

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Thomas Road, Oakford (L801) 400473 - Development Application - Rural Travel Stop & IN15/17828
(Period: 4 September 2015 to 2 October 2015)

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Applicant Response and Officer Comment
Department of Mines and Petroleum	1.1	<p>The Geological Survey of Western Australia (GSWA) has assessed this proposal on behalf of the Department of Mines and Petroleum (DMP) with respect to access to mineral and petroleum resources, geothermal energy and basic raw materials. The GSWA has no concerns with this proposed service station and fast food development.</p> <p>However, as this development is for a service station where dangerous goods will be handled, GSWA has referred this application to DMP's Resources Safety Division who will provide a separate response to the Shire of Serpentine-Jarrahdale.</p>	Noted.
Department of Transport	1.2	<p>The Department of Transport (DoT) has no comment to provide in relation to this proposed development.</p> <p>We have forwarded a copy of the letter to Department of Planning (DoP) as the subject site abuts Thomas Road which is reserved as an Other Regional Road (ORR) in the Metropolitan Region Scheme (MRS) and is under the responsibility of DoP. DoP may respond directly to you with any comments.</p>	Noted.
Department of Water	1.3	<p>Service Station</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A Drainage Design Strategy is to be completed to the satisfaction of the Department. • A layout plan showing all key infrastructure including underground fuel storage and associated pipe-work; paved forecourts and fuel dispenser areas; tank fill point sites; car parks; wash down areas; unpaved areas; vehicle wash facilities; any waste treatment facilities; structural measures to protect the environment and any stormwater management systems. • Detailed description pertaining to infrastructure design including fuel tanks, pipe work, and any additional infrastructure ie service bays or 	It is considered that all of the items requested within this submission can be provided at the point a building permit application is lodged. It appears that the Department of Water has taken this opportunity to request such plans given that it would be there only formal opportunity to comment on the proposal. Therefore, it can be reasonably determined that a condition on any

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Thomas Road, Oakford (L801) 400473 - Development Application - Rural Travel Stop & IN15/17828

(Period: 4 September 2015 to 2 October 2015)

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Applicant Response and Officer Comment
		<p>wash facilities; details of any storage and or disposal of waste; and contingency plans for spills.</p> <p>Effluent Disposal for the site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Detail on the proposed system, reticulation area and number of people this unit will be servicing. 	Development Approval requiring such plans is appropriate.
Water Corporation	1.4	<p>Reticulated water and sewerage is currently available to the subject land.</p> <p>The subject area falls within the Mundijong Drainage District, a rural drainage system. Developments within this catchment are required to contain the flows from a one in one hundred year storm event on site. Discharge to the Water Corporation drains must be compensated to pre-development levels. The developer of this land should be advised to liaise with the Water Corporation at the preliminary planning stage to determine detailed planning requirements as this area could be prone to future flooding. At the time of development the developer may be required to provide calculations from a consulting engineer to demonstrate, to the satisfaction of the Water Corporation, that the runoff from the development has been restricted to pre development levels. To determine the flood level the developer should contact the Department of Water regarding the Drainage and Water Management Plan which includes the subject area.</p> <p>Any future building proposal will require approval by our Building Services section prior to commencement of works. Infrastructure contributions and fees may be required to be paid prior to approval being issued. If the application is retrospective, approval by our Building Services section is still required.</p> <p>The information provided above is subject to review and may change. If the proposal has not proceeded within the next 6 months, the Water Corporation should be contacted to confirm if the information is still valid.</p>	Noted.
Department of Environment Regulation	1.5	<p>Lot 801 Thomas Road was reported to DER as a 'suspected contaminated site' under the Contaminated Sites Act 2003 on 27 February 2015. The site was reported due to the suspected contamination of soil after the demolition of a house constructed with asbestos containing materials (ACM). DER understands that remediation of the ACM impacted soil is proposed to be commenced</p>	Noted. We would consider it reasonable to provide an advice note on any approval indicating that any ACM must be remediated prior to commencement of development at the site.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Thomas Road, Oakford (L801) 400473 - Development Application - Rural Travel Stop & IN15/17828
(Period: 4 September 2015 to 2 October 2015)

