy and quality of life for rural living. Keirnan St, including road reserve is almost 30m wide. This is sufficient width to cater for water, sewerage and power services and bridal paths. Drainage easements already included on land titles and culverts that are already in place, should be used to manage storm water.	<p>Multiple Use Corridors (MUCs) are based upon the District Drainage and Water Management Strategy (DWMS) and are indicative only. Final extent and requirements will be determined at LSP stage and upon confirmation of the DWMS.</p> <p>Whether this is a MUC or drainage reserve, some land will be required to convey the 10.76m³/s of flow draining through this area.</p>	No
6	Richard Bloor Principal Consultant Asset and Administrative Services Department of Education	151 Royal St EAST PERTH WA 6004	It has been identified within the Draft DSP that actual locations of the school sites will be confirmed as part of the LSP process. At that time the Department can liaise with the Shire on the final criteria required for the specified schools. The Department is concerned with this approach as it generates concerns with landowners affected by school sites that the Department has to address. The Department would welcome the opportunity to discuss the school planning process within the Mundijong Whitby DSP with the Shire at a convenient time in the future.	The Department of Education has provided preliminary advice at a meeting subsequent to the submission that the general location of proposed school sites are acceptable but will undertake more site specific investigation. The location of the proposed school sites may move slightly should there be extenuating issues such as topography which will be determined following site specific investigations. Any proposed slight relocation of these sites can be dealt with at the Local Structure Plan stage.	No
7	Glenn Rowan Ref: 04/11203-05 (D10#136252) Main Roads	PO Box 6202 EAST PERTH WA 6892	Main Roads supports the planning framework for the proposed Mundijong-Whitby DSP. However, it should be recognised that development of this area will increase regional traffic movements including freight vehicles on South Western Highway through the Byford town site. This will emphasise the need to ensure that South Western Highway is planned and protected as a primary freight road.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted 	No

No.	Name	Address	Summary of submission	Comment	Modification to Draft DSP
	WA		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A review of the Planning Design Concept for Tonkin Highway at the intersections of Mundijong and Bishop Roads is required. The ultimate land protection line will differ to that shown in the Structure Plan & MRS. 2. As you are aware, Main Roads in consultation with the Shire is reviewing and updating the land usage inputs for the long term traffic model for the general area which includes the town site of Byford. This Road Network Assessment is required to determine the deficiencies in the current planned road network and will guide the planning process for the two districts. 3. Following the completion of the Road Network Assessment, a detailed Traffic Impact Assessment must be undertaken for both the Mundijong-Whitby and Byford areas. 4. A vehicle Access Strategy for South Western Highway is to be developed in consultation with the Shire, Main Roads WA, the Dep't of Planning and the Dep't of Transport. 5. The applicant is required to undertake a transport noise assessment in accordance with the guidelines of the WAPC State Planning Policy 5.4 "Road and Rail Transport Noise and Freight Considerations in Land Use Planning". 6. A service corridor must be provided within the boundary of the development to accommodate all major utility services. No regional services are permitted in control of access highway reserves (e.g. Tonkin Highway). 7. Please confirm that the intersections of the proposed district roads onto the South Western Highway are at least 1000m apart. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted: Liaison required with MRWA. • Noted • Noted • Noted: Shire to liaise with relevant agencies. • Clause 6.1 of DSP requires LSP's to be prepared in accordance with the requirements of the DSP and other relevant policy. This would include SPP 5.4. It is considered appropriate, however to include additional reference to the requirement within the DSP Part 1. • Noted: A service corridor is provided adjacent to Tonkin Highway for the provision of services. • 1 DSP intersection spacing at approximately 800m² – The DSP project team understand that MRWA preference is 1000m separation, however, MRWA will consider down to 800m dependent upon assessment of land use, extent of development, topography, available site distances, traffic volumes etc. On this basis no modification is considered necessary. 	No
8	Brett Soltoggio	Lot 150 Hicks St MUNDIJONG WA 6123	My property has been changed from Urban Development to Conservation without consultation. It should remain as Urban Development so that it can be developed. The conservation area indicated on the draft DSP is shown on my land titles plan as an easement for a drain. If it is only a drain why does it have conservation value and why can't it be moved.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The zoning is still urban development under the Town Planning Scheme. The Urban Development zone requires the preparation of Structure Plans to guide what can be developed on a site. • Any Structure Plan prepared needs to have consideration for environmental features including Conservation Category Wetlands. The District Structure Plan highlights the existence of a Conservation Category Wetland on Lot 150 Hicks St. The Shire has no control over the location and classification of wetlands. • You are able to view the location of the Conservation Category Wetland on the Shire's Intramaps by locating your property, clicking on Constraints and clicking on the Geomorphic Wetland layer. • A wetland reclassification may be sought from the Department of Environment and Conservation proposing a re-evaluation and reclassification of a wetlands management category. Further information on wetlands can be obtained from the Environmental Guidance for Planning and Development Guidance Statement No. 33, Chapter B4 which can be downloaded from: • http://www.epa.wa.gov.au/template.asp?area=EIA&ID=14&Cat=Guidance+Statements 	No
9	Peter Hodgson.	P.O. Box 24 AUGUSTA WA 6290	My property Lot 30 Soldiers Rd, Cardup is outside the study area but is on the northern side of Precinct G. The DSP makes reference to the area being bounded on all sides by agricultural land. This may be true to the south and the west but the north-eastern side is	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 2.1.1 of the DSP explanatory report notes that land to north, west and south is "generally" dominated by rural and also that rezoning to industrial is proposed at Cardup. 	No

No.	Name	Address	Summary of submission	Comment	Modification to Draft DSP
			<p>intended to be industrial and directly north is mostly rural living properties.</p> <p>The DSP makes no mention of restrictions to be placed on agricultural activity where rural land abuts urban or other forms of small holdings. It is essential that rural land has unrestricted agricultural activity</p> <p>The plan does not discuss how the rural wedge between Mundijong-Whitby and Byford will be constructed.</p> <p>The Plan suggests that 54% of the workforce will be employed locally including work on rural holdings. This I suggest may be optimistic. The majority of employment will be outside the Shire leading to large volumes of traffic.</p> <p>When this DSP was first envisaged efforts should have been made at a government level to obtain incentives to attract a major industrial employer to the area.</p> <p>Much discussion is given to the benefits of moving the freight railway line. While relocation will reduce traffic through Mundijong the Bunbury line will still operate with crossings necessary for this line.</p> <p>Much of the study area is low-lying and subject to flooding. This will require considerable landfill which needs to be properly monitored.</p> <p>Consideration should be given to larger block sizes in areas where local flooding is possible. All developments are supposed to contain stormwater on site.</p> <p>When contaminated sites were listed no mention has been made of the Bush Forever site south of Norman Rd that was contaminated by an effluent spill from the South Cardup landfill site in the early 2000's.</p> <p>The continuing problems at this site makes it unlikely that it will continue to operate in the long term. This raises the problem of where domestic rubbish will be transported to and the failure to identify this in the study.</p> <p>Shire Councils have considerable control on the way buildings are constructed and while much is made of energy saving on public buildings nothing is said about imposing this on all buildings eg. the generation of electricity. If all new houses had to provide a minimum of 2KVA generated by either solar or windpower this would put Mundijong-Whitby at the forefront of modern civilisation. The Federal Government is keen to promote its Solar Credit Scheme and would surely be keen to subsidise a new development such as Mundijong-Whitby.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no proposal for such restrictions in the DSP. • Noted – outside the DSP area. • Noted • Noted. Potential Industrial sites have been identified in Cardup and West Mundijong. • Noted • Noted: DWMS addresses District Drainage response. DWMS proposes that the 1-year 1-hour event be retained onsite. Events larger than this need to be conveyed and discharged downstream • Noted • The Shire expects the Cardup Landfill Site to continue to operate in the long term and will require appropriate management of the facility to minimise the potential for impact upon the DSP area. • Noted: DSP Sustainability Strategy promotes sustainable development and criteria include a statement that; all dwellings to achieve a 5 star FirstRate, AccuRate, or equivalent energy rating, comply with the new provisions for greenhouse pollution reduction in the national Building Code of Australia to incorporate solar, or gas boosted solar, hot water systems and roof insulation and/or ventilated roof cavity spaces. 	
10	Lynn Walker Network Services Officer Western Power -	Locked Bag 2520, Perth WA 6001	<p>To the best of my knowledge, we have no objections, but Western Power wishes to advise the following:</p> <p><u>Working in proximity to Western Power Distribution Lines</u> All work must comply with Worksafe Regulation 3.64 - Guidelines for Work in the Vicinity of Overhead Power Lines. If any work is to breach the minimum safe working distances a Request to Work Near Underground and Overhead Power Lines form must be submitted.</p> <p>Western Power is obliged to point out that any change to the existing(power) system, if</p>	Noted	No

No.	Name	Address	Summary of submission	Comment	Modification to Draft DSP
			required, is the responsibility of the individual developer.		
11	Gray & Lewis Landuse Planners On behalf of N & M Gangemi Nominees	Suite 5, 2 Hardy St SOUTH PERTH WA 6151	<p>The owners operate the IGA supermarket and plan to expand the commercial operations. The owners wish to express their complete opposition to the DSP. If implemented the proposed plan will result in the decimation of the existing historical and cultural town centre which has existed for more than a century.</p> <p>The existing town centre comprises all the community facilities associated with the town including the Shire offices, schools, shops, hotel, police station and district recreation facilities as well as the existing Mundijong train station.</p> <p>The proposed DSP will effectively result in the creation of a new town centre in the north east of the urban cell and the dilution of the existing town centre to a minimal centre.</p> <p>The whole district planning process has been driven by large landowners in the northern part, whose focus is self interest as opposed to a design based on sound planning principles. There is no particular justification or logic in relocating the town centre other than that of primary landowner interests at the complete disregard for smaller landowners and long established business interests within the existing town centre.</p> <p>We request that Council not approve the DSP as advertised, and request that it be redesigned to retain and enlarge the existing town centre so that it becomes the primary centre.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Town Centre location is based upon detailed assessment of this aspect as part of Enquiry by Design exercise (EbD). This included consideration of Munijong for Town Centre, however, a range of disadvantages were noted: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Extensive development would result in the loss of the existing country town character. The multiple land ownership structure would make it difficult to achieve high density development to support a transit station. The multiple land ownership structure would make it difficult to achieve large footprint development such as retailing. Would require a greater length of suburban rail line to be constructed with a commensurately large cost and environmental impact. The extensive bushland to the east of the railway line would result in the loss of significant portion of the potential walkable catchment to the station. The station would be at the wrong end of its main catchment, with patrons in the northern part of the study area more likely to drive to Byford. The town centre would be at the wrong end of the retail catchment, with patrons in the northern part of the study area more likely to drive to Byford. As such the existing Mundijong centre doesn't have the capacity to function as a Town Centre, it has however been confirmed as one of the three other centres in DSP. 	No
12	John & Elvie Lightbody	14 Adonis St MUNDIJONG WA 6123	Will the continuation of Adams St at the corner of Cockram St cut through the corner of our property or will it skirt around the end of the property.	Alignment of District Road in DSP is indicative only – detailed planning as part of LSP will confirm alignment with impacts on existing properties to be considered as part of that process.	No
13	Mr Pino Gangemi	219 Midland Rd HAZELMERE WA 6055	<p>I give my conditional support for the proposed DSP on the proviso that the following comments are taken into consideration. I own a number of properties directly affected by the DSP. and properties abutting the development area.</p> <p>The DSP boundary, particularly in the south-eastern corner where it follows the alignment of a discontinued railway reserve is somewhat illogical and puzzling. As a landowner and developer, I am totally committed to seeing the strategic transport corridor at the juncture of South Western Highway and future Tonkin Highway extension be activated along with the Mundijong -Whitby areas as they become urbanised.</p> <p>It is my contention that by including the south-east corner of the landholding into the DSP area, provides an opportunity for orderly and proper planning for the entire area and will create an opportunity for all stakeholders at a LSP level for detailed planning and also address a significant gateway entry for visitors from the south and the eastern wheatbelt area into the Mundijong district.</p> <p>In the past and more recently, I have clearly articulated my intentions to include my land as part of any structure planning process. For unknown reasons, my landholdings were not considered or included in any of the previous investigations undertaken in the MW development area. I respectfully request Council to give serious consideration to my landholding to be included in the DSP area or at the very least identified as suitable for further investigations. This is a good opportunity for the Council to rationalise the south east corner of the Mundijong Whitby locality.</p> <p>I remain committed to working closely with the Shire and the WAPC to further progress inclusion of my landholding in the MW DSP as an area suitable for further investigations and where necessary initiate appropriate actions to progress an MRS amendment from</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> DSP boundary reflects Urban Zoning under MRS and TPS. While the alignment of Tonkin Highway may appear an obvious boundary, inclusion of the area referred to in the submission would necessitate a separate MRS and TPS amendment process. 	No

No.	Name	Address	Summary of submission	Comment	Modification to Draft DSP
14	JP & AD & ML Gangemi	C/- 219 Midland Rd HAZELMERE WA 6055	<p>Rural to Urban /Commercial or Industrial.</p> <p>As landowners of Lot 2 Roman Road, Mundijong, we support the proposed DSP on the proviso that the following conditions and comments are taken into consideration as part of the Shire and WAPC consideration of the MW DSP prior to its finalisation.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Allow higher densities on Roman Road particularly in close proximity to centres and transport routes. Council should promote a range of densities and encourage greater proportion of the Community within walking distance of centres and employment. Densities around these nodes should be at least R40 or higher. Although the DSP has indicated under Section 6.6 that LSPs should seek to, as a minimum, achieve the target density suggested in Directions 2031. We contend that the Shire should be more visionary and bold by promoting a greater density than that prescribed by Directions 2031 particularly in Main Street areas. Modelling on European concepts, Council should ensure all Main Streets have a hard urban edge with a minimum of four storeys in building height to "bulk up" centre population and draw in pedestrian traffic. 2. Rationalisation of the DSP boundary by inclusion of landholding in the south-east corner of the Mundijong/Whitby locality to be considered to be a gateway entry into the area from visitors of the southern and eastern regions. <p>The Shire's effort in completing various background studies for the area is to be commended. However, it is emphasised that the DSP boundary, particularly in the south-eastern corner where it follows the alignment of a discontinued railway reserve is illogical and does not represent orderly and proper planning for the area as a whole. In view of the strategic transport corridor at the juncture of South Western Highway and Tonkin Highway extension, it is appropriate to rationalise the south-east corner of the Mundijong/Whitby locality by including those landholding in the DSP boundary in order to activate an important transport node with the rest of Mundijong and Whitby areas as they become urbanised over time.</p> <p>The inclusion of the south-east corner of land into the DSP area (as indicated above) provides a golden opportunity for an orderly and proper planning for the entire area. This will encourage all stakeholders at a Local Structure Planning level for detail local structure planning and at the same time address a significant gateway entry to the Mundijong district for visitors from the south and the eastern wheatbelt area.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted: The DSP promotes medium/higher densities along public transport routes and in proximity to centres (R40-R100) – the detail to be confirmed as part of LSP. • The Land referred to in the submission is within an area designated as low/medium density as it is not on a public transport route or within a centre – however, this still potentially supports medium density development up to R40. • In any case, the densities provided in the DSP are indicative and a guide only. LSP may address provision of higher densities than shown in DSP. • DSP boundary reflects urban zonings under MRS and TPS. • While the alignment of Tonkin Highway may appear an obvious boundary, inclusion of the area described in the submission would necessitate a separate MRS and TPS Amendment process. 	No
15	Gray & Lewis Landuse Planners On behalf of Mr Pino Gangemi	Suite 5, 2 Hardy St SOUTH PERTH WA 6151	<p>We represent Mr Pino Gangemi, owner of various lots comprising approximately 50 ha of land bound by the old railway line, Watkins Road, Shanley Road and South Western Highway, Mundijong.</p> <p>1.0 Structure Plan</p> <p>Whilst we acknowledge that our clients land falls just outside of the DSP area, we believe that the future development potential of the land as a strategic Industrial and rural residential area should be recognised in further planning, including any subsequent review of the Mundijong Whitby District Structure Plan.</p> <p>In our view it would be logical to extend the south eastern boundary of the DSP area to coincide with the alignment of the Tonkin Highway Reservation instead of utilising the unused railway reserve to define the southern boundary. Given that the railway has been closed for some years and will not be re-opened there is no barrier to extending the DSP area to the Tonkin Highway Reservation.</p> <p>It is recognised that the subject land will need to be rezoned under the MRS and the identification of the land on the DSP would form a sound basis to request the WAPC to initiate such amendment. If the timing of an MRS amendment cannot be co-ordinated effectively with progression of the MW DSP, a notation can be placed on the DSP over our clients land to the south to the effect of 'earmarked for future investigation for strategic industrial area subject to liaison with WAPC and separate planning investigation/structure planning'.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted – To date the DSP has been prepared in accordance with the appropriate zoned area in place but also recognising relevant external strategic propositions already acknowledged by Government. This includes the Tonkin Highway extension, Cardup Industrial Amendment and identification within the Draft Strategic Industrial Strategy of the potential industrial area to the west of the DSP area. • These items have either already been confirmed or have been subject to some level of investigation by relevant authorities. • We are unaware if any investigation (for example land capability) has been undertaken for the land referred to in the submission and detailed investigations would be required to inform any MRS or DPS amendment process. As such identification or notation within the DSP at this stage is considered premature pending consideration of such investigations. 	No

No.	Name	Address	Summary of submission	Comment	Modification to Draft DSP
			<p>2.0 Opportunity for employment diversity and strategic Industrial area In the area directly adjacent to South Western Highway fronting Shanley Road there would be an opportunity to create a Highway Commercial Zone which would expand on the existing rural industrial/hardware development currently located on Lot 1 Shanley Road. Creation of an Industrial area to the south of the Mundijong Whitby urban areas will assist in diversification and create employment opportunities to support future urban growth. Development of this land for industrial development is relatively unconstrained and has significant transport access and road exposure.</p> <p>The WA Planning Commissions 'Southern Metropolitan and Peel Sub-Regional Structure Plan' (June 2009) identifies Mundijong as an area under serious investigation for intensified urban development and Industrial development. Creation of an Industrial area to the south will assist in diversification and create employment opportunities to support future urban growth.</p> <p>The intersection of South Western Highway and Tonkin Highway will become a very significant location in terms of the regional road structure and would be highly suited to the development of a strategic Industrial area for the south east corridor and particularly the Byford and Mundijong urban areas - refer attached Landuse Plan. It is essential that planning objectives for the area include provision of employment opportunities</p> <p>We believe that the Shire can achieve this by earmarking our clients land as a future strategic Industrial area. There is a genuine opportunity to create a strategic industrial area in the south eastern corner of the DSP area to take advantage of the important Intersection of the regional roads and with the potential to be suitably Integrated yet sufficiently buffered from the surrounding urban area. It is recognised that the existing drainage line will need to be protected within a multiple use corridor and that land to the north of Tonkin Highway will need fill. Our clients are prepared to commence more detailed environmental assessment of the properties, subject to the Shire acknowledging that they will support the proposal.</p> <p>The Shire has an opportunity to flag potential for Industrial land to the south on the District Structure Plan. Even if the Shire does not wish to expand the study area it can take this opportunity to support the general concept of an Industrial area to the south as having merit for further investigation. This would not commit the Shire unduly however would give our clients sufficient confidence to undertake further significant investigation at their own cost, and engage in serious discussions with the Shire.</p> <p>3.0 Provision of lifestyle choice / larger lots The existing Mundijong area currently has a range of larger lot sizes and these will be developed for urban purposes under the MW DSP. Whilst we consider that an Industrial zoning would constitute the best use of our clients land and has the most advantages for the structure plan area as a whole, we also consider there is some need to provide some larger lifestyle lots. There may therefore be an opportunity to provide for special rural lots to the north of the watercourse on our clients land, and industrial to the south at the main Tonkin Highway / South Western Highway Intersection. A Rural Residential / Special Rural component would ensure that (1) existing larger lots becoming urban are effectively 'replaced'; (2) it would cater for greater diversification of lot sizes. Increased housing choice and lifestyle opportunities; and (3) would act as a transition between planned urban to the north and an Industrial area to the south on our clients land.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted: any proposal for a Special Rural Development should be progressed separately via a District Planning Scheme Amendment process. 	
16	Gray & Lewis Landuse Planners On behalf of Mr Paul Gangemi	Suite 5, 2 Hardy St SOUTH PERTH WA 6151	<p>We represent Mr Paul Gangemi, owner of Lot 1 South Western Highway and Lots 47, 48 and 49 Shanley Road, Mundijong. The subject land is located at the intersection of South Western Highway and Shanley Road.</p> <p>1.0 Structure Plan Whilst we acknowledge that our clients land falls just outside of the DSP area, we believe that the future development potential of the land as a strategic industrial/commercial and rural living area should be recognised in further planning, including any subsequent review of the Mundijong Whitby District Structure Plan.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To date the DSP has been prepared in accordance with the appropriate zoned area in place but also recognising relevant external strategic propositions already acknowledged by Government. This includes the Tonkin Highway extension, Cardup Industrial Amendment and identification within the Draft Strategic Industrial Strategy of the potential industrial area to the west of the DSP area. These items have either already been confirmed or have been subject to some level of investigation by relevant authorities. 	No