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Applicant Response and Officer Comment
		<p>shortly. The site will be classified following the submission and assessment of the consultant's validation report.</p> <p>There is the potential for ACM impacted soil to be spread further across the site if earthworks associated with the development begin prior to the completion of the remediation and validation of the site.</p> <p>Based on a review of historical aerial photographs there is no indication that the site has been used for a potentially contaminating land use, as specified in the guideline 'Assessment and Management of Contaminated Sites' (DER, 2014). Lot 801 lies within an area mapped as having moderate to low risk of acid sulfate soils (ASS) within three metres of natural soil surface. As development of Lot 801 is likely to disturb ASS, DER recommends that acid sulfate soils condition EN8 and advice ENa1 should be applied to the approval, as published in 'Model Subdivision Conditions Schedule' (Department of Planning and WAPC, October 2012).</p> <p>Based on available information, DER has no objection to the proposal and advises that a contamination condition is not considered necessary in this case. However, DER recommends that the development does not commence until the validation of the ACM remediation has been completed.</p>	
D Qiu 29 the Anchorage Maylands WA 6051 (A252295)	2.1	My family and I strongly suggest the Shire consider upgrading or changing zoning code of the area around and including our block to be rural living A or other residential zoning codes. We totally agree and support the Shire's development plan.	This submission does not seem to relate directly to the proposal.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Thomas Road, Oakford (L801) 400473 - Development Application - Rural Travel Stop & IN15/17828
(Period: 4 September 2015 to 2 October 2015)

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Applicant Response and Officer Comment
GC O'Brien 41 Conningham Drive OAKFORD WA (A252001)	2.2	We are concerned about the traffic which is getting busier by the month at the intersection of Kargotich & Thomas. Are you going to put traffic lights and or new merging lanes to keep the flow of traffic consistent?	Traffic congestion has been discussed below, in response to the next submission.
D McGrath 211 Kargotich Road OAKFORD WA 6121 (A25218)	2.3	I don't agree to the new development proposed for Thomas/Kargotich Road. This intersection is already dangerous with no compensation made for the already heavy flow of traffic. This area is known for its peaceful lifestyle and quiet areas. Now it has become an area that is full of speeding cars with no respect for the horse people in the area. We bought out here so we could have the land and lifestyle not to be built up within 20 years. If people wanted that they would live in Suburbia. A Petrol Station – Truck stop is not something we need. Oakford area already has enough stock feed stores and vets to choose from. Money could be better spent upgrading roads and fix traffic problems.	<p>Thomas Road has been designated as a Primary Road by MRWA for some time and therefore, it is unreasonable to expect traffic levels to be kept at a minimum on such a road. Residents could ordinarily expect an increase in traffic on such a road as further development, including the proposed, continues to occur in the surrounding area.</p> <p>Furthermore, in relation to this proposal specifically, it should be noted that the proposal was previously approved by the Shire with a traffic impact that is the same as that of the current proposal. Studies that have also been used in support of this application indicated that there was sufficient capability in the road network to support the proposed development.</p> <p>As a result of consultation with Main Roads regarding the future road plans for this area, the development plans also</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Thomas Road, Oakford (L801) 400473 - Development Application - Rural Travel Stop & IN15/17828
(Period: 4 September 2015 to 2 October 2015)