No.	Name	Address	Summary of submission	Comment	Modification to Draft DSP
			<p>We believe that there are sound planning principles for considering a composite zoning over Lots 1, 47, 48 and 49. This would seek to include the subject land as Rural Living, Service Commercial and Highway Commercial. Our clients land is ideally located for a strategic employment industrial area due to its proximity to Mundijong, that it is generally unconstrained, and has regional road accessibility being located on two major arterial roads -South Western Highway and the future Tonkin Highway.</p> <p>The land earmarked for Industrial use west of Tonkin Highway under the Industrial land Strategy 2009 Perth and Peel (ILS) is severely constrained by existing drainage lines, poor geotechnical site conditions and the requirement to fill the entire site by up to 2.0 metres.</p> <p>We have prepared a preliminary concept plan (copy attached) for the proposed subdivision of the subject land based on the development of Highway Commercial, Service Commercial, and Special Living A and B. This is only a preliminary concept and is likely to be varied at the more detailed planning and environmental evaluation phase as part of a future Scheme Amendment.</p> <p>2.0 Opportunity for employment diversity and strategic Industrial area In the area directly adjacent to South Western Highway fronting Shanley Road there would be an opportunity to create a Highway Commercial Zone which would expand on the existing rural industrial/hardware development currently located on Lot 1 Shanley Road. Creation of an industrial area to the south of the Mundijong/Whitby urban areas will assist in diversification and create employment opportunities to support future urban growth. Development of this land for industrial development is relatively unconstrained and has significant transport access and road exposure.</p> <p>The intersection of South Western Highway and Tonkin Highway will become a very significant location in terms of the regional road structure and would be highly suited to the development of a strategic industrial area for the south east corridor and particularly the Byford and Mundijong urban areas - refer attached Landuse Plan. It is essential that planning objectives for the area include provision of employment opportunities as a vital component to support future urban areas, and create a productive economy.</p> <p>Our clients are prepared to commence more detailed environmental assessment of the properties subject to the Shire acknowledging that they will support the proposal. The Shire has an opportunity to flag potential for Industrial land to the south on the DSP. Even if the Shire does not wish to expand the study area it can take this opportunity to support the general concept of an Industrial area to the south as having merit for further investigation. This would not commit the Shire unduly however would give our clients sufficient confidence to undertake further significant investigation at their own cost, and engage in serious discussions with the Shire.</p> <p>3.0 Provision of lifestyle choice / larger lots Whilst we consider that an Industrial zoning would constitute the best use of the northern portion of our clients land and has the most advantages for the structure plan area as a whole, we also consider there is some need to provide some larger lifestyle lots. A Rural Residential / Rural Living component would ensure that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. existing larger lots becoming urban are effectively 'replaced'; 2. it would cater for greater diversification of lot sizes, increased housing choice ; and lifestyle opportunities in the Mundijong area; and 3. would act as a transition between planned urban to the north and an Industrial area to the south on our clients land. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We are unaware if any investigation (for example land capability) has been undertaken for the land referred to in the submission and detailed investigations would be required to inform any MRS or DPS amendment process. As such identification or notation within the DSP at this stage is considered premature pending consideration of such investigations. • Any proposal for a Special Rural Development should be progressed separately via a District Planning Scheme Amendment process. <p>Noted: any proposal for a Special Rural Development should be progressed separately via a District Planning Scheme Amendment process.</p>	
17	Maria & Philip Jones	62 Adams St MUNDIJONG WA 6123	<p>1.0 To date a LSP has not been undertaken for what will be known as precinct F. Therefore I request the concept plan and Water Strategy Plan, which are no longer applicable being removed and or amended from the Shire's website and Shire offices. Currently these two maps show:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Draft Water Management Strategy Figure A8 shows primary school and storm 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted • The DWMS covers precinct F. The basin illustrated on Kiernan 	<p>No</p> <p>No</p>

No.	Name	Address	Summary of submission	Comment	Modification to Draft DSP
			<p>water drainage on two boundaries on 62 Adams St, Mundijong.</p> <p>b. Concept plan shows storm water drainage on two boundaries of 62 Adams St, Mundijong.</p> <p>2.0 It is disappointing that the outcome of the MW DSP does not consider the town's people, rather focuses on the surrounding areas of the town site which is to be developed into housing, ultimately benefiting developers.</p> <p>The existing Mundijong townspeople are unable to develop their properties due to a LSP not being prepared for precincts F, B, D and F. The lack of planning for these areas will impact on the residents and the outcomes and options they may have planner for their properties are now obsolete, whilst the surrounding vast acres of alnd is sub divided around them by developers. The inevitable future council rate increases will affect the affordability of the small land holders in those precincts of B, D and F, impacting further on their ability to sustain their current lifestyles.</p> <p>The Shire's new restrictions relating to the use of land after sale, ultimately impacts on the resale of properties, as the property owner can no longer use the option of keeping horses as a selling point. Once the property is sold the lifestyle choice of being able to stable and graze horses on the property will not be permitted. As the surrounding areas are developed, existing property owners with horses will ultimately receive complaints from new residents regarding the existence of livestock due to flies, smell etc.</p> <p>The existing townspeople of Mundijong have not been considered in the DSP and this is unacceptable given the number of years the Shire have had to prepare for the development. I believe due to a lack of Shire funds the shire does not have funds available to complete the necessary LSPs. Should the Shire suggest that the small land owners contribute towards their own LSP and place the expectation on ratepayers to raise the funds to draft the plan is inadmissible.</p> <p>I have continually stated no owner/occupier should be adversely affected by the decision of developers. I seek clarification why areas B, D and F are included in the DSP as these areas will not be given the option to develop. Surely the small landowners of Mundijong have a far greater vested interest having lived and been a part of the community than the developers short term profits.</p> <p>I would also like a response as to when a LSP will be drafted by the Shire for areas B, D and F.</p>	<p>St and Tonkin St is indicative only. The storage area and location can be adjusted to meet the DWMS requirements, and will need to be refined in the LSP stage.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The concept plan was prepared as part of the Enquiry by Design workshop as part of preliminary planning for the area and provides a context for the process undertaken. • The MWDSP does not seek to benefit developers. Its purpose is to provide a planning framework to guide development within the Mundijong Whitby urban cell. • The Shire has not committed to funding for preparation of LSPs in Mundijong/Whitby and may or may not choose to do so in the future. • The Shire has prepared a draft interim policy to guide development in Mundijong/Whitby prior to an LSP being in place. • Landowners comments have been considered as part of preparation of the draft interim policy. 	
18	Gray & Lewis Landuse Planners On behalf of Owners of Lots 1 & 2 Roman Rd, Mundijong	Suite 5, 2 Hardy St SOUTH PERTH WA 6151	<p>1. Support for the Mundijong District Structure Plan We generally support the DSP and urge the Shire to actively progress future planning for this area. Our clients request that Shire give priority to the development of this area and expedite progression of the District Structure Plan with strong involvement by local landowners.</p> <p>2. Existing Town Centre We are concerned that the DSP is being utilised as a vehicle to substantially downgrade the function of the existing Town Centre which has been the areas main commercial area for a number of years. The Draft DSP as proposed marginalises and minimises growth opportunities for the existing Town Centre, and instead attempts to completely relocate and transfer the main Town Centre role to the north (and this is purely based on a long term future railway station).</p>	<p>Noted</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Town Centre location is based upon detailed assessment of this aspect as part of EbD exercise. This included consideration of Mundijong as a District Centre, however a range of disadvantages were noted: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Extensive development would result in the loss of the existing town country character. ○ The multiple land ownership structure would make it difficult to achieve high density development to support a transit station. ○ The multiple land ownership structure would make it difficult to achieve large footprint development such as retailing. ○ Would require a greater length of suburban rail line to 	No

No.	Name	Address	Summary of submission	Comment	Modification to Draft DSP
			<p>One severe failing of the DSP as currently proposed is that it does not significantly recognise the importance to retain the existing Town Centre as the main focus and community activity node for the area. The current plan will have a negative impact on the Shire as it attempts to completely downgrade the role of the existing Town Centre, which has historically served the existing local community needs, is well located and is occupied by long standing well established businesses.</p> <p>We are concerned that the Draft DSP appears to place a higher priority on proposed development in the north. The existing, long standing and locally recognised Town Centre should be the Council's priority and needs to clearly be identified as the higher commercial activity centre on the DSP.</p> <p>3. Precincts and proposed densities Our clients land is included in Precinct C and the DSP indicates that the majority of this area will be low to medium density in the range of R20 to R40. Higher densities should also be considered in unconstrained areas such as our clients' land which is close to existing services, and can provide for increased housing choice and redevelopment in the short term.</p> <p>4. Conclusion We generally support the proposed DSP however would encourage greater flexibility over density for our clients land due to the proximity to the town centre. The application of a low to medium density for Precinct C is relatively constraining for long term planning, and we consider that the DSP should allow for increased flexibility and greater scope for additional higher density areas to be considered in Precinct C.</p> <p>Higher densities will act as a development incentive, maximise use of infrastructure and provide increased flexibility to examine greater housing choice at the LSP stage. It is considered important that the DSP is adaptable so it can respond to changes in circumstances without the need for future structure plan amendments.</p> <p>We also urge Council to give high priority to the established Town Centre as the major activity node, and support existing local businesses through prioritising revitalisation of the Town Centre. The importance of the existing Town Centre needs to be clearly identified and recognised as a modification to the DSP.</p>	<p>be constructed with a commensurately large cost and environmental impact.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The extensive bushland to the east of the railway line would result in the loss of significant portion of the potential walkable catchment to the station. ○ The station would be at the wrong end of its main catchment, with patrons in the northern part of the study area more likely to drive to Byford. ○ The town centre would be at the wrong end of the retail catchment, with patrons in the northern part of the study area more likely to drive to Byford. <p>As such the existing Mundijong centre doesn't have the capacity to function as a Town Centre, it has however been confirmed as one of the three other centres in DSP.</p> <p>Densities shown in DSP are indicative and a guide only. Higher densities may be proposed as part of LSP's.</p> <p>Noted: See above comments</p>	
19	Gray & Lewis Landuse Planners On behalf of Owners of Lot 5 Baskerville Rd, Mundijong	Suite 5, 2 Hardy St SOUTH PERTH WA 6151	<p>2. Proposed Precincts and densities Our clients land is included in Precinct F and the DSP indicates that the majority of this area will be low to medium density in the range of R20 to R40. Our clients land is clearly within the identified 'pedshed' for the Town Centre and has excellent access to existing services and facilities. The land is slightly elevated, is well drained and completely unconstrained therefore provides a prime opportunity for medium R30 / R40 development.</p> <p>3. Existing Town Centre We are concerned that the DSP is being utilised as a vehicle to substantially downgrade the function of the existing Town Centre. The Draft DSP as proposed marginalises and minimises growth opportunities for the existing Town Centre, and instead attempts to completely relocate and transfer the main Town Centre role to the north (and this is purely based on a long term future railway station). We are concerned that the Draft DSP appears to place a higher priority on proposed development in the north.</p> <p>The current plan will have a negative impact on the Shire as it attempts to completely downgrade the role of the existing Town Centre, which has historically served the existing local community needs, is well located and is occupied by long standing well established businesses. We believe that the Shire should be focusing on re-enforcing the existing Town Centre role, enhancing the area and retaining the existing centre as the dominant retail and commercial centre.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Densities shown in DSP are indicative and a guide only. Higher densities may be proposed as part of LSP's. • Town Centre location is based upon detailed assessment of this aspect as part of Ebd exercise. This included consideration of Mundijong as a District Centre, however a range of disadvantages were noted: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Extensive development would result in the loss of the existing town country character. ○ The multiple land ownership structure would make it difficult to achieve high density development to support a transit station. ○ The multiple land ownership structure would make it difficult to achieve large footprint development such as retailing. ○ Would require a greater length of suburban rail line to be constructed with a commensurately large cost and 	No

No.	Name	Address	Summary of submission	Comment	Modification to Draft DSP
			<p>4. Conclusion We generally support the proposed DSP as it affords flexibility for our clients land to be developed for medium density development. The lower R20 range within Precinct F should be limited and the Shire should actively promote R30 to R40 densities as a development incentive, and to maximise use of infrastructure.</p>	<p>environmental impact.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The extensive bushland to the east of the railway line would result in the loss of significant portion of the potential walkable catchment to the station. ○ The station would be at the wrong end of its main catchment, with patrons in the northern part of the study area more likely to drive to Byford. ○ The town centre would be at the wrong end of the retail catchment, with patrons in the northern part of the study area more likely to drive to Byford. <p>As such the existing Mundijong centre doesn't have the capacity to function as a District Centre, it has however been confirmed as one of the three other centres in DSP.</p>	
20	CJ and EJ Allison	154 Livesey st Mundijong 6123	<p>Being the land owner of property within the MW DSP we are disappointed that the plan does not consider local residents who have lived and paid rates over many years, but appears to favour big developers. Our property located in precinct "F" could be left in limbo for many years as no apparent LSP will be prepared. The lack of planning for this area will effect property values, sales and lifestyles. The Councils new restrictions relating to the use of land after sales will effect anyone wanting to purchase a property to keep a pony or horses for recreational use. The council has been talking about development for many,many years, so should have been much more advanced in overall planning.</p> <p>I would like a response to this letter as to when a LSP will be drafted for precinct "F".</p>	<p>Noted</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Shire has not committed to funding for preparation of LSPs in Mundijong/Whitby and may or may not choose to do so in the future. • The Shire has prepared a draft interim policy to guide development in Mundijong/Whitby prior to an LSP being in place. • Landowners comments have been considered as part of preparation of the draft interim policy. 	No
21	Ron & Lyn Iannello	324 Jarrahdale Rd JARRAHDAL WA 6124	<p>Fig 14 District Road Network & Fig 15 Indicative Public Transport Network reveals a proposed district road running from Paterson St to unmade (Adam) Rd reserve. This road will run the full length along my southern boundary and will also partly isolate the south west corner of my block because of its irregular shape.</p> <p>From the point of view of future development this will have a negative impact on our retirement asset. There is already a suitable road reserve which is unmade (Cockram St) linking up to Adam St which would be a suitable option and does not require any land resumption requirements. Cockram St from Paterson Rd thru to Adam Rd is an existing conduit which only needs to be extended.</p> <p>The Shire should be responsible for preparing a LSP for the small landowner precincts otherwise confusion will bog down the entire project for precincts B, D and F.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The district road link was originally considered to encourage retail and commercial development to occur down Whitby Road and create a main street with retail and commercial frontage along both sides and to facilitate a link to the Mundijong centre. As no public transport route will utilise this link the necessity for this short proposed District link has been reconsidered. • The Shire is not responsible for the preparation of LSPs and has not committed to funding for preparation of LSPs in Mundijong/Whitby. 	Yes – delete district road link.
22	Francesco Arena	C/- 219 Midland Rd HAZELMERE WA 6055	<p>As a landowner of Lot 2 Roman Road, Mundijong, I support the proposed DSP on the proviso that the following conditions and comments are taken into consideration as part of the Shire and WAPC consideration of the MW DSP prior to its finalisation.</p> <p>1. Allow higher densities on Roman Road particularly in close proximity to centres and transport routes. Council should promote a range of densities and encourage greater proportion of the Community within walking distance of centres and employment. Densities around these nodes should be at least R40 or higher.</p> <p>Although the DSP has indicated under Section 6.6 that LSP should seek to, as a minimum, achieve the target density suggested in Directions 2031. I contend that the Shire should be more visionary and bold by promoting a greater density than that prescribed by Directions 2031 particularly in Main Street areas. Modeling on European concept Council should ensure all Main Streets have a hard urban edge with a minimum of four storeys in building height to "bulk up" centre population and draw in pedestrian traffic.</p> <p>Rationalisation of the DSP boundary by inclusion of landholding in the south-east corner of the Mundijong/Whitby locality considered to be a gateway entry into the area from visitors of the southern and eastern regions.</p> <p>The DSP boundary, particularly in the south-eastern corner where it follows the alignment of a discontinued railway reserve is illogical and does not represent orderly and proper</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted – Densities shown in the DSP are indicative and a guide only. Higher densities may be proposed as part of LSPs. • DSP boundary reflects urban zonings under MRS and DPS. • While the alignment of Tonkin Highway may appear an obvious boundary inclusion of the area described in the submission would necessitate a separate MRS and DPS Amendment process. 	No

No.	Name	Address	Summary of submission	Comment	Modification to Draft DSP
			<p>planning for the area as a whole.</p> <p>In view of the strategic transport corridor at the juncture of South Western Highway and Tonkin Highway extension, it is appropriate to rationalise the south-east corner of the Mundijong/Whitby locality by including those landholding in the DSP boundary in order to activate an important transport node with the rest of Mundijong and Whitby areas as they become urbanised over time. The inclusion of the south-east corner of land into the District Structure Plan area (as indicated above) provides a golden opportunity for an orderly and proper planning for the entire area. This will encourage all stakeholders at a Local Structure Planning level for detail local structure planning and at the same time address a significant gateway entry to the Mundijong district.</p>		
23	Ian Atwell	PO Box 10 MUNDIJONG WA 6123	Include all of Lot 200 in the urban development zone or include it in Darling Views, Bilya St Light Industry/Residential area.	The property referred to is outside the boundaries of the DSP area. Should the landowner wish to pursue an alternative zoning to that in place then this should be actioned separately from the DSP process.	No
24	Julie Bosma	54 Keirnan St MUNDIJONG WA 6123	<p>We have been effected by the DSP, when we purchased our property it was zoned rural and we could have hooved livestock, now under after rezoning livestock are not permitted.</p> <p>If the DSP goes ahead the area will no longer be rural, just another extension of the city with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • huge increases in traffic • dangerous for school kids getting to school • current roads unable to cope with increased traffic <p>Need to retain the rural aspect in Mundijong by having blocks no smaller than a half acre and larger blocks allowed to keep livestock and keep Byford as the buffer for the smaller block/high density living.</p> <p>Facilities such as large shopping areas and TAFE are not needed in a rural area, if we wanted to be close to such facilities we would have chosen to live in a more populated area. Don't make the SJ Shire just another extension of Armadale.</p> <p>The end of a train line is one of the greatest places for crime activity, so ending the train service in Cardup will bring the crime and turn SJ into a high crime spot.</p> <p>Relocating the freight line is a huge waste of taxpayers/ratepayers money, it's been there for years why move it just for looks.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Subject area is now zoned for urban purposes. • The Shire has prepared a draft interim policy to guide development in Mundijong/Whitby prior to an LSP being in place. • Landowners comments should be considered as part of preparation of interim policy. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Re-alignment of the Freight Railway is an important principle of DSP but no detailed assessment yet undertaken. • Any proposal to relocate the Freight Rail will need to consider the impact to existing properties and will be subject to extensive community consultation. The DSP indicates the principle of moving the freight rail and substantial work is required to determine the feasibility of such a proposal. 	No
25	Andrew Bosma	54 Keirnan St MUNDIJONG WA 6123	The reason for choosing to live in the SJ Shire was for the rural lifestyle. If your planning goes ahead it won't be a rural setting and will be like Byford complete with high traffic volume.	<p>Noted</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Subject area is now zoned for urban purposes. • The Shire has prepared a draft interim policy to guide development in Mundijong/Whitby prior to an LSP being in place. • Landowners comments have been considered as part of the preparation of the draft interim policy. 	No
26	Stuart Wade District Manager Perth South East Fire & Emergency Services Authority of WA	South Metropolitan Regional Office, 20A Phillimore St, Fremantle 6160	<p>The Draft MW DSP does not identify any requirements or standards pertaining to the planning for bush fire protection or the provision of emergency services within the identified areas. As such, I would recommend that these areas be addressed and the following two clauses are included as a minimum.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>All development applications are required to conduct a full Flood, Fire and Storm risk assessment of the development and its effect on the surrounding area in accordance with AS ISO 31000, 31010, WA State Planning Policy 3.4 Natural Hazards & Disasters, WAPC/FESA Planning for Bush Fire Prevention Guidelines 2010 (or latest revision) and provide the necessary whole of life plans to mitigate</i> 	While the DSP requires compliance with all relevant Planning Policies, including SPP 3.4, this could be more explicitly worded.	Yes – reword the DSP (specifically Part 2 section 4.1:3) to make more explicit that all SPP policies must be complied with.