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Applicant Response and Officer Comment
			<p>depict the future development of a roundabout at the intersection in question. The upgrading of this intersection is currently being designed by Main Roads and its future construction will result in further improvements to road safety in the area.</p> <p>Finally, in relation to traffic safety, it should be noted that the revised plan no longer depicts a left-out only egress point, ensuring a more safe development outcome, even in comparison to what previously approved by the Shire of Serpentine-Jarrahdale.</p> <p>This submission, along with many others, has raised concerns regarding the number of Rural Stockfeeds developments in the area, noting that another is not necessary. Objections relating to demand and competition are not relevant town planning considerations in this instance.</p>
<p>W Heard 301 Kargotich road OAKFORD WA 6121 (A320146)</p>	2.4	<p>I reject the proposal for the development of the corner of Thomas and Kargotich road with the Service Station truck stop etc. as this intersection is a very busy and dangerous with many bad vehicle accidents including deaths on this road, to add a Service Station Truck Stop etc. is only going to make it worse as Thomas road is already a Heavy Haulage route and Oversize Route and has been made busy due</p>	<p>Please refer to the comments regarding traffic safety in response to submission 2.3.</p> <p>In addition to these comments, it is also important to note that the proposed use</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Thomas Road, Oakford (L801) 400473 - Development Application - Rural Travel Stop & IN15/17828
(Period: 4 September 2015 to 2 October 2015)

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Applicant Response and Officer Comment
		to Tonkin Hwy ending at Thomas road, also the noise is an issue with the trucks, there are better locations to have a truck stop etc. than have it here at a bend on the road. I'm hoping the people involved with this proposal are looking at the safety and not there Bank acc as there has been far there many Deaths and injuries at this cross road to do this proposal.	is being proposed on the basis that Thomas Road is a road that is used by many trucks, and that trucks need a safe stopping point for fuel, food/drinks and rest.
P & J Chandler 10 Mount Eden Lane OAKFORD WA 6121 (A398415)	2.5	Do not wish development application to be approved. Thomas road is a high wide load corridor that main roads have said they will not approve traffic lights at the relevant intersections. In September 14 th 2015 Council minutes it was stated that intersection is the responsibility of Main Roads and not the Shire. Thus, more congestion, more accidents and making it harder for us to get home, especially if Abernethy is made into a cull-d-sac then Thomas-Kargotich is the only way home from school and work travel. We don't need another petrol station, caravan/trailer parking etc. as the redevelopment of Oakford Traders – liquor, convenience and service station (L196 Thomas Road) is only a few minutes down the road.	Refer to previous comments regarding traffic impact, control and comments in relation to demand and completion in response to submission 2.3.
J Stubbs 145 Cunningham Drive North OAKFORD WA 6121 (A251814)	2.6	I wish to submit my opposition to the above development. The development of a vet clinic and stock feed is totally unnecessary as we already have enough of those small businesses in Oakford and surrounding areas. The location of the development is the major issue. The intersection already has heavy traffic and is very dangerous (as by the number of accidents already occurred). Having a development on the corner would bring more traffic and make it much harder then what is already is to turn right into Thomas Rd from Kargotich Rd or cross over Thomas. As a nearby resident i use this intersection all the time and fear if the development goes ahead only more traffic issues and accidents will occur. Maybe in another location this development would	Refer to previous comments, relating to traffic impact, and demand/competition in response to submission 2.3.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Thomas Road, Oakford (L801) 400473 - Development Application - Rural Travel Stop & IN15/17828
(Period: 4 September 2015 to 2 October 2015)

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Applicant Response and Officer Comment
		be plausible.	
J Swinstead 178 Kargotich Rd OAKFORD WA 6121	2.7	I am against the proposal. Kargotich/Thomas is a very dangerous intersection already and the proposal will make this worse. We do not need more stock feeds in this area.	Refer to previous comments regarding traffic impact and demand/competition in response to submission 2.3.
Nadine Herbert N.Herbert@murdoch.edu.au	2.8	I would like to advise my total opposition to this proposal. Oakford has been subjected to unprecedented development in recent times. Byford has had a vast increase in housing development, the Armadale Shire are trying to create commercial estates north of Rowley Road and Thomas Road and the Tonkin Highway become busier by the day. People choose to live in Oakford for the country lifestyle and for peace and quiet. It is now noisy all day due to main roads increase development of housing and commercial outlets. The quality of infrastructure is poor. Our quality of life is deteriorating due to development. It will result in more traffic, noise, pollution.	Please refer to previous comments regarding traffic impact in response to submission 2.3.
K & S White 298 Kargotich OAKFORD WA 6121 (A320126)	2.9	<p>We Karen and Steve White of 298 Kargotich Rd Oakford wish to provide the following comment.</p> <p>Although we welcome progress and development of our shire there have been a number of fuel stations approved in the local vicinity and another development of this nature is not required</p> <p>An application for a commercial development is out of character for the area proposed as the purpose and intent of the Rural Zone is to allocate land to accommodate the full range of rural pursuits and associated activities conducted in the Scheme Area. This land abates with land zoned special rural with purpose and intent is to depict places within the rural area wherein closer subdivision will be permitted to provide for such uses as hobby farm, horse training and breeding, rural residential</p>	<p>The suggestion that this development does not fit with the rural character of the area is not supported given that the rural zoning allows for such development at the site.</p> <p>It should also be noted that the development of a rural stockfeeds and veterinary provide services to the surrounding rural areas. This further facilitates the development of a full range of rural pursuits in the area.</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Thomas Road, Oakford (L801) 400473 - Development Application - Rural Travel Stop & IN15/17828

(Period: 4 September 2015 to 2 October 2015)

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Applicant Response and Officer Comment
		<p>retreats and intensive horticulture, and also to make provision for retention of the rural landscape and amenity in a manner consistent with the orderly and proper planning of the selected areas. – Quoted from Shire of Serpentine – Jarrahdale Town planning scheme 2</p> <p>We therefore believe that the allowance of this commercial development is not in the interest of the ratepayers or Shire residents</p> <p>The traffic figures quoted in the proposal were out-dated and new figures are available freely by main roads and vary significantly which is misleading. Thomas Rd east of Nicholson 14,950 (2013/14). The junction of Kargotich and Thomas is significantly too unsafe as it currently stands for any development to be considered. This junction is 4 ways at present and frequent accidents occur. The council should consider cul-de-sac Kargotich Rd North of Thomas Rd to improve the safety of this junction</p> <p>The plans submitted show a proposed development of a roundabout on the intersection of Kargotich and Thomas this is also misleading as Main Roads have advised that although this junction is due for an upgrade no costing's have been done and no time frame has been placed on this and is in fact number 834 on the black spot list and the upgrade could be anywhere from 5 – 20 yrs. away which has significant impact on the proposed development.</p> <p>The application for the veterinary establishment and a rural stockfeed (both listed, as AA use is a smoke screen for this commercial development</p> <p>The application and submitted plan contradict on several occasions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The document produced out lines the development of a rural 	<p>The traffic numbers relate to the initial application approved several years ago and reapproved last year. This application relates to a re-design of site layout following consultation with Main Roads regarding future intersection planning, taking account of future traffic flows.</p> <p>The applicant and landowner have had discussions with MRWA regarding the upgrading of this intersection. The Kargotich Road section adjoining the site will be constructed and upgraded with widening, median and turning lanes. Further, a contribution toward the intersection upgrade will be required as a condition of development.</p> <p>The claims regarding proponents intentions in relation to the development are unfounded and should be disregarded.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The intent is for the development to

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

**Thomas Road, Oakford (L801) 400473 - Development Application - Rural Travel Stop & IN15/17828
(Period: 4 September 2015 to 2 October 2015)**