No.	Name	Address	Summary of submission	Comment	Modification to Draft DSP
			<p><i>those risks identified.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Provision for emergency services should be based on Risk to Resource modelling, taking into account the natural and built environments, the people and the community.</i> 		
27	Rod and Rebecca Lee	12 Coral Road SAFETY BAY WA 6169	To retain the general Heritage and Streetscape of the areas that adjoin POS, rail and river reserves, densities should be lower, R codes of R5 or less should be maintained to create buffer /corridors for wild life. Leaving natural breeding habitats that will give a sanctuary for displaced animals as wholesale clearing will destroy much of the little left, it will lessen the impact and help retain the rural aspect/desired character of Mundijong/Whitby area.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted – Transitional areas with lower densities are identified on the periphery of the DSP area to provide a transition between urban areas and surrounding rural areas. • DSP also promotes retention of remnant vegetation and MUC are anticipated to provide corridors for fauna movement. 	No
28	Joe Algeri Algeri Planning & Appeals On behalf of 122 Eileen Ave Pty Ltd & 123 Eileen Ave Pty Ltd and 119 Kiernan Ave Pty Ltd	PO Box 444 ARMADALE WA 6992	<p>The landowner currently owns the following properties within Cell B of the Structure Plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lots 122 & 123 Eileen Avenue • Lot 119 Keirnan Street <p>This submission forms in principle support for the proposed the Structure Plan.</p> <p>Background The landowner expresses support for the DSP proposed for the district. It is believed the DSP will provide for coordinated and well designed development of the Mundijong-Whitby urban cell. The landowner fully supports the urban development of the Mundijong-Whitby localities as well as the introduction of new facilities. It is believed the development of the DSP area will see the extension of the existing Armadale railway line to Byford and then to Mundijong-Whitby. Moreover, the landowner believes the general structure of activity centres and school sites under the DSP are well considered. The landowner supports the DSP as is presented for advertising.</p> <p>Residential Densities The landowner's lots and others within the street block and indeed, most of Cell B, have been identified for urban development at "Low/Medium density" under Figure 19 of the DSP which equates to an equivalent R-Code density of R20-40. The landowner wishes to express in principle support to this classification as being wholly appropriate given the population and average density targets of the Structure Plan and current market conditions.</p> <p>Preparation of Local Structure Plans It is our opinion that given the fragmented ownership of land, particularly with Cells B, D & F, the Shire should take responsibility for preparing LSPs that follow the adoption of the DSP. Given the fragmented land ownership within those cells the prospect of any proponent driven LSPs ever being pursued is remote, even where there is a broad willingness to pursue development from the landowners; the cooperation required is logistically difficult. The experience from other similar areas is that the Local Government or the relevant local authority needs to prepare and facilitate such plans.</p> <p>The other advantages of Shire prepared LSPs are that there may be a more robust and objective approach to the allocation of non-developable land, particularly public open space. In this regard, the landowner is provisionally willing to commit the expertise of his own consultant(s) to the preparation of a LSP for Cell B subject to mutually acceptable terms. Most likely there would also be other landowners that are in a similar situation; too small to undertake an entire LSP themselves but have sufficient landholding to take a more active role in shared or a joint basis.</p> <p>Public Open Space The landowner expresses support to the DSPs nominated target of ten-percent (10%) POS across the entire structure plan area and the broader principles for its allocation in accordance with the State Government's <i>Liveable Neighbourhoods</i>. It is my view that the DSP should provide additional guidance and parameters for the allocation of POS that will result in better outcomes in the subsequent preparation of LSPs. This could include criteria for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Avoiding pockets of POS that are inherently difficult to maintain; • Avoiding pockets that are similarly too small to be considered useable; • Encouraging POS to be co-located near proposed schools, community and/or other activity centres; and, 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted • Noted • Noted - The Shire has not committed to funding for preparation of LSP's in Mundijong/Whitby and may or may not choose to do so in the future. • DSP provides sufficient district level guidance for POS provision. • More detailed consideration of POS provision will be undertaken at LSP stage. 	No

No.	Name	Address	Summary of submission	Comment	Modification to Draft DSP
			<p>• Encouraging POS to be combined with other natural streams or drainage functions.</p> <p>In summary, more considered and detailed guidance to the allocation of public open space, particularly in Cells of diverse ownership, should be provided at the DSP stage.</p> <p>Development Contributions As outlined in Section 16.3 of the Structure Plan Report, it is critical that equitable development contribution arrangements are finalised as soon as possible following the adoption of the Structure Plan. Without doing so the Shire may get caught in a perpetual cycle of revising provisional figures whilst some developers proceed with development and then are required to enter legal agreements for the payment of contributions. Formalised contribution figures which are reviewed on a regular basis provide more certainty for developers wishing to proceed with development and subdivision.</p> <p>Relocation of Railway & creation of an industrial precinct Finally, we fully support the relocation of the existing freight railway that currently dissects the DSP area. Should the existing rail network otherwise remain it will not allow for a fully integrated and functional urban cell, and may ultimately constrain and prejudice urban development nearby. All required investigations for the relocation for the rail to the western side of the DSP should be given high priority. The added benefit of a combined highway/rail stream in this location is that it will best serve any future industrial precinct that can be co-located.</p> <p>Providing a local employment base for future residents is not only desirable but critical to the sustainability and the success of the urban cell and is therefore fully supported.</p> <p>Conclusion The landowner supports the proposed DSP, its general intent and relevant provisions. It is believed that the DSP will provide for high quality and coordinated development of the Mundijong and Whitby localities. We reiterate in particular that the Shire should instigate with urgency the facilitation of LSPs for the cells that have fragmented ownership. The Structure Plan has been a long time coming but is still just another step in the orderly planning processes that must precede urban subdivision and development. The Shire must be mindful that the Structure Plan is for all landowners and not just so the larger developers can proceed to that next step.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Shire will be progressing preparation of development contribution arrangements within the near future. • Noted • Noted 	
29	Ahmed & Fatima Khan	153 Allen Rd FORRESTDAL WA 6112	We bought our property at 10 Butcher St, because of its location in the heart of town with a potential of R40 zoning. With the emphasis now on the new development, the 'old' Mundijong will suffer. We are very impressed with the Shire's efficiency and planning, we only hope that the same encouragement extends to the "older areas".	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted 	No
30	Claire Richards Greg Rowe & Associates On behalf of Clarendon Residential Group Pty Ltd and Qube Property Group Pty Ltd	Level 3, 369 Newcastle St NORTHBRIDGE WA 6003	<p>We confirm our general support for the DSP however provide the following comments relating to specific provisions proposed under the DSP.</p> <p>SERVICE CORRIDOR AND TONKIN HIGHWAY Under Part One of the DSP Clause 7.5.3.9 stipulates that a LSP must appropriately address any buffer requirements for the proposed service corridor located east of the Tonkin Highway reserve. It is understood from our discussions with the Water Corporation and from a review of preliminary service corridor designs provided, that no amenity impact on adjoining residents is anticipated as a result of the service corridor. Notwithstanding, we acknowledge that appropriate noise mitigation methods will be required for those urban areas located within proximity to Tonkin Highway and, in accordance with the WAPC's SPP 5.4 a noise acoustic study may need to be undertaken to determine appropriate mitigation measures.</p> <p><i>We therefore request that Clause 7.5.3.9 of the DSP is amended to remove the reference to a buffer requirement in the context of the service corridor and be worded to reference the requirement for LSPs to adequately address amenity impacts through an acoustic study, in accordance with the provisions of SPP 5.4.</i></p> <p>DESIGN AND LANDSCAPE DESIGN GUIDELINES</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted • Agreed – clause 7.5.3.9 should be modified to refer for noise mitigation matters to be addressed in accordance with appropriate Policy requirements at LSP stage. 	Yes – modify clause 7.5.3.9

No.	Name	Address	Summary of submission	Comment	Modification to Draft DSP
			<p>Under Part Two of the DSP Report specific low and medium density targets are specified. Whilst we support the objective for land and housing product diversity within the DSP area we are of the view that applying specific percentage targets does not appropriately respond to the local market for the area, nor provide sufficient flexibility over time for lot delivery.</p> <p>We again note the locality's ability to provide affordable housing options for the metropolitan area, whereby the land component can be provided at a lower cost in comparison to similar urban corridors. In this instance, where land costs are comparatively lower, smaller lot sizes or higher densities will be problematic, given the low demand. We do not suggest that medium density products reflecting R30 and R40 densities would not be taken up by the market, nor that this product be necessarily excluded by developers, however a flexible approach to density should be considered.</p> <p>The application of target densities through the LSP process, as required under LN3, provides sufficient flexibility to cater for market demand. Furthermore, a consistent higher density across a LSP area (say 22 dwellings per site hectare in accordance with LN3) can be more readily achieved through the application of target densities as opposed to specifying particular density percentages.</p> <p><i>We therefore suggest the DSP be amended to reflect target densities as prescribed under LN3 to provide sufficient flexibility for the delivery of a variety of housing products which can respond to market demand over time.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Target densities have been identified following consultation with the DoP and reflect and are consistent with WAPC targets of achieving 15 units per gross hectare in new developments. 	
31	David Atwell On behalf of Sporting for the Future		<p>We are concerned at the lack of sporting facilities in the area. Urgent action is required to rectify this. A multi-discipline sporting facility that would provide for all types of sport in this area would be beneficial to all members of the community. Given that all sporting bodies have similar requirements, combining them into one facility would also be more cost effective for the Shire to sustain. The best location for the new facility would be to locate it in the Mundijong – Whitby area.</p> <p>Supporting data supplied by various sporting clubs within the Shire, including forecasts for team members, teams and required facilities is enclosed.</p>	<p>A Community Facilities and Services Plan has been prepared and will form the basis of a future Developer Contribution Arrangement for Community Infrastructure. This will identify what Community facilities will be required to be provided. The submission with supporting data should be considered as part of the process of formulating a Developer Contribution Arrangement.</p>	No
32	Darren and Tenille Walters	PO Box 253 MUNDIJONG WA 6123	<p>Our property (and our 10 neighbours) on Pure Steel Lane Mundijong, is located immediately west of Precinct E of the DSP area, is zoned Farmlot and as such falls outside the area being considered. Though our properties fall outside the DSP area, we want it noted we would be severely impacted by some of the proposals of the DSP, but appear to have been overlooked in the drafting of it.</p> <p>The major impact we foresee is the proposed realignment of the heavy freight railway line alongside the future Tonkin Highway. Moving the railway line to the proposed location would place it less than 200 metres from our back door. This impact is highlighted best in the words straight from the DSP Page 93:</p> <p><i>(6.9 The future extension of Tonkin Highway and the alignment of the existing and future freight rail line will generate high levels of noise that may be detrimental to residential amenity.)</i></p> <p>While we have always been aware of the future Tonkin Highway extension, (even prior to the purchase of our block), the issue of the DSP is the first time we have been aware of the proposal to move the heavy freight railway line alongside the highway. It should be made very clear this submission is not a case of "not in my backyard" as we fully support most of the proposals in the DSP (including the realignment of the railway, which would be a major benefit to the heart of Mundijong) and congratulate Council for the foresight and meticulous planning that is occurring to ensure we have a place to live and work that we can all be proud of.</p> <p>Our concerns are making sure it is done right and that all affected landowner concerns are acknowledged during the process. As such this submission is more a case of "please don't forget about us", as from reading the DSP it would appear the 11 households located on Pure Steel Lane do not even exist. The DSP in its current form raises several questions we feel need answers. Specifically:</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Re-alignment of Freight Railway an important principle of the DSP but no detailed assessment has yet been undertaken. Any proposal to relocate the Freight Rail will need to consider the impact to existing properties and will be subject to extensive community consultation. The DSP indicates the principle of moving the freight rail and substantial work is required to determine the feasibility of such a proposal. Further detailed assessment should be pursued in conjunction with DoP. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted 	No

No.	Name	Address	Summary of submission	Comment	Modification to Draft DSP
			<p>Page 111 7.10.5 Western Rail Alignment issues <i>By progressing the relocation upfront and prior to or concurrent with the extension of the Tonkin Highway, there will be substantial benefits including . . .</i> . . .6. <i>Removal of the need for a noise assessment report to be prepared for land adjacent to freight rail.</i></p> <p>1. Why would there be no need for a noise assessment report? Surely moving the railway line anywhere would mean a noise assessment report must be completed? Especially if there are houses within the immediate vicinity as is the case with those on the eastern side of Pure Steel Lane.</p> <p>2. We understand the plans used in the DSP are purely indicative, but why is the area of the Pure Steel Lane estate shown as Proposed Industrial Area when it is quite clearly excluded from the District Structure Plan area in all other regards?</p> <p>Page 109/110 <i>Under the existing alignment buffers will include the 40m rail reserve and adjacent roads such as Paterson/Soldiers Road. Where there is an adjacent road, noise investigations may show that the buffer is sufficient subject to special building conditions on development.</i></p> <p>3 Existing homes such as those on Pure Steel Lane can't be affected by new special building conditions, therefore rendering this point invalid.</p> <p><i>With the potential western re-alignment, Tonkin Highway and its noise amelioration measures may be a sufficient buffer against rail noise but special conditions on development may be required for vibration. This will, however, affect the western periphery of the DSP area only rather than its central core as per the existing alignment.</i></p> <p>4. What about Pure Steel Lane? The whole last sentence is wrong as outlined by our concerns above. The residents of Pure Steel Lane will be the most affected of all residents in Mundijong should the heavy rail be realigned. While our concerns around the realignment of the heavy railway line and the route of the Tonkin Highway extension will be pursued with the relevant State Government bodies during their consultation periods (with regards to noise abatement mounds/bunds and drainage issues), we want to ensure the residents of Pure Steel Lane (and other similarly affected landowners who are located adjacent to the DSP area) are not forgotten.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clause 7.10.5 primarily refers to land adjacent to the existing freight line • Actual DSP itself does not identify industrial – however reference is made in the document to industrial in this location based upon the Draft State Industrial Strategy. • Noted 	
33	Melissa McKay	Lot 113 Soldiers Rd CARDUP WA 6122	The railway line should finish in Byford and not in Cardup as I believe that the higher population should also stay in Byford and the country/rural living of Cardup and Mundijong be retained so as not to spoil the lifestyle that people originally moved out here for.	Noted	No
34	Wellstrand Pty Ltd	52 Taylor Rd MUNDIJONG WA 6123	<p>Access/Movement Network NORTHERN CONNECTION ROAD FROM SOUTH WESTERN HIGHWAY THAT CONNECTS EAST/WEST</p> <p>The proposed road to the north of the Mundijong townsite which runs from the South Western Highway, through the Whitby land and connects to Taylor Road has been realigned from the outcomes report, where it originally connected directly to Bishop Road. Given that in the future Tonkin Highway is planned to have an on off ramp at Bishop Road we would support the original alignment of this road to Bishop Road, as per the outcomes report. We believe the current configuration will in the future lead to traffic congestion and is a convoluted path to move east/west through the townsite.</p> <p>The lots of land have been in the Bett family since 1917 and certainly over the past 20 years we have noticed the increase in traffic flow through the township in a diagonal direction - north west / south east. This has occurred due to several reasons – increased housing built in central Mundijong, extension of Tonkin Highway to Thomas Road and the widening of Hopkinson Road. Many residents also exit Kwinana Freeway from between Armadale</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A direct link from the Bishop Road Tonkin Highway interchange through the proposed Town Centre to South-Western Highway is not supported. The DSP is designed to direct regional traffic along Tonkin Highway around Mundijong/Whitby onto South-West Highway. Creation of a direct route at the northern side of Mundijong/Whitby does not support this objective, will result in regional traffic traversing through the urban community diminishing accessibility for residents to the Town Centre and place additional pressure on the proposed Town Centre rail crossing. 	No

No.	Name	Address	Summary of submission	Comment	Modification to Draft DSP
			<p>Road and Anketell Road as it is a quicker route into Mundijong than via the Mundijong Road exit, due to the freeway veering slight westward after Anketell Road. So with Bishop Road being the major corridor road into Mundijong when travelling to or from the north it would seem to make more sense to create a smooth path to the South Western Highway rather than a convoluted one. We fully disagree with the transport consultant who stated that most transport from Mundijong Whitby will flow via the South Western Highway - in our opinion, this is not the case.</p> <p>KIERNAN STREET Due to the fact that Kiernan Street currently connects the townsite to the South Western Highway and also more importantly has an existing railway crossing it would make sense to realign and connect Kieran Street east of the railway line with the proposed road that is shown running from the South Western Highway through the bottom section of Urban Pacific's Whitby land. One of the critical points to making the district structure plan work is the relocation of the freight railway line to the west side of Tonkin Highway, which may not happen in the near future, if at all. So in order for the current established township of Mundijong located on the west side of the railway line to access the new town centre this would seem a logical option. Whilst the current DSP plan shows a crossing at Bishop Road, it is extremely unlikely that the railways would allow another crossing so close to the current Soldiers Road existing crossing.</p> <p>Landscape and Vegetation Management Plan Whilst we fully support maintaining the bush feeling, the Shire should investigate as to whether this is achievable on a number of fronts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is there enough seed stock in the state to achieve this? • Is it financially viable for nurseries to grow these plants commercially and finally how much water is required for these plants? <p>With the Shire actively supporting a sustainable future it may be an option to promote water wise gardens, as most plants that tolerate our harsh summers are native Australian. This then in our opinion gives a broader and more achievable outcome and is currently being pitched to the general public through most garden shows and literature, thus people are more likely to embrace water wise gardens than "local species" which may or may not be easily obtainable.</p> <p>Urban Form The objective <i>"to create a distinctive and responsive built form that enhances the sense of place, community identity and character of Mundijong/Whitby"</i> is non descriptive and needs to be redeveloped. Firstly the character of Mundijong - well Mundijong was originally a timber junction town where rail would meet from 4 different directions and there are today very few remaining wooden cottages left from that era. Those that remain simply reflect our history but by no means create an underlying main character for the town. When passing through the streets of the existing township there is a mix of brick and tile houses ranging from the 1950's through to current - so really we would argue that we don't really have any significant character. A better objective would be that the housing built form encourages environmental sustainability in reducing carbon outputs - something that the existing houses in Mundijong cannot achieve. At the same time the small pocket of existing timber cottages and existing shopping precinct could be retained and enhanced to make it a feature of recognising the past.</p> <p>Ideally though due to the fact that houses will not be built till around 5 years time and that building materials and methods are rapidly evolving we would recommend that Urban Form is placed in LSP stage as they are more likely to be relevant to the time of building than the DSP. This Shire prides themselves on being environmentally sustainable but it does not</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The link as proposed would necessitate another crossing of Mandjedal Brook. The DSP is seeking to minimise such crossings and this link is not required in order to substantially improve access. While the existing rail crossing is acknowledged, by avoiding a link here, the argument to establish a new crossing to connect the Town Centre is strengthened. • A great diversity of local native species are available, but often only grown at a commercial scale if requested – therefore, sufficient quantities should be available if sufficiently planned for. Nevertheless guaranteeing such a supply may be difficult. On this basis it is suggested the Sustainability Strategy 3.1.3 e) be modified to provide more flexibility by requiring landscape plans within local structure plans to primarily include local native planting for public spaces, streetscapes and also wildlife corridors. • Water wise plants which are adapted to the local soils and climate should also be encouraged. • It is considered that greater clarity and guidance could be provided by inclusion of additional detail within the DSP, in particular in relation to Urban Design guidelines. 	<p>No</p> <p>Yes – modification to Sustainability Strategy 3.1.3</p> <p>Yes – modify the DSP to include greater clarity and guidance for matters to be addressed and the structure of Urban Design Guidelines.</p>

No.	Name	Address	Summary of submission	Comment	Modification to Draft DSP
			seem to be reflected in the stated objective.		
35	Barry Mort	Lot 10 Keirnan St MUNDIJONG WA 6123	<p>Congratulations to all the people involved in pulling together the DSP, meeting that deadline was a great outcome.</p> <p>The Plan covers all the components involved in a development of this magnitude and will deliver an outcome cognizant with the expectations and vision of everyone concerned. Two of the many concepts that should be well received by everyone are protection of the environment and retaining the leafy green atmosphere. I would like to comment on the following items from the draft DSP:</p> <p>In the DSP report, I found difficult to decipher:</p> <p>Pg 22 Plan 1. Legend colour for residential is different to the map.</p> <p>Pg 31 Fig 4. Top three Legend colours are very similar and difficult to read.</p> <p>Pg 48 Fig 7. Legend is difficult to read.</p> <p>Pg 52 Fig 8. Legend is difficult to read.</p> <p>Pg 56 Fig 9 Legend is difficult to read.</p> <p>Pg 60 Fig 10 Legend is difficult to read.</p> <p>Pg 62 Fig 11 .Legend is difficult to read</p> <p>Pg 77 Fig 13. Some areas on the map do not have a legend to show what they are.</p> <p>Pg 128 Fig 19. Table at top of page is difficult to read.</p> <p>Pg 45 Last paragraph of page: The DSP states that Illuka Resources owns, Lots, 22—27, 29 & 45 South Western Highway, and Lots, 302 & 399, Reilly Road. The Land Ownership Plan (circulated to the Community Reference Group members) shows Urban Pacific are the owners.</p> <p>Pg 46 3rd Paragraph. Cardup Landfill Site: DSP states: <i>This site is not considered a significant issue for the redevelopment of the DSP area, assuming the present land uses for the site remain.</i> Would having a landfill site so close to a residential development be a constraint to the sale of future blocks?</p> <p>Two further items I would like to mention:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> To help combat the future water shortage a large tank for each household may be an option, although larger blocks may be necessary to provide sufficient space for the tank. Community Gardens; An area to be used by the residents for the cultivation of vegetables, flowers etc. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agreed Agreed Agreed Agreed Agreed Agreed Agreed Agreed This is the same as the original EbD Noted – this is also included as Table 2 on page 93 Reference to landowners to be deleted within DSP report. <p>The landfill is outside the urban zoned area and it is understood the implications of its proximity were considered as part of the Urban Zoning process.</p> <p>Noted. A Rainwater tank will be at the discretion of the land owner and not required as part of any Integrated Water Cycle Management Scheme. This is due to preliminary feasibility studies that have identified Groundwater extraction and Sewer Mining as more viable alternative water reuse options for further investigation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted 	<p>Yes – correct errors in figures.</p> <p>Yes - Delete reference to landowners.</p>
36	Henry McKenna	Lot 89 Watkins Rd MUNDIJONG WA 6123	<p>It was stated that established areas may remain the same, can you please provide information to support this. Does this apply to Watkins Rd (Precinct D)?</p> <p>As stated by Shire President and Shire officers that residents in established areas will not be rated out due to zoning change. Can you please provide appropriate documentation to support this statement. Also can the state planning authority intervene?</p> <p>A point of interest from the community information session held 16 June 2010 relating to when equine properties are sold those new owners will not be allowed to carry on that land use. Can you explain the policy on this and can the Shire change this. This is of great concern to me as a property owner.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where a landowner does not want to develop, they cannot be forced to develop their land. Therefore some land parcels in established area may remain the same, though this will be entirely up to the landowner. The Shire has prepared a draft interim policy to guide development in M/W prior to an LSP being in place. This includes provisions relating to the keeping of horses. 	No
37	Claire Richards Greg Rowe & Associates On behalf of Kiernan St Pty Ltd	Level 3, 369 Newcastle St NORTHBRIDGE WA 6003	<p>PROPOSED PRIMARY SCHOOL SITE</p> <p>The DSP proposes 2 primary school sites within Precinct C – one being positioned in the northwest corner of our Client's land at Lot 50 Galvin Road, and the other located on Watkins Road immediately west of the Parks and Recreation Reserve. For reasons explained below, we are of the view that the designation of 2 primary school sites within Precinct C is unnecessary. We are also of the view that any primary school site identified within the Precinct should be more centrally located in order to better service the intended future population. We address each of these concerns separately below.</p> <p><u>Requirements for Two (2) Primary School Sites</u></p> <p>As set out in Table 2 on page 93 of the DSP Report, Precinct C is expected to yield a future population in the order of between approximately 3,800 and 5,000 people. If this population target is to be met, we would expect between 1,400 and 1,900 lots to be required. Element</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> General Primary School locations are based upon the distribution of school sites over the entire DSP area at optimum build out not specific precincts. 	No

No.	Name	Address	Summary of submission	Comment	Modification to Draft DSP
			<p>short to medium term. This further supports our suggestion above that the proposed District Road be realigned further west of its current position.</p> <p><i>We therefore request that the DSP be amended to re-align the proposed District Road in a more north-south orientation (refer suggested modified DSP in Attachment 1).</i></p> <p>DESIGN AND LANDSCAPE DESIGN GUIDELINES Whilst we acknowledge the benefits of stipulating specific design objectives and guidelines within LSPs, we disagree with the need for the creation of Local Planning Policies (LPP) to facilitate this framework (refer to Clause 7.5.3.6 and 7.5.3.7 of the DSP Report). The preparation of LPPs in this regard is an unnecessary process and one that simply duplicates the requirements under Liveable Neighbourhoods Edition 3 (LN3). Under Community Design Element 1, LN3 stipulates that a LSP must consider and address the following: » Define sense of place and/or identity of village; » Design response to site and context analysis; » Land use distribution and rational; » Design objectives, and » Density targets</p> <p>In addition, under Element 3 Lot Layout, a LSPs must stipulate those areas where Detailed Area Plans (DAP) are required. Once identified under the LSP, DAPs will be required as a condition of subdivision approval and will detail such built form matters in keeping with the design objectives and sense of place identified under the LSP.</p> <p>Under Element 4 Public Parkland, parkland management strategies and a landscape master plan must also be prepared to support a LSP. Further to subdivision approval, individual Landscape Management Plans will be required for each open space area which provides a more detailed appreciation of landscaping features. Therefore in the context of the above requirements, the DSP's additional requirements to prepare LPPs and landscape design guidelines is considered a duplication of provisions provided under LN3. This also provides greater uncertainty and will invariably complicate the approvals framework currently utilised by the WAPC.</p> <p>We note Part Two of the DSP has been prepared in accordance with the LN3 framework and addresses the above requirements at a district level. It therefore provides a consistent framework in which to prepare subsequent LSPs.</p> <p><i>We therefore request that Part One of the DSP reflect the current planning framework and provide specific reference to LSPs being required to address the provisions under LN3 and that Clause 7.5.3.6 be amended to delete reference to the requirement for the preparation of Local Planning Policies.</i></p> <p>THIRD PIPE SYSTEM Clause 7.5.3.8 of the DSP Report notes that LSPs "shall demonstrate provisions for the implementation of a Third Pipe System as part of the development of the LSP area". As noted under Part Two of the DSP, integrated water cycle management schemes are in their infancy in Perth with no specific policy or approval framework in place. Without an appropriate framework for these schemes to be approved and the further management of assets once implemented, that has been problematic. We are not aware of any broad scale in-house usage of groundwater to date.</p> <p>In regard to the DSP's desire to see infrastructure provided to ensure a scheme can be retrospectively applied, we note the additional cost impost as well as the uncertainty which this creates in land delivery. Whilst we support the Shire's desire for best practice outcomes within the DSP area, we consider the implementation of such a proposal will ensure additional costs are borne by the land purchaser.</p> <p><i>We therefore request this provision be deleted from the DSP unless all relevant authorities support the scheme and provide certainty on both the approvals process and asset</i></p>	<p>places this link along property boundaries minimising the impact while the alternative as proposed would see it cross through the middle of a number of properties.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is appropriate that urban and landscape design guidelines be required at LSP stage, however, greater guidance could be provided as to what these should address as part of the DSP. Draft DSP states that a third pipe system is to be installed. As this approach is currently under investigation requiring its installation prior to the completion of the investigation is premature. In the eventuality that the investigation supports installation of a third pipe system, the opportunity for such a system could be protected in the interim by provision being made to accommodate future installation in the planning and design of LSP's and subdivision. 	<p>Yes – modify the DSP to include greater clarity and guidance for matters to be addressed and the Structure of Urban and Landscape Design Guidelines to be required as part of LSP's.</p> <p>Yes – Modify DSP clauses relating to third pipe system.</p>

No.	Name	Address	Summary of submission	Comment	Modification to Draft DSP
			<p><i>management structure.</i></p> <p>DENSITY HOUSING DIVERSITY Under Part Two of the DSP Report specific low and medium density targets are specified. Whilst we support the objective for land and housing product diversity within the DSP area we are of the view that applying specific percentage targets does not appropriately respond to the local market for the area, nor provide sufficient flexibility over time for lot delivery.</p> <p>We again note the locality's ability to provide affordable housing options for the metropolitan area, whereby the land component can be provided at a lower cost in comparison to similar urban corridors. In this instance, where land costs are comparatively lower, smaller lot sizes or higher densities will be problematic, given the low demand. We do not suggest that medium density products reflecting R30 and R40 densities would not be taken up by the market, nor that this product be necessarily excluded by developers, however a flexible approach to density should be considered.</p> <p>The application of target densities through the LSP process, as required under LN3, provides sufficient flexibility to cater for market demand. Furthermore, a consistent higher density across a LSP area (say 22 dwellings per site hectare in accordance with LN3) can be more readily achieved through the application of target densities as opposed to specifying particular density percentages.</p> <p><i>We therefore suggest the DSP be amended to reflect target densities as prescribed under LN3 to provide sufficient flexibility for the delivery of a variety of housing products which can respond to market demand over time.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Density target is in response to and consistent with WAPC expectations to achieve 15 units per gross hectare in new urban developments. 	
38	Tayne Evershed Associate Taylor Burrell Barnett Town Planning & Design On behalf of Peet Ltd	187 Roberts Road SUBIACO WA 6008	<p>1 INTRODUCTION In general terms, the intent of the DSP has merit and is supported. We do however, have some concerns relating to a number of matters within the DSP which are outlined in detail.</p> <p>2 LAND INTEREST Peet Ltd has an interest in lots 37, 46, 98 and 9000 comprising a total approximate land area of 210.67 ha. All of these lots are located on the western side of the railway. Lots 37, 9000 and 98 are within precinct G to the north, and Lot 46 is within precinct E to the south. Precinct F occupies approximately the middle third of the western side and incorporates the existing Town Centre.</p> <p>3 REVIEW OF THE DRAFT DISTRICT STRUCTURE PLAN A review of the documents associated with the DSP has been undertaken with specific attention being paid to the implications for Peet's land. These documents comprise:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Draft Mundijong/Whitby District Structure Plan; Draft Mundijong/Whitby District Structure Plan Report (May 2010 rev3); Environmental Study for Mundijong/Whitby District Structure Plan (April 2009 rev3); Mundijong/Whitby District Structure Plan District Water Management Strategy (March 2010); Mundijong District Structure Plan Report Infrastructure and Services Strategy (Servicing) (30 April 2010 rev2); Mundijong Whitby District Transport Study (3 September 2007 ver1); Mundijong District Structure Plan Activity Centres Background Paper (April 2010 Final); and Mundijong Whitby District Structure Plan Sustainability Strategy (March 2010 ver1). <p>4 DISTRICT STRUCTURE PLAN The DSP (both the report and plan) incorporate a number of elements which are of concern to our client. These elements appear to unfairly burden and constrain our client's land, the details of which are discussed in detail below. A hand drawn sketch representing the issues raised is contained in Appendix 1. A separate submission from Emerson Stewart is contained in Appendix 2.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted 	

No.	Name	Address	Summary of submission	Comment	Modification to Draft DSP
			<p>4.1 Multiple Use Corridors Two Multiple Use Corridors (MUC) are identified on the DSP which traverse Peet's land. The first MUC is in alignment with a designated conservation area containing Manjedal Brook. A second MUC runs from the southern tip of the Serpentine Jarrahdale Grammar School and connects with Manjedal Brook. The District Water Management Strategy (DWMS) identifies these MUCs as aligning with the 100 year ARI flood extent. Clause 6.4 (Part 1) of the DSP deals with MUCs and states: <i>6.4 Multiple Use Corridors shall be provided generally in the locations identified within the District Structure Plan. The location, size and dimension of MUCs shall be determined at Local Structure Plan stage based upon the requirements of District and Local Water Management Strategies and LSP design. [our emphasis added]</i> The flood event modelling has been reviewed by Emerson Stewart who are of the view that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A large number of assumptions made by the DWMS are derived from a report prepared by Sinclair Knight Mertz in 2007 (SKM); • The SKM report recommended that further investigations into hydraulic behaviour are required in order to enable more detailed flood modelling; • As such, areas identified as being within the extent of a 100 year flood event may be inaccurate; and • Further detailed modelling will be necessary to more accurately determine flood extents and potential solutions including establishing alternative flood paths. <p>Given these comments, it is likely that more detailed modelling and appropriate engineering solutions may result in the need for, at a minimum, the second MUC being deleted, and more realistic flood management solutions being implemented based on improved data. The location and size of the second MUC can be better determined once a more detailed drainage model is established. It is therefore considered appropriate the second MUC be deleted from the DSP as its status is subject to further detailed investigations at LSP stage.</p> <p>The Enquiry by Design (workshop 25-27 March 2009) concept plan shows a MUC (linear park) on the eastern side of the railway line connecting to Manjedal Brook via the railway reserve. This is also confirmed by section 8.12 – stormwater management, of the Enquiry by Design (ED) outcomes report which depicts the flow path travelling south along the railway reserve, then connecting to Manjedal Brook. It is noted that the Shire's Local Planning Policy No. 9 – Multiple Use Trails identifies the Manjedal Brook MUC, but does not identify a trail or MUC in the second location between the school and Manjedal Brook as proposed by the DSP.</p> <p>4.2 Public Open Space The General Provisions of Part 1 of the DSP deal with the provision of POS. The provisions generally assert that POS provided within a MUC or as retained remnant vegetation "may" or "shall not" contribute to the 10% POS. This is inconsistent with Liveable Neighbourhoods (LN) and will result in more than 10% POS being required by the DSP. The oversupply of POS also has two significant implications on the Shire and wider region.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Firstly, the oversupply of POS will result in increased maintenance costs to the Shire into the future which may be difficult to contain; and • Secondly, the supply of urban land is critical to meeting the current and future population driven demand for housing. The oversupply of POS constrains the efficient use of urban land and ultimately reduces the supply of residential land and housing. <p>4.2.1 Multiple Use Corridors Clause 6.3.2 (Part 1) of the DSP deals with POS contributions within MUC's and states: <i>6.3.2 Those portions of Multiple Use Corridors (MUC) included within the MUC for the purposes of Public Open Space may be included within the 10% POS contribution. [our emphasis added]</i> Where a MUC incorporates an area of POS which qualifies for a POS contribution, either restricted or unrestricted, these areas must be included within the 10% POS contribution in accordance with LN. It will be necessary for clause 6.3.2 to be amended to be consistent with LN.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Multiple Use Corridors in the DSP reflect the most current version of the District Drainage and Water Management Strategy. The flood modelling confirms that the flow path exists, and that it conveys a significant volume of stormwater for it to be considered as an MUC. The scale and intent, however, may vary to other MUCs given the lack of existing vegetation in the MUC location and this will be determined at LSP stage. • Noted – the current wording in the DSP should be clarified. Clause 6.3.3 should be modified to more accurately reflect the relevant Liveable Neighbourhoods elements. • Noted – the current wording in the DSP should be clarified. Clause 6.3.3 should be modified to more accurately reflect the relevant Liveable Neighbourhoods elements. 	<p>No</p> <p>Yes – modify clause 6.3.3</p> <p>No</p>