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Applicant Response and Officer Comment
		<p>stockfeed however this term is then interchanged with produce store which leads to confusion as produce for human consumption should not be sold with feed for animals. There is also no identified need in the local area for a stockfeed as there are 2 such stockfeeds within 3kms of this proposed development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The document states a veterinary establishment to service the local area. This is not required as there are at least 5 vets in the local vicinity including a vet that does home visits • Why on the submitted plans does the veterinary establishment require a loading dock? • The proposal is for 136 vehicle bays however the outlined parking requirements are for 67. Why has this number been doubled? - This is of concern as the application has not addressed why so many bays are required and this is not in keeping with this development • The proposed operating hours on the development proposal for the service station are 5am - 9pm 7 days - however the plans show a night window in the service station and the plans also show a sign with open 24 hours. • The proposal states that the architectural design is an important factor given the nature of the rural location and it states the design reflects rural Australiana but the plans show a grey, teal and tangerine coloured fuel stop <p>The proposal has acknowledged that the land is subject to a high water table and all residential properties in the area are required to be built on a significant raised pad. The submitted plans DO NOT give an indication of pad height for either of the proposed buildings or the fuel outlet / bowser placement. Which will have significant impact on the local area</p> <p>An issue regarding security for local residents and the number of truck /</p>	<p>comprise a 'rural stockfeeds'. Please also refer to previous comments regarding the demand/competition in response to submission 2.3.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Refer to comments above regarding establishment of additional veterinary's. • Loading dock is for medical supplies and other items as necessary. • The additional parking bays are for customer convenience, should the need arise. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The operation times of the fuel station will be between 5am and 9pm 7 days a week. The revised plans no longer illustrate opening hours. • The detailed colours and finishes will be further developed at building permit stage. The spacious layout of the site design also reflects rural character. <p>Plans submitted at building permit stage will provide an indication of the height of pad. This is considered sufficient as such details do not need to be provided at Development Application stage.</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Thomas Road, Oakford (L801) 400473 - Development Application - Rural Travel Stop & IN15/17828
(Period: 4 September 2015 to 2 October 2015)

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Applicant Response and Officer Comment
		<p>caravan parking if allowed to have 24 hour access / overnight parking which will significantly impact the safety and security of surrounding properties not only that the proposed large car parks will significantly increase the likelihood of attracting unsociable behaviours into the area</p> <p>The proposed garden area along Thomas Rd does not state what vegetation will be used and we would like to propose that significant amount of native trees and shrubs be planted to provide a screen of at least 2m in height</p> <p>The signage for the fuel station should not be placed near the proposed Rural development as it is not in keeping with the surrounding area and would significantly impact local residential properties but should be positioned between the entry and exit for the fuel station</p>	<p>The site will be sufficiently lighted and is located adjacent to a major road, discouraging potential unsociable behaviour. A lighting plan can be required as a condition of approval. The proposal does not include a 24hr/overnight parking area.</p> <p>A landscape plan can be required as a condition of any approval.</p> <p>The signage location has not changed significantly from what was previously approved.</p>
<p>T Keehner 13 Limousin Place OAKFORD WA 6121 (A200942)</p>	<p>2.10</p>	<p>I, Terillee Keehner owner/occupier of 13 Limousin Place, Oakford, do not agree with the development as presented for a proposed Rural Travel Stop at Lot 801 Thomas Rd (Corner Kargotich Road), Oakford.</p> <p>Based on the documentation provided for the proposal, the items that I am most strongly opposed to are:-</p> <p>Traffic management –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information provided is based on 2009 data and therefore does not adequately represent current flow nor take into account the increased traffic volume due to development in the region. • Proposed roundabout at the corner of Thomas Road and Kargotich Road would be an inadequate management for the traffic flow at current levels. Traffic at this juncture would be further increased if proposed development is to proceed. This intersection is currently hazardous with multiple serious accidents and fatalities. A minimum of traffic lights would be required to provide adequate traffic management. 	<p>Refer to comments above relating to traffic data in response to submission 2.9.</p> <p>The statement that a roundabout is inadequate is contrary to Main Roads studies and plans.</p> <p>Furthermore, the provided traffic report discusses the impact of the proposed development on Kargotich Road and confirms that the impact will be acceptable.</p> <p>Please also refer to previous comments regarding demand and competition in</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

**Thomas Road, Oakford (L801) 400473 - Development Application - Rural Travel Stop & IN15/17828
(Period: 4 September 2015 to 2 October 2015)**