No.	Name	Address	Summary of submission	Comment	Modification to Draft DSP
			<p>Clause 6.3.3 (Part 1) deals with contributions associated with restricted POS, and states: <i>6.3.3 Those portions of Multiple Use Corridors (MUC) included within the MUC for the purposes of urban water management, wetland protection of Conservation Category Wetlands (CCW) or wetlands of a similar environmental value, including relevant wetland buffers and Resource Enhancement Wetlands or wetland of similar environmental value shall not be included as public open space. Though may be allowed to contribute to the 2% restricted open space permitted in accordance with Liveable Neighbourhoods. [our emphasis added]</i></p> <p>The above clause appears to be contradictory. On one hand, areas of restricted POS shall not be included as POS; but on the other, they may be allowed to contribute as 2% restricted POS. To avoid confusion and misrepresentation of this provision it should clearly state that restricted POS shall contribute to the overall POS calculation in accordance with LN.</p> <p>4.2.2 Remnant Vegetation The DSP makes reference to the Shire of Serpentine-Jarrahdale Local Planning Policy 26 – Biodiversity Planning and Biodiversity Strategy (adopted by Council 27 October 2008). Clause 6.3.4 (Part 1) and its preamble state:</p> <p><i>In addition to the above and Liveable Neighbourhoods, it is the position of the District Structure Plan that the following shall apply: 6.3.4 Areas of remnant vegetation identified under the Shire of Serpentine-Jarrahdale Local Biodiversity Strategy shall be protected from subdivision and development and may be included within the 10% POS contribution. [our emphasis added]</i></p> <p>The DSP asserts that any remnant vegetation within the DSP area shall be protected and these areas are not automatically included in the 10% POS calculation, should they qualify under LN. The consequence of the preamble to clause 6.3.4 would be that such areas are to be provided in addition to the 10% POS contribution. As this is inconsistent with LN, the clause should be reworded to reaffirm these areas contribute to the 10% POS calculation. The preamble should be deleted.</p> <p>4.3 Primary School Sites The DSP has identified four primary schools are required to service the western half of the DSP, comprising of three new and one existing primary school. All three additional primary schools appear to be wholly contained on Peet's land. Current WAPC and Department of Education and Training (DET) policy guidelines require one primary school to be provided for every 1500-1800 dwellings. However, LN prescribes one primary school is to be provided for every 1500 dwellings. The DSP report projects a population range of between 30,000 to 40,000 people when fully developed. The estimated number of dwellings corresponding to this population range relevant to precincts E, F and G are set out in the table below. In addition, TBB has undertaken approximate lot yield calculations over precincts E, F and G, and estimates up to a total of 5,427 lots/dwellings could be accommodated, corresponding to 3.6 primary schools at a ratio of 1:1500 dwellings.</p> <p>Based on the lower population estimate of 30,000 people and our approximate lot yield calculations based on an average lot size of 550m² it does not appear likely that precincts E, F and G will generate the need for three additional primary schools. Therefore the number of additional primary schools proposed to service the western side should be reduced to two. The reduction in the number of primary schools will result in a redistribution of their location in accordance with Liveable Neighbourhoods.</p> <p>It is not usual practice for the location of primary schools to be prescribed at DSP stage in such detail, rather the general location is identified. The detailed location and layout should be considered at LSP stage. Given the large population range proposed by the DSP it is requested that only two additional primary schools servicing the western side of the railway be identified at this stage. The need for a fourth primary school, its location and design can be dealt with at LSP stage.</p>	<p>The DSP allows for vegetation to be included in the 10% requirement in accordance with Liveable Neighbourhoods. Though if areas of remnant vegetation identified under the Shire of Serpentine-Jarrahdale Local Biodiversity Strategy cannot be contained within the 10% requirement, these areas will need to be provided above the 10% requirement to ensure that these areas of remnant vegetation are protected.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DoE has advised that Primary School requirement is between 7-8 and its position is based on 8 to ensure no shortfall eventuates. • General Primary School locations are based upon the distribution of school sites over the entire DSP area at optimum build out not specific precincts. • Subsequent liaison with DoE have confirmed general locations as appropriate – however DoE to utilise more site specific investigations to confirm preferred site within area of general locations identified. • A direct link from the Bishop Road Tonkin Highway interchange is not supported. The DSP is designed to direct regional traffic along Tonkin Highway around Mundijong/Whitby onto South- 	<p>No</p> <p>No</p> <p>No</p>

No.	Name	Address	Summary of submission	Comment	Modification to Draft DSP
			<p>4.4 Bishop Street Diversion The ED concept plan diverted Bishop Street from its present alignment in a south easterly direction, crossing the railway line, directly connecting the new town centre and Tonkin Highway. This is considered a vital element in delivering a Town Centre and activity corridor which will support increased intensity of land use.</p> <p>The proposed DSP removes this direct connection. Indirect access to the Town Centre is proposed via Taylor Road or an additional railway crossing adjoining the Serpentine Jarrahdale Grammar School in the north. Given comments raised in the ED outcomes report (s. 10), it would appear unlikely that two railway crossings in close proximity would receive support from the responsible agencies.</p> <p>The proposed alternative road alignments will significantly reduce the energy of the Town Centre and development of an activity corridor between both the Town Centre and urban rail station, and Tonkin Highway. The direct connection between Tonkin Highway and the Town Centre should be re-established in accordance with the ED concept plan.</p> <p>4.5 Built Form Design Guidelines Objectives for built form design guidelines are required to be established at Local Structure Plan Stage and implemented as a Local Planning Policy prior to subdivision. The DSP states the design guidelines should be cognisant of sections 8.8 and 8.9 of the Shire's ED Report.</p> <p>These articulate a diversity of lot and housing product types from rural lifestyle (R5 density) to multiple dwelling and mixed use (R80 – 100) and encourage a sense of place. The sense of place is influenced by landscape and building form of the existing Mundijong town.</p> <p>Whilst these characteristics are important considerations when integrating new development with the influence of the existing town centre, it is unreasonable to constrain the development of greenfield areas (i.e. precincts E and G) to a narrow, prescribed set of design requirements. Such guidelines may stifle innovate design and housing choice for the future residents of the DSP area.</p> <p>It is recommended the development of objectives for the guidelines not be constrained by sections 8.8 and 8.9 of the ED outcomes report. Reference to these sections of the report in the preparation of guidelines for precincts E and G should be deleted.</p> <p>4.6 Landscape Design Guidelines The DSP requires landscape design guidelines to be provided at LSP stage to address both public and private landscaping. It is noted the leafy green feel of the old Mundijong town is characterised by a mixture of both local and Australian native species in combination with exotic species. The ED outcomes report (s. 8.9) encourages the use of <i>"native and/or cottage garden themes... to reinforce the existing rural hamlet character"</i>.</p> <p>The Sustainability Strategy for the DSP requires that landscape plans for LSP's are to have a minimum of 70% local native planting for public spaces, streetscapes and wild life corridors. Whilst it is possible to achieve 70% Australian native plants, with a significant proportion being from the Swan Coastal Plain, the ability to achieve 70% local native species is not practical.</p> <p>Given old Mundijong town incorporates a mixture of exotic and native species it will be necessary for the Shire, through the consideration of Landscape Design Guidelines, to</p>	<p>West Highway. Creation of a direct route at the northern side of Mundijong/Whitby does not support this objective, will result in regional traffic traversing through the urban community diminishing accessibility for residents to the Town Centre and place additional pressure on the proposed Town Centre rail crossing. Specialist commercial/retail planning advice confirms the current DSP proposal supports both resident's accessibility and the viability of the Town Centre.</p> <p>Sections 8.8 and 8.9 of the Enquiry-by-Design Outcomes Report cover a wide range of development forms from large single residential lots, through conventional suburban lots, to mixed-use urban development, which are appropriate to both new and existing development areas.</p> <p>Sections 8.8 and 8.9 of the Enquiry-by-Design Outcomes Report are not prescriptive requirements, but simply provide guidance on how local character might be developed. It is expected that developers' consultants will apply their additional expertise to interpret the advice provided and develop their own set of guidelines as part of a LSP that might deliver a recognisable sense of place.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is appropriate that urban design landscape guidelines be required at LSP stage, however, greater guidance could be provided as to what these should address as part of the DSP. • A great diversity of local native species are available, but often only grown at a commercial scale if requested – therefore, sufficient quantities should be available if sufficiently planned for. Nevertheless guaranteeing such a supply may be difficult. On this basis it is suggested the Sustainability Strategy 3.1.3 e) be modified to provide more flexibility by requiring landscape plans within local structure plans to primarily include local native planting for public spaces, streetscapes and also wildlife 	<p>Yes – modify the DSP to include greater clarity and guidance for matters to be addressed and the structure of Urban and Landscape Design Guidelines to be required as part of LSP's.</p> <p>Yes – modification to Sustainability Strategy 3.1.3</p>

No.	Name	Address	Summary of submission	Comment	Modification to Draft DSP
			<p>apply some degree of flexibility around the 70% requirement for local native species.</p> <p>Section 5.3.1.6 (Part 2) should be amended at point 6 to state that 'where practicable' landscaping of public and private spaces to consist of locally native species.</p> <p>4.7 Third Pipe The DSP requires LSP's which cover precincts A, C, E and G to demonstrate provisions for the implementation of a Third Pipe system to address Integrated Water Cycle Management (IWCM). It is unclear as to why this requirement has not been applied to precincts B, D and F given the DSP facilitates the urbanisation of large, underdeveloped allotments within these precincts. The ad-hoc application of this requirement is not equitable and should therefore be deleted.</p> <p>Furthermore, the ED outcomes report (s. 8.13) recognises that whilst the implementation of IWCM can be applied at the lot, subdivisional or local catchment level, the application of a system (ie. Third Pipe) at the broader catchment level requires further detailed investigations.</p> <p>4.8 Service Corridor (Precinct E) A Service Corridor is proposed to be located on the eastern side of Tonkin Highway within precinct E. The service corridor is proposed to be approximately 30 to 40 metres in width, however it is understood the final width is yet to be confirmed.</p> <p>It is considered this service corridor should be located on the western side of Tonkin Highway or within the Tonkin Highway Road reservation. This will ensure the urban land resource is efficiently utilised given population driven demand for housing and land. In the event the service corridor is not able to be relocated or collocated within the Tonkin Highway Road reserve it is recommended that the need for a 30 to 40 metre wide service corridor be reviewed to enable a more efficient use of the land.</p> <p>4.9 Undefined Use of Lot 98 The structure plan designates a blank, uncoloured area on the southern portion of lot 98 adjoining a proposed primary school. The Shire has confirmed this is an error on the plan and is intended to be residential.</p> <p>4.10 Transport Study A Transport Study dated September 2007 has been provided in support of the DSP. It is noted the study does not consider the implications of the DSP as its preparation predates the release of the DSP. It will be necessary for the Transport Study to be updated and DSP modified where necessary.</p> <p>4.11 Developer Contributions The Shire has confirmed a developer contribution plan has not been finalised but has indicated a draft contribution scheme is likely for public comment by the end of the year or early next year. We retain the right to make further submissions with respect to the DSP in the event the Developer Contribution plan has implications on the DSP.</p> <p>5 CONCLUSION In conclusion the DSP is generally supported; however the following concerns and comments to be addressed by the Shire prior to the final adoption of the DSP:</p>	<p>corridors.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft DSP states that a third pipe system is to be installed. As this approach is currently under investigation requiring its installation prior to the completion of the investigation is premature. In the eventuality that the investigation supports installation of a third pipe system, the opportunity for such a system could be protected in the interim by provision being made to accommodate future installation in the planning and design of LSP's and subdivision. • The Draft DSP did not place the requirement for a third pipe on areas in fragmented ownership due to the width of existing local roads making it difficult to achieve. As the requirement now relates to protecting the future provision of third pipe, this requirement should be included for Precinct F, B and D. • The location of the service corridor and the road reservation are determined in accordance with the requirements of Main Roads and the public utility service providers. To change the location of the service corridor would require further consultation and agreement will all stakeholders. The same applies to co-location of the services corridor and the road reserve – historically Main Roads has resisted this particularly where a road could potentially become a freeway. • The width of the services corridor should be determined as part of the Local Structure Plan. • Noted – drafting error to be rectified • Noted – updated traffic modelling based on the DSP is currently being progressed. • Noted - The Shire will be progressing preparation of development contribution arrangements in the short term. It is likely that the DSP is finally adopted prior to a draft DCA, though all landowners will have the opportunity to comment on the DCA. 	<p>Yes – Modify DSP clauses relating to provision of a third pipe system.</p> <p>Yes – insert clause into Precinct F, B and D to require spatial provision for third pipe.</p> <p>No</p> <p>Modify DSP plan</p>

No.	Name	Address	Summary of submission	Comment	Modification to Draft DSP
			<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Delete the second MUC within precinct G, running between the existing private high school and Manjedal Brook from the DSP as the proposed alignment is not supported by detailed flood modelling, the ED concept plan/report, nor is it identified in the Shire's Local Planning Policy No. 9; 2. Amend the DSP report to reflect all POS is to be provided in accordance with LN. This to include a recognition that both restricted POS and areas of remnant vegetation contribute to the required 10% amount of POS; 3. Delete one primary school from the western side of the DSP area, and redistribute the remaining two primary schools in accordance with Liveable Neighbourhoods, showing a general location; 4. Reinstate the direct link between Tonkin Highway and the Town Centre in accordance with the ED concept plan; 5. Delete the requirement for built form design guidelines for precinct E and G; 6. Amend the DSP to clearly state that <i>'wherever practicable'</i> landscaping of private and public spaces shall consist of local native planting as, firstly; the minimum criteria of 70% stated in the DSP Sustainability Strategy is unrealistic, and secondly; does not support the landscape theme of cottage gardens to reinforce the rural hamlet as identified in the ED outcomes report; 7. Delete the requirement for a Third Pipe system in precincts E and G as the implementation of such a system has not been investigated as required by the ED outcomes report and is therefore inequitable as it is applied on an ad-hoc basis throughout the DSP land; 8. Relocate the service corridor to the western side of Tonkin Highway or co-locate the service corridor within the Tonkin Highway road reserve. If this is not supported, reduce the proposed service corridor width to ensure the efficient use of urban land which is a limited resource in demand; 9. Amend the DSP to reflect the intended residential land use of the blank area on the southern portion of lot 98; and 10. Provide an updated Transport Study which reflects the proposed DSP. <p><i>(Appending this submission from TBB was a review of the DWMS (GHD Draft 1, September 2009) and Infrastructure and Services Strategy Rev 1 SKM April 2010 undertaken by Emerson Stewart on behalf of Peet Ltd)</i></p>		
39	Ron & Dorothy Bettesworth	PO Box 33 MUNDIJONG WA 6123	Will Local Planning Policy No. 16 – Paterson St Design Guidelines be continued?	<p>Paterson Street Guidelines are currently proposed to be continued. As part of preparation of a Local Structure Plan or policy for the existing Mundijong town site it may be determined that the Paterson Street Guidelines are no longer necessary and the policy may be discontinued. In the meantime, the Paterson Street Design Guidelines will continue to guide development along Paterson Street.</p> <p>'Should any modification to the Paterson Street Guidelines occur or should any documentation replace the Paterson Street Guidelines it must be ensured that the objectives and principles of the current policy are maintained.'</p>	No
40	Vitalina Madeo	PO Box 229 MUNDIJONG WA 6123	<p>My property just falls on the top left corner of the boundary of Precinct F. I do not object to the Shire's proposal that a Minor Shopping Area be created on the intersection of Keirnan Street, Adams and Taylor Roads. I do however have a few concerns with the stages of development for each of the precincts:</p> <p>1.0 Precinct F as shown on the DSP has fragmented ownership and as my property just falls into this precinct, the future development of my property will be hindered if not stalled because of the large number of owners in this precinct not being able to agree on a common goal.</p> <p>2.0 Regarding the lower section of Precinct G and the top section of Precinct F where the</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Shire has not committed to funding for preparation of LSP in Mundijong/Whitby and may or may not choose to do so in the future. • The Shire has prepared a draft interim policy to guide development in Mundijong/Whitby prior to an LSP being in place. 	No

No.	Name	Address	Summary of submission	Comment	Modification to Draft DSP
			<p>boundary runs along Keirnan Street, the lower part of Precinct G as shown on the DSP also has fragmented ownership and two major landholders being Wellstand Pty Ltd and Peet Limited. The corner of Precinct G and Precinct F (the intersection of Keirnan Street, Adams Rd and Taylor Road has been earmarked to be a Minor shopping Centre/Precinct. My property falls on the boundary of these two precincts; it would be unfair for the landowners on the boundary of Precinct F to watch the Minor Centre develop across the road but not be able to develop their side of the road or to be able to sell it to a potential developer because they have to wait until everything else is developed before the Shire even looks at drafting a LSP for Precinct F. I believe that the Shire of Serpentine Jarrahdale should immediately prepare a LSP for Precinct F.</p> <p>If the Shire drafted a LSP for boundary of Precincts F and G, it would give these current landowners security for their future that they would know what was happening, that they can sell; sub-divide and/or develop. It will also increase the potential for developers to come in and purchase land in this area knowing that they can develop and what the Shire is expecting from them.</p> <p>A Shire drafted Local Structure Plan for Precinct F (including lower section of Precinct G) will also put in place the foundations (infrastructure, ie roads, parks etc) for which the other major developers can then extend onto and into their developments. By doing this, future developments can be connected into precinct F where one precinct would flow in to another, thereby all precincts are connected rather than 7 individual precincts that cause a traffic and development nightmare and which don't work well with each other.</p> <p>3.0 Relating to Precinct A; I believe that Urban Pacific Limited wish to develop their land holdings immediately and that they are in the process of finalising a LSP for this. Their landholdings fall in Precinct A, which I believe is to be the new township of Mundijong and a major town centre. I do not have a problem with Urban Pacific's desire to draft a LSP in relation to their landholdings; my concern with the future development of Precinct A is that the Shire should be working simultaneously with Urban Pacific. The LSPs for Precincts A, B, D and F should flow into each other. The precincts should be connected to each.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Landowners comments have been considered as part of preparation of the draft interim policy. Noted 	
41	Roberts Day On behalf of Qube Pty Ltd	Level 1, 130 Royal St EAST PERTH WA 6004	<p><u>Integrated Water Cycle Management (IWCM Third Pipe System)</u></p> <p>It is not clear from the DSP report what "<i>provision for the implementation of a Third Pipe System....</i>" means.</p> <p>In proposing this initiative it should be incumbent on the Shire to undertake a detailed economic feasibility to identify all operational considerations, costs and benefits of the system and to ensure approvals are in place to enable the system to be viable and implementable prior to including provision of third pipe infrastructure in the DSP.</p> <p>Provision of third pipe infrastructure imposes a significant cost impost, adding several thousands of dollars to the cost of each lot created. It is understood that IWCM is a key initiative of the DSP Sustainability Strategy. Given the cost associated with implementing a third pipe system and the lack of certainty surrounding the ability to efficiently operate a system within this area, the costs associated with this initiative could be better spent on other initiatives (design, sustainability, community) where the outcomes have a greater degree of certainty and benefit.</p> <p>It is also noted that the requirement for a third pipe system is not applied to all precincts within the DSP area. This raises issues of equity across the DSP area as it imposes a significant cost impost on some landowners in the form of additional subdivisional costs placing them at a commercial disadvantage when compared with landowners in precincts where a third pipe system is not required. It is unfair and onerous for the DSP to indiscriminately require a third pipe system in only some precincts, placing these landowners at a distinct and serious disadvantage and as such, the third pipe requirement should be deleted.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Draft DSP states that a third pipe system is to be installed. As this approach is currently under investigation requiring its installation prior to the completion of the investigation is premature. In the eventuality that the investigation supports installation of a third pipe system, the opportunity for such a system could be protected in the interim by provision being made to accommodate future installation in the planning and design of LSP's and subdivision. 	Yes – Modify DSP clauses relating to provision of a third pipe system.