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Applicant Response and Officer Comment
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed Service Station is planned with access to this service off Kargotich Road, diverting traffic from the primary road, Thomas Road. The use of Kargotich Road as the Service Station access would not only increase the traffic on this road but also significantly impact on the local residents who have no option other than to use Kargotich road to enter/egress Thomas Road from residences. All access for this service should be from Thomas Road, as this is the main road and forms part of the Primary Freight Route between Tonkin Highway and Kwinana Freeway. <p>The need for Proposed Services –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Produce Store (Rural Stock Feed) is not essential as the region is already serviced by three comparable stores within a <5 km radius, with additional stores within a 10 km radius. • Truck, Caravan/Trailer Parking Facilities is questionable due the location and original proposed development of the Oakford region as circulated by SJ Shire as part of their Oakford Rural Economic Living Area Plan. • Gazebo/Barbeque area and fenced Playground superfluous based on current and proposed services to this location and the operating hours. <p>Revegetation –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed gardens along the northern and eastern boundaries of Lot 801 are insufficient and neither provides any buffering of noise and activity nor adds to the beautification of the area. <p>Vehicle Bays –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The planned 136 vehicle bays are in excess of necessity for the building structures and services as proposed. <p>The proposed operating hours of services are within the standard operating hours for similar services within the area.</p>	<p>response to submission 2.3.</p> <p>The concerns raised with regarding Truck, Caravan/Trailer Parking facilities should not be supported given this use is incidental to proposed uses and not contrary to the Town Planning Scheme.</p> <p>The Gazebo/Barbeque area and fenced playground are not superfluous given that they add to the overall intent of the proposed development, which is to represent a rural travel stop.</p> <p>The claim that the proposed revegetation is insufficient is subjective and cannot be supported. It is not the intent of the vegetation to provide noise or activity buffering as this would be of no effect given the adjacent road is a greater producer of noise.</p> <p>Please refer to previous comments in relation to the amount of parking bays provided in response to submission 2.9.</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Thomas Road, Oakford (L801) 400473 - Development Application - Rural Travel Stop & IN15/17828

(Period: 4 September 2015 to 2 October 2015)

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Applicant Response and Officer Comment
M & W Bridgehou 75 Swamp Gum Road OAKFORD WA 6121 (A320113)	2.11	<p>We are strongly opposed to the development application for a proposed rural travel stop at the corner of Kargotich Road and Thomas Road for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This is already a dangerous intersection where there have been numerous vehicle accidents and at least one fatality 2. As this is proposed to be also a truck re fuelling facility we believe that there will be an increase in traffic noise due to the airbrakes used by heavy vehicles when approaching and stopping. 3. This area is supposed to be 'special rural 'and NOT industrial. There are already residents not complying with rules that council have made by buying properties with the intention to use as truck parking depots. We believe that if this proposal is accepted it will encourage more of this unacceptable use. 4. We believe that this will attract trouble makers who would use this area as a place to congregate resulting in abusive behaviour and litter pollution. 5. We feel that this kind of development would be better suited to a more business populated area or industrial area where it will not be a threat to the tranquillity of the 'special rural' lifestyle we have invested in. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Please refer to previous comments relating to traffic impact in response to submission 2.3. 2. The potential increase in noise is to be no greater than the current approved land use for the site. 3. The proposed uses do not represent industrial land uses and the issues relating to other 'industrial' land uses in the locality are irrelevant to this application. 4. Please refer to above discussion regarding security issues in response to submission 2.9. 5. The Town Planning Scheme does not prohibit such a use at this site, and therefore the claims that this development is not suitable are unfounded. Rather, it could be argued that the proposed use benefits the area given the services that it will provide to the locality.
FJ & LA Kapor 32 Swamp Gum Road Oakford WA 6121 (A320109)	2.12	<p>With consideration to shire development proposal – Proposed Rural Travel Stop Lot 801 Thomas Road (Corner Kargotich Road), Oakford, please find our comments below relating to the 4 summary items:</p> <p>The proposed development includes a Service Station to be located near a busy intersection where traffic is already congested and during</p>	Please refer to previous comments in relation to traffic impact in response to submission 2.3.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Thomas Road, Oakford (L801) 400473 - Development Application - Rural Travel Stop & IN15/17828