No.	Name	Address	Summary of submission	Comment	Modification to Draft DSP
			<p>Section 7 in Part one of the DSP report requires the following of some precincts (A, C, E and G) "LSP's shall demonstrate provision for the implementation of a Third Pipe System as part of development of the LSP area". Section 13 of Part two of the DSP report states that "A third pipe scheme is required to be implemented to ensure that any outcome as a result of further investigations into the Integrated Water Cycle Management options can be retrospectively applied"</p> <p>If "provision for implementation" means providing sufficient width within road reserves/service corridors to enable a third pipe system to, at some time in the future be funded, physically constructed and operated; then this may be possible to accommodate depending on the exact land take implications.</p> <p>However if "provision for implementation" means that the developer/landowner is responsible for funding and constructing dormant third pipe infrastructure that can only be used once an overall system is established and operating, then the proposal is strongly opposed.</p> <p><u>Management Plans</u></p> <p>Clarity is needed with regard to requirements for various Management Plans.</p> <p>There are a number of management plans required in the DSP report, the supporting documents and in Local Planning Policy 29. There appears to be an overlap in what each of these documents requires and this requires further clarification.</p> <p>Part one of the DSP report identifies matters that need to be addressed within the LSP's for each precinct and includes reference to LPP 29. However Section 3 in Part two of the document also makes reference to various management requirements. It would be useful if all environmental management requirements were identified in one section. It is also important that where a management plan is required that information on when the plan is required and what needs to included in the plan is also detailed.</p> <p><u>Location of Primary School sites</u></p> <p>Two Primary School sites are proposed in Precinct C of the DSP. One of these sites is located on our clients land. On 15 March 2007, following a meeting with the Shires Senior Strategic Planner a concept plan for Lot 492 was lodged with the Shire. As outlined in the covering letter, the purpose of preparing the concept plan was to provide Council with an indication of our client's aspirations for the property and to assist Council in the formulation of the DSP.</p> <p>The need for 2 Primary Schools to be located within Precinct C is questionable with respect to demand and with respect to location of the sites within their catchments. The site located on our clients land (lot 492) is adjacent to Watkins Road, a major District Road and a large area of Bush Forever/Regional Parks and Recreation. Both these adjacent land uses form major barriers to the site. We believe that one Primary school should be sufficient to cater for the demand of Precinct C and that this Primary school should be centrally located within the catchment on lot 4995 or lot 50.</p> <p>Earlier discussion with the Department of Education (DoE) confirm the need for 6 primary schools to service the Mundijong Whitby district. If a seventh primary school is to be</p>	<p>Agreed. Greater clarification should be provided to detail the following:</p> <p>Local Structure Plans are required to include a Landscaping Masterplan and Landscape Survey including a visual landscape assessment. A Landscaping and Vegetation Management Plan will be required at subdivision stage.</p> <p>Where development is proposed near wetlands, a Wetland Management Strategy is required at Local Structure Plan stage and a Wetland Management Plan in accordance with DEC Guidelines is required at subdivision stage.</p> <p>A level 2 flora and fauna survey is required at Local Structure Plan stage. Where the clearing of native and remnant vegetation is proposed a flora and fauna management plan may be required at subdivision stage.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DoE has advised that Primary School requirement is between 7-8 and its position is based on 8 to ensure no shortfall eventuates. • General Primary School locations are based upon the distribution of school sites over the entire DSP area at optimum build out not specific precincts. • Subsequent liaison with DoE has confirmed general locations as appropriate – however DoE to utilise more site specific investigations to confirm preferred site within area of general locations identified. 	<p>Yes – Include greater clarification on Management Plans within DSP</p>

No.	Name	Address	Summary of submission	Comment	Modification to Draft DSP
			<p>considered, a logical location would be south of Watkins Road as a school in this location could also service the rural hinterland to the south of the DSP area. If and when the large special rural/lifestyle lots in Precinct B are subdivided for residential lots, the demand for a seventh primary school will be derived from this precinct.</p> <p><u>Wetlands</u></p> <p>Based on current DEC mapping there are existing Conservation Category Wetlands (CCW's) within our clients landholdings. The areas mapped as 'conservation wetland' have been submitted for revaluation from CCW's to Multiple Use Wetlands (MUW's) as the on the ground values do not reflect the current mapped management categories. At this stage the CCW's are shown on various plans and figures within the DSP report and supporting documents, however should the reclassification be successful the DSP information will be superseded.</p> <p><u>Public Open Space (POS) calculation method</u></p> <p>Section 6.3 of Part one outlines provisions which apply to the calculation of POS as per Liveable Neighbourhoods (LN) requirements. The wording and format of section 6.3.3 could be interpreted to mean that buffers to Resource Enhancement Wetlands (REW) wetlands cannot be included as unrestricted POS. This is not consistent with LN Element 4 Requirement 33 which does not identify REW buffers as restricted POS. We would be seeking unrestricted POS credits for any land contained within REW buffers in accordance with LN.</p> <p><u>Remnant Vegetation - Locally Significant Natural Areas</u></p> <p>Clarity and consistency of terminology is needed within the DSP Documents and the Local Biodiversity Strategy in order to clearly articulate what is expected with respect to remnant vegetation outside of Bush Forever Sites.</p> <p>Section 6.3.4 of Part one of the DSP report states that areas of remnant vegetation identified in the Local Biodiversity Strategy shall be protected from subdivision and development.</p> <p>Section 10.2 of Part two of the DSP report indicates the DSP identifies '<i>locally significant natural areas</i>'; however this statement is not referenced to any particular Figure. 'Figure 20 – Identified Local Biodiversity Sites' identifies '<i>Potentially Locally Significant Natural Areas</i>'.</p> <p>We support the principle of retention of remnant vegetation on the basis of site specific assessment and verification of the vegetation quality and values and consideration of all other LSP issues. We do not support the outright requirement for protection of all remnant vegetation from subdivision or development.</p> <p><u>Noise Buffers</u></p> <p>Where the DSP refers to noise emissions from the current railway and highway or proposed Tonkin Highway/freight line, there appears to be a presumption that acoustic management will be dealt with through buffers/separation distances. Clarity should be provided on what is meant by buffer – is it an area in which no development can occur, or is it an area that will require noise investigation and potentially mitigation. We recognise that there is likely to be noise impacts from these land uses, however reference should be made to LSP's showing that future development will appropriately address the requirements under <i>State Planning Policy 5.4 Rail and Transport Noise and freight Considerations in Land Use Planning</i>. Under SPP 5.4 there is flexibility in how noise impacts can be mitigated' such as through noise walls, setbacks and/or quiet house design which ever best satisfies the proposed land-use and likely noise impacts. This should be clearly reflected in the DSP to avoid confusion associated with the term 'buffers'.</p> <p><u>Sustainability Strategy</u></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DSP reflects current status of wetlands mapping • Noted – the current wording in the DSP should be clarified. Clause 6.3.3 should be modified to more accurately reflect the relevant Liveable Neighbourhoods elements. • Agreed • Agreed – DSP should be modified to remove reference to noise buffers and instead require the addressing of appropriate noise mitigation measures in accordance with SPP 5.4 at LSP stage. 	<p>Yes - modify clause 6.3.3</p> <p>Modify 6.3.4 of part one of the DSP to state: "Potentially locally significant natural areas identified under the Shire of Serpentine Jarrahdale Local Biodiversity Strategy shall be protected from subdivision and development and may be included within the 10% POS contribution."</p> <p>Modify Section 10.2 to refer to 'Potentially Locally Significant Natural Areas'.</p> <p>Yes – modify DSP to reference SPP 5.4 and noise mitigation measures.</p>

No.	Name	Address	Summary of submission	Comment	Modification to Draft DSP
			<p>In general we support the intention of the Draft Sustainability Strategy. We have concerns relating to some of the Water Resources and Biodiversity Strategies.</p> <p>Our concerns relating to the provision of a Third Pipe system have been addressed above. With respect to imported fill, we are also opposed to the suggestion in the SMEC Environmental Study that fill be brought in to maximise phosphorous retention time. We do not agree with the specification of fill with a specific Phosphorous Retention Index (PRI) or any other specific solution at DWMS stage. Soils should have an adequate Phosphorous Retention Index (PRI) in line with State requirements. Objectives for nutrient attenuation should be outlined, consistent with State guidelines.</p> <p>With respect to landscaping, we are concerned about being able to meet the 70% target for all landscaped planting to be comprised of local native plant species. We support the intent of this requirement however we are concerned that a sufficient diversity of local native species may not be available at a commercial scale. In view of this we suggest this target be reconsidered.</p> <p><u>General comments</u></p> <p>Most of the figures included in the DSP report are not referenced in any corresponding text and the applicability and context of the information shown in the Figures is therefore not clear. Conversely Figure 6 is referenced in the text but does not appear in the report. There are also a number of minor typographical errors, of particular note is the reference to medium sized rural residential properties as R20 – R40 in Part two section 2.1.2.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns raised in the submission are noted, however, it is considered there is opportunity to achieve the target of 70% PRI where extensive nutrient application will eventuate post development such as in turfed active POS areas. The DSP should be modified to require this target to be met at such areas. A great diversity of local native species are available, but often only grown at a commercial scale if requested – therefore, sufficient quantities should be available if sufficiently planned for. Nevertheless guaranteeing such a supply may be difficult. On this basis it is suggested the Sustainability Strategy 3.1.3 e) be modified to provide more flexibility by requiring landscape plans within local structure plans to primarily include local native planting for public spaces, streetscapes and also wildlife corridors. Noted – Fig 6 should be included. 	<p>Yes – modify DSP to require 70% PRI at active POS areas.</p> <p>Yes – modification to Sustainability Strategy 3.1.3</p> <p>Yes – include Fig.6 in documentation.</p>
42	Roberts Day On behalf of Urban Pacific Ltd.	Level 1, 130 Royal St EAST PERTH WA 6004	<p>Key Issues of Concern</p> <p>They key issues we wish to raise are summarised below and are furthered detailed in the attached table and appendices. The attached table is based on the Contents page of the DSP report and follows the structure of the report by Part and Section numbers. Where detailed technical advice has been provided by a member of our clients consultant team in separate correspondence, this has been included as an appendix and cross referenced in the table.</p> <p>With respect to the DSP plan we have proposed a number of changes which reflect the detailed planning we are currently undertaking with respect to preparation of a Local Structure Plan for Precinct A. We have annotated a copy of the advertised DSP to identify the proposed changes. We have also produced a revised DSP plan showing these changes. Copies of these plans are attached.</p> <p><u>Integrated Water Cycle Management (IWCM) Third Pipe System</u></p> <p>We do not support the provision of dormant third pipe infrastructure as a requirement of subdivision within the DSP area for the following reasons.</p> <p>(i) It is not clear from the DSP report what “<i>provision for the implementation of a Third Pipe System...</i>” means. The position is therefore unclear and vague and there is no certainty regarding the form or timing of a third pipe system. With such limited information it is unreasonable for such a requirement to be included in the DSP.</p> <p>(ii) In proposing this initiative it should be incumbent on the Shire to undertake a detailed economic feasibility to identify all operational considerations, costs and benefits of the system and to ensure approvals are in place to enable the system to be viable and implementable prior to including provision of third pipe infrastructure in the DSP.</p> <p>(iii) Cossill and Webley have reviewed the 3 options for an IWCM discussed in the DSP document and provided comment on implementation implications (see attached correspondence). Their conclusion is that incorporation of a dual water supply system</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Draft DSP states that a third pipe system is to be installed. As this approach is currently under investigation requiring its installation prior to the completion of the investigation is premature. In the eventuality that the investigation supports installation of a third pipe system, the opportunity for such a system could be protected in the interim by provision being made to accommodate future installation in the planning and design of LSP's and subdivision. The Draft DSP did not place the requirement for a third pipe on areas in fragmented ownership due to the width of existing local roads making it difficult to achieve. As the requirement now relates to protecting the future provision of third pipe, this requirement should be included for Precinct F, B and D. 	<p>Yes – Modify DSP clauses relating to provision of a third pipe system and insert clause into Precinct F, B and D to require spatial provision for third pipe.</p>

No.	Name	Address	Summary of submission	Comment	Modification to Draft DSP
			<p>is not appropriate for the Whitby precinct as it is neither practical nor economically viable.</p> <p>Areas of concern identified by Cossill and Webley in relation to Option 2 include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • required abstraction rates and implications for the number of bores or the need for major storage facilities; • the high cost of this infrastructure and the likelihood that it will not meet the Water Corporations economic analysis for them to accept responsibility for service provision; and • additional costs associated with the need to treat bore water used for in-house non drinking supply. <p>(iv) Provision of third pipe infrastructure imposes a significant cost impost, adding several thousands of dollars to the cost of each lot created. It is understood that IWCM is a key initiative of the DSP Sustainability Strategy. Given the cost associated with implementing a third pipe system and the lack of certainty surrounding the ability to efficiently operate a system within this area the costs associated with this initiative could be better spent on other initiatives (design, sustainability, community) where the outcomes have a greater degree of certainty and benefit.</p> <p>(v) It is also noted that the requirement for a third pipe system is not applied to all precincts within the DSP area. This raises issues of equity across the DSP area as it imposes a significant cost impost on some landowners in the form of additional subdivisional costs placing them at a commercial disadvantage when compared with landowners in precincts where a third pipe system is not required. It is unfair and onerous for the DSP to indiscriminately require a third pipe system in only some precincts, placing these landowners at a distinct and serious disadvantage and as such, the third pipe requirement should be deleted.</p> <p><u>Management Plans</u></p> <p>Clarity is needed with regard to requirements for various Management Plans.</p> <p>There are a number of management plans required in the DSP report, the supporting documents and in Local Planning Policy 29. There appears to be an overlap in what each of these documents requires and this requires further clarification and clear articulation in the DSP. This is further outlined in attached correspondence from Cardno. Some specific examples are outlined below.</p> <p>Part one of the DSP report identifies matters that need to be addressed within the LSP's for each precinct and includes reference to LPP 29. However Section 3 in Part Two of the document also makes reference to various management requirements. It would be useful if all environmental management requirements were identified in one section. It is also important that where a management plan is required, that information on when the plan is required and what needs to included in the plan is also detailed.</p> <p>Another matter of particular note is the requirement for a Foreshore Management Plan (FMP) for Manjedal Brook. Manjedal Brook traverses the DSP area through Precincts A, B and G and forms the boundary between Precincts A and B. Precinct A is the only Precinct in which a FMP is a requirement of the LSP and the FMP is required for both sides of the Brook effectively requiring the proponent of a LSP for Precinct A to prepare a FMP for land located within Precinct B. There is no requirement for a FMP for the section of Manjedal Brook located within Precinct G. This inconsistency needs to be addressed to ensure that the DSP requirements are applied equitably.</p> <p>Whilst we note that there is an issue of inconsistency and inequity with respect to the requirement for preparation of a FMP we are not opposed to taking on the responsibility of preparing the document subject to implementation responsibilities being equitably allocated and subject to the costs of the preparation of the FMP being a DCA item to enable cost sharing between Precincts A and B.</p>	<p>Agreed. Greater clarification should be provided to detail the following: Local Structure Plans are required to include a Landscaping Masterplan and Landscape Survey including a visual landscape assessment. A Landscaping and Vegetation Management Plan will be required at subdivision stage.</p> <p>Where development is proposed near wetlands, a Wetland Management Strategy is required at Local Structure Plan stage and a Wetland Management Plan in accordance with DEC Guidelines is required at subdivision stage.</p> <p>A level 2 flora and fauna survey is required at Local Structure Plan stage. Where the clearing of native and remnant vegetation is proposed a flora and fauna management plan may be required at subdivision stage.</p> <p>Whilst development of Precinct B will generate the need for management of Manjedal Brook, due to the fragmented landownership within Precinct B, development is likely to occur in the long term. The equitable allocation of costs, as suggested within the submission, will need to be addressed through the DCA process.</p>	<p>Yes – Include greater clarification on Management Plans within DSP</p>

No.	Name	Address	Summary of submission	Comment	Modification to Draft DSP
			<p><u>Bush Forever Negotiated Planning Solution Parks and Recreation Reserve Boundary</u></p> <p>Bush Forever Site 354 is subject to a Negotiated Planning Solution (NPS). Section 3.3 of Part two of the DSP report states that <i>“The boundary of Bush Forever Site 354 has been successfully renegotiated with the WAPC by Urban Pacific.”</i> A copy of correspondence from DPI relating to the NPS is attached</p> <p>Plan 1 in Part One and Figure 30 in Part Two of the DSP Report identify the pre NPS boundary of BF Site 354 as Parks and Recreation. These Plans/Figures and others throughout the DSP report (i.e. Fig 5, Fig 8, Fig 9, Fig 31, and possibly Fig 6) should be modified to correctly reflect the BF NPS boundary and the future Parks and Recreation (P&R) boundary. The boundary of the Urban zoned land and the future P&R land has been established by virtue of the lifting of the urban deferred zoning which was gazetted in December 2006.</p> <p>The DSP needs to accurately recognise this and clearly establish that the Bush Forever boundary has been determined and requires no further investigation.</p> <p><u>Location of High School and Primary School Sites</u></p> <p>We have met with representatives of the Department of Education (DoE) to discuss the location of the schools within Precinct A. We have been progressing the preparation of a LSP for this precinct and have, in consultation with the DoE, refined the location of the proposed school sites. The location of these sites is shown on the attached amended Figure 30 District Structure Plan and proposes a combined High School and Primary School site to the south of the precinct and a second Primary School Site centrally located towards the north of the site. The DoE are supportive of the proposed location of school sites within Precinct A.</p> <p><u>TAFE site</u></p> <p>We have also discussed the proposed TAFE site with a representative of the Department of Training and Workforce Development (DTWD). We understand that the department does not support the identification of a TAFE site within the DSP and that TAFE are not in a position to acquire the land at commercial land values in an appropriate timeframe. The advice received from the department is that whilst they are seeking a TAFE site in the outer south east metropolitan area, they have identified a preferred site in Armadale and are currently in negotiations to secure the site. Should these negotiations be successful they will not be in need of an additional site. In view of this they cannot commit to or categorically support the proposed TAFE site within the MW DSP.</p> <p>The need for a TAFE in the DSP area is not supported by any demand or needs analysis and there appears to be no requirement from DTWD for a TAFE in the DSP area. In addition with respect to Precinct A, a significant amount of land (approx 18 ha) is required for the school uses. Spatially, Precinct A is providing significant areas of land for education purposes and it is unreasonable to impose a further district education facility in this precinct.</p> <p>We are progressing with Local Structure Planning and the provision of a TAFE site could require an additional 10 ha of land to be allocated for this use. Given that TAFE have a preferred site in Armadale which is developable in the short term as it has access to infrastructure and services and is within close proximity to existing public transport, it is not considered reasonable to identify a TAFE site within the DSP area and we do not support this proposal.</p> <p><u>Landscape Protection Policy - Local Planning Policy 8 (LPP8)</u></p> <p>We do not support the application of LPP8 within the DSP area and particularly to Precinct A.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agreed • Agreed • The DTWD have advised Shire Officers that it would prefer that the TAFE be noted as a possible future TAFE site. • The DSP cannot prevent LPP8 from applying to precinct A. An amendment to LPP8 may be considered to ensure consistency with the vision and intent of the DSP. • Noted – retain LPP 8 and delete requirement for larger lots in 	<p>Yes – Modify DSP plan accordingly</p> <p>Yes – modify DSP plan accordingly.</p> <p>Yes – The DSP be modified to note the identification of a site for the purposes of a possible future Technical and Further Education (TAFE) campus of approximately 10ha within proximity to the future District Centre. The following criteria shall apply in determining the final location of a possible TAFE site within a Local Structure Plan:</p> <p>Adjacent to a Neighbourhood Connector Road. Within 800m of a proposed transport node. Within 800m of the proposed District Centre.</p> <p>Should it be identified in the future that the site is not required to be provided for a TAFE, an Amendment to any Local Structure Plan is to be considered to remove the requirement for a TAFE site. Any decision to remove the possible TAFE site should be undertaken in consultation with the Shire and the Department of Training and Workforce Development.</p> <p>Yes – modify DSP accordingly.</p>

No.	Name	Address	Summary of submission	Comment	Modification to Draft DSP
			<p>We support the broad principle of landscape protection however we believe this policy in its current form is not relevant or appropriate for Urban zoned land which will be ultimately subdivided into residential lots. We have reviewed the requirement of the policy including the figures and can only conclude the policy when originally drafted was not intended to apply to Urban land. We acknowledge that it may be relevant should development occur on the rural zoned land however we do note that the adjacent rural residential subdivision in Precinct B is not subject to this policy</p> <p>The Landscape Protection Policy identifies 5 objectives which are applied to all areas depicted on an attached Map 1. Map 1 identifies significant areas of Urban zoned land located within the DSP area and in particular Precinct A.</p> <p>It will not be practicable or reasonable to require compliance with the policy provisions for the land depicted on Map 1 within Precinct A. In an urban context, opportunities to retain vegetation generally exist in areas of local open space or road reserves, and nature reserves adjacent to areas such as Manjedal Brook, or within Bush Forever sites. Due to the size of the urban lots dictated by the market and density targets in the DSP and other WAPC planning policies, it will not be possible to screen development or vehicle access points from view or achieve the landscape protection objectives of the policy.</p> <p>In addition to the above the requirements of LPP8 are contrary to the density targets and Direction 2031. Section 5.3.3.2 suggests larger lots in the Landscape Protection area. This is inappropriate adjacent to the District Centre and will not support the realisation of a passenger rail extension</p> <p>The policy requires a planning application to be lodged for all development in the Landscape Protection Area including dwellings and outbuildings. Planning applications are to be supported by information relating to such matters as revegetation along access roads, screening of access to the lot, vegetation to be removed from the site and a schedule of colours and finishes. This information would be appropriate and relevant if the land were zoned rural or rural residential, however it is not appropriate or relevant for urban lots of approximately 350m² - 500m² in area which have been predominantly cleared and filled to achieve engineering, drainage and building standards. In addition, the requirement for a Planning Application for each dwelling will require significant staff resources to administer as hundreds of lots will be affected by this requirement.</p> <p>In view of the above we believe that Map 1 needs to be modified to exclude land which will be subdivided for residential use. Of the 5 objectives listed in the policy we believe that objective 4 which seeks to maintain the integrity of landscapes in the line of sight view corridor along identified scenic routes and natural water courses is the most relevant to urban zoned land. The underlying outcome being sought by this objective can be achieved by alternative measures undertaken through Local Structure Planning and Subdivision processes particularly the retention of existing vegetation in selected areas identified via a landscaping master plan as required by LPP 29.</p> <p><u>Remnant Vegetation - Local Biodiversity Strategy and Identified Local Natural Areas (LNA's)</u></p> <p>We support the principle of retention of remnant vegetation on the basis of site specific assessment and verification of the vegetation quality and values and consideration of all other LSP issues. We do not support the outright requirement for protection of all remnant vegetation from subdivision or development and submit that the DSP should seek only to provide statements to direct the LSP's to retain remnant vegetation where possible.</p> <p>Clarity and consistency of terminology is needed within the DSP Documents and the Local Biodiversity Strategy in order to clearly articulate what is expected with respect to remnant vegetation outside of Bush Forever Sites.</p> <p>Section 6.3.4 of Part One of the DSP report states that areas of remnant vegetation identified in the Local Biodiversity Strategy shall be protected from subdivision and</p>	<p>DSP.</p> <p>Agreed</p>	<p>Modify 6.3.4 of part one of the DSP to state: "Potentially <u>l</u>ocally significant natural areas identified under the Shire of Serpentine Jarrahdale Local Biodiversity Strategy shall be protected from subdivision and development and may be included within the 10% POS contribution."</p> <p>Modify Section 10.2 to refer to 'Potentially Locally Significant Natural Areas'.</p>

No.	Name	Address	Summary of submission	Comment	Modification to Draft DSP
			<p>development.</p> <p>Section 10.2 of Part two of the DSP report indicates the DSP identifies 'locally significant natural areas', however this statement is not referenced to any particular Figure. 'Figure 20 – Identified Local Biodiversity Sites' identifies 'Potentially Locally Significant Natural Areas'.</p> <p><u>Community Services and Facilities Plan</u></p> <p>It is our intention to address the provision of community services and facilities as part of preparation of the LSP for Precinct A. In this regard we are intending to commission a Community Facilities Planning report will have regard for the Shire's Community Services and Facilities Plan and provide us with advice on the Whitby Precinct. We are confident that we will be able to make provision for a number of the items identified in the Shires report for the Mundijong/Whitby/Mardella area within Precinct A.</p> <p><u>Transport issues - Rail Crossings and Roads</u></p> <p>There are a number of transport issues related to Precinct A that we wish to comment on. These issues are outlined in the attached correspondence from Transcore, Cardno and Department for Planning and Infrastructure. Of key importance to our client are the reasons for the location of the access points to SW Highway which are summarised below and the need for an at grade crossing adjacent to the District Centre which is addressed in the following section on the District Centre.</p> <p>(i) We do not support the access points to South West Highway (SW Hwy) as shown on the advertised DSP. Our preferred locations are shown on the attached plan titled "Amended Mundijong Whitby DSP for Precinct 'A' - Urban Pacific Landholdings". The reasons for the location of our preferred access points relate to engineering and transport planning considerations as well environmental considerations.</p> <p>Preliminary planning for Precinct A commenced in 2005 as part of the lifting of Urban Deferred. A key issue that has been investigated in liaison with DPI (Strategic Biodiversity Planning incorporating Bush Forever) and Main Roads WA (MRWA) is an appropriate location for a new intersection with South West Highway to provide access to the north eastern part of the DSP area. Both agencies have given in principal support for the intersection location as evidenced in the attached correspondence.</p> <p>A suitable location for this new intersection has been carefully selected with respect to exiting vegetation and highway conditions. The chosen location has been determined based on safe separation distances to adjacent quarry access points and the current and future road geometry for SW Hwy. The proposed location was one of a number of options discussed with DPI officers and reflects their preferred option. The proposed access point is located within an area of BF site 354 which is devoid of structured vegetation and contains only isolated individual trees of a mixture of native and non native species. The proposed road will have separated carriageways to enable retention of the maximum number of remnant native trees and facilitate the north south movement of fauna within the BF site. It will also provide a valuable opportunity to increase awareness and appreciation of the sites remnant vegetation amongst Whitby's future residents and visitors.</p>	<p>• Noted</p> <p>Given the lack of vegetation in the location proposed this may not be an issue and the Bush Forever Office advice of agreement in principle is noted, however, this is subject to the support of other Government agencies which is yet to be confirmed. Therefore at this stage the existing alignment should be retained on the DSP. If the proponents can show the support of other agencies, including the Shire, has been achieved then the alignment could be adjusted at LSP stage.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It should also be noted that Shire Environmental officers currently do not support provision of an alignment through Bush Forever given alternative access from South Western Highway is possible that poses less threat and impact on landscape and environmental and social assets. They have also raised the following impacts of a road through this area of Bush Forever: Proposed District road access from South Western Highway into the urban development site is not a suitable sensitive design use compatible with Bushforever conservation objectives and intentions for buffering of development impacts to ESA. • Proposal affects cleared open parkland area within bush forever site that would be ideal for passive/active public open space activity. • Proposal creates new threats (pollution, fire, surfacewater management) within bushforever areas and adjacent to sensitive areas including waterways. • Proposal separates areas of bushland and imposes a significant barrier to public foot or bicycle traffic and native faunal movement. Concepts of community facilities within the southern bushland area that direct public to walkways along the northern portion will be severely affected by the significant obstruction of a district road. • Proposal requires fill and changes to topography with consequent effects on waterflows and terrestrial fauna movements. • Increased potential for fire events from traffic and threats to traffic from fire within a Bushforever zone – which would require more fire management infrastructure in the locality and consequent impacts • Engineering of slip road and access infrastructure will have significant impact on vegetation on SW highway at the proposed site 	No

No.	Name	Address	Summary of submission	Comment	Modification to Draft DSP
			<p>th respect to the southern access point to SW Hwy we are, as previously mentioned, currently preparing a LSP for the Precinct A area. We have proposed an alternative intersection point to the south of the existing Reilly Road intersection in consideration of road conditions and safe separation distances between intersections on the opposite side of SW Hwy.</p> <p>(ii) We are supportive of the rail crossing adjacent to the District Centre. As detailed below the viability of the future District Centre in this location is dependent on an at grade crossing. Preliminary modelling and analysis undertaken by Transcore indicates that this crossing would operate satisfactorily at grade level with appropriate control measures.</p> <p>(iii) We support provision for a future passenger rail extension along the existing railway corridor, however are strongly opposed to the new rail spur option. The rail corridor exists and any future station can and should be accommodated within the existing rail reserve. The provision of a future passenger rail service in this area is uncertain and may not eventuate for 30+ years, if at all. We are strongly opposed to the alternative alignment to the east of the exiting rail corridor as it will sterilise this land for an unacceptable period of time and create an unusable area of land between the current rail corridor and the future alignment.</p> <p>(iv) We support the proposed realignment of the Freight Rail line as it will remove a significant barrier between the east and west sides of the DSP area.</p> <p>(v) The DSP shows an extension of Bishop Road across the railway line into Precinct A. Whilst we are not opposed to this crossing we are advised that relevant agencies will only support one additional rail crossing between the existing Norman Road and Kiernan Street crossings. In view of this and given the proposed crossing adjacent the District Centre is essential to its viability we would only support the Bishop Road crossing if it was in addition to a crossing adjacent to the District Centre and will not actively pursue approvals for this crossing.</p> <p><u>District Centre</u></p> <p>We support the location of the District Centre within Precinct A particularly in close proximity to the railway reserve. We also strongly agree with the risk identified in the table in section 8.3 1 of the DSP report. The identified risk is that failure to achieve at grade access across the rail alignment and Soldiers Road will reduce the ability for the District Centre to trade successfully and would ultimately require the District Centre to be reduced in size and therefore be better located closer to the centre of Precinct A. It will also reduce the employment self sufficiency of the District.</p> <p>As the future viability of the District Centre is totally dependent upon an at grade crossing it is imperative that the Shire support and promote the achievement of this initiative and as</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed modification to the southern most South-West Highway location in Precinct 1 will reduce the existing separation distance to less than 800m. The current 800m separation is considered the minimum MRWA is likely to accept. On this basis, the proposed modification is not currently supported. However, should the proposed modified location be acceptable to MRWA and the proponent can provide appropriate confirmation then the DSP could be further modified. • Noted • The alternative rail spur option was initially included in the EbD plan as it was thought it would be more environmentally acceptable and was included in the DSP on this basis. Subsequent investigations have confirmed it is possible to accommodate a passenger rail station with minimal environmental impact within the existing railway reservation, while the proposed spur has the potential to have a significant environmental impact at its northern end. On this basis it is considered the alternate spur option is now unnecessary and can be deleted. In doing so the DSP should be modified to extend the passenger line further to the south, accommodate the east-west district road with space in-between to the south of the extended line and include appropriate words to ensure appropriate planning and design of the Town Centre to address land use and interface with the possible Transit precinct is addressed at LSP stage. • Noted • Noted 	<p>Yes – delete second rail spur and modify DSP plan and text accordingly.</p>

No.	Name	Address	Summary of submission	Comment	Modification to Draft DSP
			<p>such make strong and timely representations to the relevant agencies to obtain formal approval of this.</p> <p><u>District Water Management Strategy (DWMS)</u></p> <p>There are a number of water management issues related to Precinct A that we wish to comment on. Our concerns relating to the provision of a Third Pipe system have been addressed above. Further comment on this and other DWMS issues are outlined in the attached correspondence from Cardno and summarised as follows.</p> <p>The existing culverts under the railway appear to be holding back a significant volume of runoff that results in more storage within Precinct A and less in the CCW adjacent to the railway line in precinct G. We therefore propose that these culverts be increased in size to restore pre development (pre railway) environmental flows to facilitate the direction of flows from major events to the adjacent CCW which is in a depressed condition.</p> <p>We do not agree with the specification of fill with a specific Phosphorous Retention Index (PRI) or any other specific solution at DWMS stage. Objectives for nutrient attenuation should be outlined, consistent with State guidelines.</p> <p><u>Sustainability Strategy</u></p> <p>In general we support the intention of the Draft Sustainability Strategy. However there are a number of issues related to Precinct A and the district that we wish to comment on. These issues are outlined in the attached correspondence from Cardno, key issues are summarised below.</p> <p>Our concerns relating to the provision of a Third Pipe system, LPP8 – Landscape Protection and requirements for imported fill to meet PRI criteria have been addressed above.</p> <p>With respect to landscaping, we are concerned about being able to meet the 70% target for all landscaped planting to be comprised of local native plant species. We have spoken with a botanist who has advised that this in an impractical and impossible target. We support the intent of this requirement however we are concerned that a sufficient diversity of local native species may not be available at a commercial scale. In view of this we suggest this target be reconsidered following more detailed investigations by the Shire into the diversity and availability of local native plant species. In addition to issues of availability we believe that this target is contradictory to the requirement to preserve the existing character of Mundijong which has a number of exotic species lining its streets.</p> <p><u>General Comments</u></p> <p>We do not support the requirement for the preparation of design guidelines for built form and landscaping at the LSP stage. The preparation of guidelines is appropriate as a condition of subdivision or development. We do support the inclusion of guiding principles in the LSP's and propose that these be required in place of guidelines.</p> <p>We cannot commit to achieving the object of rural character and concerned about the practicalities of achieving this objective as it is not clear what is meant by this term. Rural character is typically represented by large lots with wide frontages, open fencing, large homes with verandahs set back from the street, tree line driveways and unkerbed roads with gravel verges. Management of stormwater in an urban environment typically requires roads to be kerbed and drained contrary to rural environments. Urban development at the densities contemplated cannot achieve these rural characteristics and standard project home product available in the market place is tailored to suit small urban lots with narrower frontages and minimal setbacks. The cost impost of designing site specific housing product cannot be sustained throughout the DSP area.</p> <p>We support the objective of retaining existing vegetation wherever possible and aspiring to create a 'leafy green' character through landscaping and design. We suggest that the</p>	<p>Disagree- this will be detrimental to downstream landholders. CCW is based on groundwater not surface water.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerns raised in the submission are noted, however, it is considered there is opportunity to achieve the target of 70% PRI where extensive nutrient application will occur post development such as in turfed active POS areas. The DSP should be modified to require this target to be met at such areas. • It is understood from Shire Officers that a great diversity of local native species are available, but often only grown at a commercial scale if requested – therefore, sufficient quantities should be available if sufficiently planned for. Nevertheless guaranteeing such a supply may be difficult. On this basis it is suggested the Sustainability Strategy 3.1.3 e) be modified to provide more flexibility by requiring landscape plans within local structure plans to primarily include local native planting for public spaces, streetscapes and also wildlife corridors. • It is considered that these items are best dealt with within the context of the Urban and Landscape Design Guidelines to be provided at LSP stage. The DSP should, however, be modified to provide greater guidance and structure for the preparation of these guidelines. 	<p>No</p> <p>Yes – modify DSP to require 70% PRI at active POS areas.</p> <p>Yes – modification to Sustainability Strategy 3.1.3</p> <p>Yes – modify the DSP to include greater clarity and guidance for matters to be addressed and the structure of Urban and Landscape Design Guidelines to be required as part of LSP's.</p>

No.	Name	Address	Summary of submission	Comment	Modification to Draft DSP
			<p>objective relating to rural character be reconsidered and expressed in a manner which can be readily achieved in an urban environment. Alternatively the objective to maintain the rural character could be limited to Precinct F which includes the existing Mundijong Town site.</p> <p>Most of the figures included in the DSP report are not referenced in any corresponding text and the applicability and context of the information shown in the Figures is therefore not clear. Conversely Figure 6 is referenced in the text but does not appear in the report. We therefore request that the text be updated to reference each figure and indicate its purpose and applicability.</p> <p>There are also a number of minor typographical errors; of particular note is the reference to medium sized rural residential properties as R20 – R40 in Part two Section 2.1.2.</p> <p>Lastly we request that Clauses in Part one which relate to preparation of LSP's or provide for Council and the WAPC to require further information should include the words 'generally' or 'reasonably'. For example Clause 6.1 LSP's should be prepared 'generally' in accordance with the requirements of the DSP; and Clause 7.1.3.14, other information as may 'reasonably' be required. This makes these provision less arbitrary and provides an opportunity for negotiation between proponents and agencies.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted - correct • Agreed 	<p>Yes – correct typographical errors</p> <p>Yes – modify clauses as suggested</p>
43	Brett Coombes Senior Town Planner Land Planning and Policy Development Services Water Corporation	PO Box 100 LEEDERVILLE WA 6902	<p>Wastewater Planning</p> <p>Mundijong is situated within the Water Corp's Byford Wastewater Scheme Catchment Area (Sewer District 86). The Corporation does not currently operate any wastewater infrastructure within the MW DSP area. The Corporation's wastewater scheme planning for the catchment requires a range of major headworks items to be constructed. The Corporation may be prepared to consider developers prefunding and staging the construction of some of these assets.</p> <p>The wastewater planning for this area has been developed based on generalised land use, development and density/yield assumptions from previous draft iterations of the DSP. The current version of the DSP does not contain sufficient detail to warrant a review of wastewater planning. The detailed sewer mains and reticulation layout will need to be determined following the finalisation of the DSP and the preparation of draft LSPs.</p> <p>The wastewater planning for this area indicates the need for major gravity mains running east to west (downhill) through the development area and a large collector sewer along the western edge of the urban development area. These sewers will need to be adequately accommodated within existing and future road reserves together with other domestic services. The width of road reserves and the size of these mains will need to be reviewed in more detail as the more detailed structure planning progresses for the various precincts.</p> <p>The wastewater planning also provides for dual 600mm diameter wastewater pressure mains, which will ultimately pump wastewater southwards from Byford pump stations to a large regional pump station in Mundijong in the longer term. This wastewater pump station will need to be constructed at the western edge of the Mundijong DSP urban area, adjacent to the future Tonkin Highway extension.</p> <p>The Mundijong pump station has been planned to pump westwards through a large wastewater pressure main to the future East Rockingham Waste Water Treatment Plant (WWTP) in the longer term and will require an odour buffer of at least 150m radius.</p> <p>The pump station site will need direct road access and services and should preferably be co-located with POS and drainage areas. Residences and similarly sensitive areas must not be located within the pump station buffer. The general location of the pump station and its 150m buffer should be reflected on the DSP, together with an annotation to indicate the need to identify the pump station site at the LSP and subdivision stages and for the site to be set aside for future acquisition by the Water Corp.</p> <p>The interim wastewater strategy for this area is to convey wastewater from Mundijong and</p>	<p>Details highlighted here to be included in DSP. Also recommended that a proposed location for the waste water pump station be identified on the DSP, location to be confirmed as part of Local Structure Plan.</p>	<p>Yes - modify as suggested</p>

No.	Name	Address	Summary of submission	Comment	Modification to Draft DSP
			<p>Byford northwards by pressure mains to the Waterworks Rd Main pump station (at the corner of Tonkin Hwy and Armadale Rd, Westfield) and then onwards to the Woodman Point WWTP. Initial sewer flows from developments in the Mundijong area will be pumped northwards through the Byford sub-catchment via the Byford pump station, subject to capacity limits. Based on the Water Corp's best estimates of growth rates from Byford and Mundijong, a limit of approximately 20 litres/sec has been allowed from Mundijong pumping northwards through the Byford pump station.</p> <p>The Corporation intends to progressively upgrade the Byford pump station in stages according to demand in the area. In the longer term, this wastewater pumping system will reverse direction and will pump southwards to the regional Mundijong pump station. The Corporation will monitor development growth rates and flows in the Byford pump station catchment to determine when/if the Byford pump station and other assets need to be upgraded.</p> <p>The 20 litres/second limit from the Mundijong urban area through the Byford pump station is available on a first-come-first-served basis. It is estimated that this will cater for approximately 1,500 lots in Mundijong.</p> <p>The wastewater conveyance strategy beyond the planned limits of the Byford pump station and beyond the limits of downstream assets including the Waterworks Rd pump station and the pressure mains to Woodman Point WWTP is currently not known. The Corporation will need to review the planning in the future to determine the appropriate time to implement the ultimate conveyance strategy to the East Rockingham WWTP.</p> <p>Water scheme planning Water is currently supplied to Mundijong via an off-take from the Serpentine Trunk Main at Wright Rd, approximately 5.5km to the south of the town. Water is conveyed to Mundijong via a distribution main that varies in diameter from 050mm to 300mm along its length. The Corporation has scheduled replacement of the 150mm sections of the distribution main with 400mm pipes over the next 3-5 years in order to address water pressure problems in Mundijong. It is anticipated that these upgrades should meet growth demands in Mundijong until around 2023.</p> <p>The long-term water scheme planning is to supply water to Mundijong from a new high level tank to be located somewhere to the east of Byford (tank site location yet to be determined or acquired). This tank will supply southwards to Mundijong via large distribution mains to the proposed Mundijong Gravity zone. Some sections of the future distribution mains may need to be laid in stages as part of supply to Mundijong subdivisions as an interim solution while the area is still being supplied with water from the trunk main to the south. These mains would then later be used to supply water from the north through the ultimate scheme.</p> <p>It would be noted that the Corporation's water infrastructure planning for this area has been conducted at a relatively high level and more detailed planning and reticulation layouts will need to be determined at the LSP and subdivision stages.</p> <p>Service corridor – bulk water transfer pipes The Water Corporation is currently concluding route planning and environmental approvals for the identification of major service corridors through the SE urban area, including Byford and Mundijong. The proposed service corridors are to accommodate the future construction of large (1,400mm diameter) bulk water transfer pipes to convey raw water from southern sources (including from the Binningup Seawater Desalination Plant) northwards to storages in the east and southeast parts of the Perth metropolitan area.</p> <p>One of the pipeline routes identified in the planning traverses the western edge of the Mundijong DSP area. This pipe route is nominally identified as "Possible Service Corridor" on the draft DSP. The width of the corridor in this location varies. Other routes being considered are indicated on the attached plan. The final routes and corridor widths will be known following the conclusion of the environmental approvals for the routes. As an interim measure, all the pipe routes shown on the attached plan should be indicated as "Possible</p>	<p>Much of the information contained here, albeit in slightly more detail, is contained in the SKM Report – Infrastructure and Services Strategy. DSP to be updated to reflect the additional information provided here.</p> <p>The possible location of the service corridor in the DSP has now been determined as the preferred alignment with EPA's approval but its final alignment will need to be determined at LSP stage.</p>	<p>Yes – modify DSP to include additional information</p> <p>No</p>

No.	Name	Address	Summary of submission	Comment	Modification to Draft DSP
			<p>Service Corridors" on the DSP.</p> <p>Drainage The Oaklands drain (Sub-section B, B1 and B2) drain the southern and south-western portions of the DSP area. The Water corporation operates the Oaklands Drain under licence conditions specified by the ERA. The Oaklands Drain and other downstream contributing sub-drains are rural drains which were constructed in the 1930's by the former Public Works Department (PWD) in order to lower regional groundwater levels to prevent flooding of buildings and to allow land on the Swan Coastal Plain to be used for agricultural purposes. These drains came under the responsibility of the then Water authority in 1985 when the PWD was abolished.</p> <p>These rural drains only have a limited hydraulic capacity and were designed to flood adjacent rural land for up to three days, as specified in the Water Corp's Drainage Operating Licence. The responsibility for management of the relevant sections of the Oaklands drains adjacent to or within planned urban areas will need to be transferred to the Shire. The DWMP for MW should identify the sections of drains to be transferred to the Local Government. Flows from surrounding land developments must be compensated to pre-development levels for a 100 ARI rainfall event.</p> <p>In the event the Local Government is not prepared to take over responsibility for managing the drains, their rural drainage function must be protected by setting aside the minimum flood path and ensuring this area remains free of any additional development. No local urban drainage connections will be permitted into the rural drain.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted</p>	<p>No – however MW's DWMP should be updated to identify the sections of drains to be transferred to the Shire.</p>
	<p>Andrew Trevor Principal Planning Officer Department of Planning</p>	<p>Albert Facey House 469 Wellington Street Perth WA 6000</p>	<p>The Department expresses caution about some of the statements in the MDSP which read as provisions, in particular, Section 7.0 District Structure Plan Precincts.... "There is a general presumption that no further subdivision shall proceed within the precinct unless subject to an adopted Local Structure Plan". The WAPC is the approval agency of applications for subdivision and may not wish to be fettered by the MDSP (or LSP) where an application for subdivision has merit.</p> <p>Council may wish to reconsider having Parts 1 and 2 both starting at section 1.0 as this can lead to some confusion when reading the document.</p> <p>References to rural and historic character</p> <p>There are a number of references in the document to existing and preferred future character of the MDSP area. This is largely a matter for the Shire to address in detailed planning and development, however, some observations are offered.</p> <p>Section 7.0 refers several times to the "historic landscape character". It would be useful to define what specific aspects of the historic local character are, and are not, included in that term to avoid disagreements over its meaning and implementation in the proposed design guidelines for Local Structure Plans (LSP). The same applies to terms such as "historic architectural character", "current architectural character" and "rural landscape character". These terms could have many definitions and may cause uncertainty as to what they may be requiring.</p> <p>While it seems appropriate to reference contributors to local character such as road reserve widths and patterns, building setbacks, tree corridors along roads, local flora, internal/external views and heritage buildings and places, these matters should not act to undermine residential density goals.</p> <p>It may not be appropriate to impose residential and rural building styles from past decades, which are often no longer suitable for contemporary lifestyles and activities, on residential and other urban development especially if this unnecessarily constrains development or adds to cost.</p> <p>It may be better for the emphasis to be on <u>sustainable</u> architecture, design and planning</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted – however the notification in question is considered appropriate and it does not preclude subdivision. • Noted • These matters are best addressed within the context of the Urban and Landscape Design Guidelines. The DSP should, however, be modified to provide greater clarity and guidance as to matters to be addressed and the structure of the proposed guidelines. 	<p>No</p> <p>Yes – Modify the DSP to include greater clarity and guidance for matters to be addressed and the structure of Urban and Landscape Design Guidelines to be required as part of LSP's</p>

No.	Name	Address	Summary of submission	Comment	Modification to Draft DSP
			<p>which itself would create a unique and genuine look and character for the town and locality.</p> <p>Some of the uncertainties around this issue appear In section 2.1.3 where there seems to be a contradiction between point (1) Referring to “maintaining a sense of rural character” and point (2) Referring to “an urban town”. Later on page 74 reference is made to a vision of the locality as a vibrant “village”.</p> <p>PART 1: DISTRICT STRUCTURE PLAN FRAMEWORK</p> <p>6.2 The section could include advice that compliance with stated planning principles also need to be consistent with WAPC policy.</p> <p>6.3.4 & 11.1 - Council should ensure that sufficient areas of active recreation are provided as well as providing for conservation under the Local Biodiversity Strategy.</p> <p>7.0 District Structure Plan Precincts</p> <p>There is quite a lot of repetition in describing the requirements for the individual Precincts. There may be some benefit in starting the section with a list of requirements common to all and then listing the individual requirements for each Precinct.</p> <p>8.0 Implementation</p> <p>1st sentence could be modified to read :... and all other Commonwealth, State and Local Government policy requirements”.</p> <p>The terms "traditional" and "community" infrastructure should be defined, unless this is defined elsewhere.</p> <p>PART 2: EXPLANATORY REPORT</p> <p>8.0 Activity Centres</p> <p>Centre Characteristics (p121/122)</p> <p>The soon to be finalised Activity Centres Policy classifies Mundijong as a <i>District Centre</i>. The policy sets out various characteristics and functions for District Centres (p12). These include reference to typical retail types, typical office development, etc.</p> <p>The policy indicates the residential density target for the <u>400m</u> walkable catchment to be between <u>20 (minimum) – 30 (desirable)</u>.</p> <p>The policy also indicate the diversity performance targets for the various types and sizes of centres (<u>±30% mix of land use</u> (Mixed use includes office civic, business, health, community, entertainment cultural uses and showrooms))</p> <p>These targets are in the Tables on pages 121/122 (Northern Town Centre, Mundijong Village Centre).</p> <p>10.0 Residential Development / Lot layout</p> <p>Section 10.1.1 a sentence should be added to make reference to the residential density as proposed by Table 3 for District centres in the new Activity Centres Policy.</p> <p>WAPC will be expecting to see a minimum of 15 dwellings per hectare achieved.</p> <p>11.1 Public Parklands</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted • Noted • Noted • Noted • Noted • Noted • Noted • Modify DSP to make reference to residential density for District Centre in Activity Centres Policy. 	<p>Yes</p>

No.	Name	Address	Summary of submission	Comment	Modification to Draft DSP
			<p>3rd paragraph - this should be modified to say that residential components of mixed use developments will be included for the purpose of calculating the 10 (POS) requirement.</p> <p>There appears to be no mention of district level open space such as ovals and sports grounds or designation of these on the plan. Guidance on this matter for developers preparing local structure plans is required.</p> <p>11.2 POS calculation deductions</p> <p>Although compliance with Liveable Neighbourhoods is already referred to in the DSP it could be included in this section that POS calculations are to be consistent with that document.</p> <p>16.0 Implementation</p> <p>Section 16.2 could be boosted with some additional discussion on how staging and growth could occur possibly by reference to staging of LSP's and residential development in them. The section could pull together some speculation on timing of some major infrastructure such as moving the freight rail line, establishment of the passenger rail station and development of the Industrial area.</p>	<p>Agreed. Mixed Use (non-residential component) to be included as a deduction and Mixed Use (residential component) to require a public open space contribution.</p> <p>This is provided as part of the Community Facilities and Services Plan and determination of ultimate facilities required will be undertaken through the process of formulating a Developer Contribution Plan for Community Infrastructure.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted – The current wording in the DSP should be modified to more accurately reflect relevant Liveable Neighbourhoods requirements 	<p>Yes - Modify DSP accordingly</p> <p>Yes – Modify clause 6.3.3.</p>
	<p>Department of Environment & Conservation Lyndon Mutter</p>	<p>PO Box 1167 Bentley Delivery Centre WA 6983</p>	<p>Threatened Ecological Communities</p> <p>As noted in the DSP report, there are five State listed Threatened Ecological Communities (TEC's) within the DSP area, two of which are also protected under the Commonwealth's Environmental Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999 (EPBC Act). As outlined in the DSP report, should there be any proposal involving the disturbance of TEC'S, the involvement of DEC, and in the case of the Commonwealth listed TEC's, the Commonwealth Department of Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts (DEWHA) will be required, including clearing permit applications. Should they be supported, these are likely to require offset proposals.</p> <p>DEC supports the following DSP reports' objectives, strategies and recommendations in relation to TEC's;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The recommendation on Page 54 that <i>"No development should occur within important wetlands, significant natural areas or wetland or significant natural area buffers. New subdivisions should ensure that lot boundaries do not intersect important wetlands, natural areas or their buffers"</i>. The objective on page 74 <i>"To protect and enhance significant natural areas and their buffers"</i>. Section 5.3.11 Page 79. <i>"Threats to the remaining biodiversity within the DSP area include loss of and fragmentation of remaining habitat through clearing for development, changes to hydrological conditions, uncontrolled access and rubbish dumping in natural areas, weeds pest and feral animals, and inappropriate fire regimes. These threats need to be managed as part of future planning and development through the establishment and implementation of management plans and management strategies,"</i> <p>Strategy 3, <i>"Where possible no vegetation should be cleared in TEC's or near populations of Declared Rare Flora (DRF). If development is planned near a TEC, ground truthing is required to confirm the TEC boundary. Should clearing be required approval should be obtained from relevant State and, or Federal Government Agencies", and</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted Noted Noted Noted 	<p>No</p> <p>No</p>

No.	Name	Address	Summary of submission	Comment	Modification to Draft DSP
			<p>Strategy 5, "Vegetation Management Plans should be prepared for environmentally sensitive areas which address the identified threats to biodiversity conservation and contain mechanisms for implementation of management requirements".</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Page 129 10.2 "Where LSP's are affected by Bushforever and Conservation areas, management plans will need to be implemented in order to provide for ongoing health and viability". <p>TEC management plans should be prepared to ensure measures are put in place to manage the threats associated with urbanisation to the satisfaction of DEC. Detailed investigations should be undertaken during the Local Structure Planning to identify the site specific buffer requirements of the TEC occurrences and to demonstrate that the development identified within the TEC buffers will not impact the TEC's. The TEC management plan should also provide for a monitoring program to monitor groundwater, surface water and vegetation condition before and after urban development.</p> <p>Bushforever Areas and DEC Managed Nature Reserves</p> <p>As identified in the DSP report, the subject area contains Bushforever sites 350, 354, 360 (Mundijong Rd and Watkins Rd Nature Reserve), 362 (Roman Rd Nature Reserve) and 365.</p> <p>DEC supports the recommendation on Page 38 that a Landscape and Vegetation Management Plan be prepared that details; 1. Protected areas within the SDSP area or precincts, 2. Management practices for each area of remnant vegetation, 3. Ecological linkages within the DSP area, 6. Weed Management requirements for DSP areas, and 7 Hygiene requirement for soil imported into the DSP area, and the strategy on page 79, "Retain and protect Bush Forever sites and rehabilitate nearby areas where possible to establish fauna linkages".</p> <p>The local structure planning will need to address the fire separation and protection requirements for any residential areas proposed in areas adjoining bushland areas, consistent with the WA Planning Commission Guidelines outlined in the Planning for Bushfire Protection report. Where there is a requirement for hazard separation zones, DEC would not support hazard separation zones which rely solely on hazard reduction burning within the Nature Reserves and Bush Forever vegetation. DEC and other reserve managers can not guarantee that hazard levels will be maintained at the level required for a hazard separation zone. Additionally, frequent hazard reduction burning may adversely impact the ecological values of the vegetation overtime.</p> <p>Native Vegetation</p> <p>DEC supports the following recommendations in the report;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The recommendation on Page 38 that "A Landscape and Vegetation Management Plan should be prepared that details, 1. Protected areas within the DSP area or precincts, 2. Management practices for each area of remnant vegetation, 3. Ecological linkages within the DSP area, 4, An approved plant list for gardens and public open space, and 5. Offset requirements should native vegetation require clearing, 6. Weed Management requirements for DSP areas, and 7. Hygiene requirements for soil imported into the DSP area. Page 42, "Should there be any proposals involving the disturbance of remnant vegetation, particularly Environmentally Sensitive Areas (ESA's) or potentially significant Local Natural Areas, the involvement of DEC and in some cases the Federal DEWHA will be required, including clearing permit applications. These will likely attract an offset proposal should they be supported. Regional Ecological Linkages within Mundijong/Whitby have been identified and these will also need to be considered and incorporated into the District and Local Structure plans with recommendations for specific relevant management such as vegetation retention or revegetation". 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted Noted Noted Noted Noted 	

No.	Name	Address	Summary of submission	Comment	Modification to Draft DSP
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As outlined on page 51 of the report, clearing of native vegetation should not be undertaken unless authorised by a DEC clearing permit or it is exempt under Schedule 6 of the EPA Act 1986 or the Environmental Protection (Clearing of Native Vegetation) Regulations 2004. • Page 79, Strategy 2 "Verify, protect and retain natural areas and achieve the goals and targets of the Serpentine Jarrahdale Local Biodiversity Strategy", and Strategy 4. "Where clearing of any remnant vegetation is proposed, detailed floristic surveys should be undertaken prior to subdivision in accordance with the EPA Guidance Statements No 51 terrestrial flora and vegetation surveys for environmental Impact assessment". <p>Wetlands</p> <p>DEC supports the following recommendations outlined in the DSP report;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Page 54, "No development should occur within important wetlands, significant natural areas or wetland or significant natural area buffers. New subdivision should ensure that lot boundaries do not intersect important wetlands, natural areas or their buffers". <p><i>"Where future subdivision has the potential to impact Manjedal Brook, a Foreshore Management plan should be prepared by the subdivider for approval. All remnant vegetation, fringing vegetation and ecological linkages associated with wetlands and watercourses should be maintained. Access to wetlands should be controlled / restricted by using paths, fences and gates. The exact nature of these measures should be determined during the LSP stage".</i></p> <p><i>"Wetland management strategies should be produced at the LSP stage to ensure any existing inappropriate stormwater disposal to wetlands or water courses are replaced and the water management at the site is in accordance with relevant policies. Where development is proposed near a wetland, a wetland management plan should be prepared and include the following, the wetland buffer distance, the proposed management of water within in and out of the wetlands, the management of groundwater and its recharge, any approved groundwater abstraction allowances, any required rehabilitation of the wetland, site monitoring, and the management of ASS where appropriate".</i></p> <p><i>"Wetland management plans are also to be prepared in accordance with EPA Guidance Statement No 33 (Chapter B4) which outlines the requirements for wetland management".</i></p> <p>The wetland management plans proposed should be consistent with the DEC "Guidelines/checklist for preparing a Wetland Management Plan" December 2008, in addition to the EPA Guidance Statement No 33 (Chapter B4).</p> <p>Fauna</p> <p>DEC supports the following recommendations in the report;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Page 43, "Where possible significant hollow bearing trees located in cleared pasture land adjacent to remnant vegetation areas should be preserved to facilitate the movement of fauna across the landscape and provide bred an shelter resources for significant fauna such as the threatened Carnabys Cockatoo", <p><i>"Prior to commencing work in areas of remnant vegetation, field investigation for specially protected fauna should be undertaken. If identified these species should be protected I accordance with the Wildlife Conservation Act 1950".</i></p> <p>As clearing of vegetation outside of the identified conservation areas will result in the loss of habitat for Carnaby's Black Cockatoo (<i>Calyptorhynchus latirostris</i>), listed as Endangered under the EPBC Act and Specially Protected under the Wildlife Conservation Act 1950,</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted • Noted 	

No.	Name	Address	Summary of submission	Comment	Modification to Draft DSP
			<p>DEC advises that infrastructure should be aligned to avoid TEC occurrences, significant natural areas and nature reserves. DEC should be consulted during the future planning of these routes.</p> <p>District Structure Plan Map</p> <p>The DSP map, Figure 30, page 157, does not show Bushforever Site 362 (Roman Rd Nature Reserve, R46818) and Bush Forever Site 350 as 'Conservation'. Also it is unclear if Bush Forever Site 360 (Mundijong Rd Reserve) is shown as 'Conservation' or 'Possible Service Corridor'. The DSP map should be amended to clarify that any significant natural areas are shown as 'Conservation' to avoid issues and confusion further in the planning process.</p>	Agreed	DSP should be amended to clearly identify Conservation Areas and Bush Forever sites.