(Period: 4 September 2015 to 2 October 2015)

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Applicant Response and Officer Comment
		<p>peak hours both AM and PM, with residents of Mary Ellen Estate having difficulty each day trying to cross Thomas Road via Kargotich Road, attempting to turn west into traffic on Thomas Road via Kargotich Road, and attempting to turn west from Spears Road into traffic on Thomas Road.</p> <p>Although a roundabout has been proposed for Kargotich and Thomas Road intersection, there does not appear to be a plan to remedy the existing traffic management issue where the Bridge exit on Kargotich Road is only wide enough for small vehicular traffic and therefore not a safe option for use with caravans and trucks. With the increased volume of traffic to Thomas Road when the Rural Travel Stop is operational, there is no mention of traffic management to be implemented for residents exiting Spears Road to travel west on Thomas Road.</p> <p>Recommendation: Widen the Kargotich Road Bridge near the North side of Thomas Road before implementing roundabout and Travel Stop and reduce the speed limit from Tonkin Highway to Nicholson Road to 70 KPH, (Same as Thomas Road East of Tonkin Highway), in an attempt to lower the risk of accident for residents merging into peak traffic.</p> <p>The proposed development is to add another Veterinary Establishment and Produce Store to the area. There appear to be more than an adequate number of businesses currently within the area already supplying these services to the community, such as Serpentine Rural Supplies, Regent Park Stock Feeds, Anketell Stock Feed Supplies, Oakford Stock Feeds, Whitby Falls Stock Feeds, Budget Stock Feeds, Silverson Byford Veterinary Hospital, Byford Veterinary Clinic, Armadale-Byford Veterinary Hospital, South of the River Mobile Veterinary Services, New Era Mobile Vet, Oakford Equine Hospital.</p> <p>Question: Would the Planning Office please explain the benefit to the</p>	<p>Please refer to previous comments in relation to road upgrading contributions in response to submission 2.9.</p> <p>Please refer to the previous comments regarding demand and competition in response to submission 2.3.</p> <p>Specific discussions regarding the design of the Thomas Road/Kargotich Road intersection are ongoing, and therefore, whilst the recommendation is noted, the specific design of the intersection is not an issue that need to be completely finalised before the granting of Development Approval. The current roundabout location and the design of the roads leading into it can be subject to further discussion that is ordained through a condition requiring the upgrade of the intersection.</p> <p>The benefit of the proposed use to the locality includes the ability to offer services to passing vehicles as well as rural supply services to the surrounding area.</p> <p>As noted previously, the noise issue is</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Thomas Road, Oakford (L801) 400473 - Development Application - Rural Travel Stop & IN15/17828
(Period: 4 September 2015 to 2 October 2015)

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Applicant Response and Officer Comment
		<p>community and businesses, of these proposed additional services to the 'Rural Travel Stop'.</p> <p>Revegetation (in the form of a Garden) is proposed along the northern and eastern boundaries of the lot.</p> <p>Question: Noise pollution has increased due to the widening of Thomas Road and the clearing of scrub/trees along the easement between Thomas Road and Lot 15, number 32 Swamp Gum Road. What plan does the Shire have in place for revegetation or in providing some sort of buffer along the Thomas Road North side to absorb the increased traffic noise which will increase even more after the Proposed Rural Travel Stop is operational?</p> <p>136 vehicle Bays proposed</p> <p>Question: What is the reasoning for this volume of parking bays, and what is the anticipated traffic flow after the development has been completed and is operational?</p> <p>Operating hours of the Service Station 5.00am-9.00pm Monday – Sunday.</p> <p>Question: Can the Shire guarantee that operational hours for the Service Station will not be changed in the future to be a 24 hour Service?</p> <p>Having lived in another Shire previously where a Service Station was developed, we are aware that apart from the traffic congestion and increased noise to the area, rubbish discarded along the roadside becomes a problem to the wildlife, stock and properties. Since the widening of Thomas Road there has been an increase in disposable food and drink packaging on Thomas road verge, and blowing into the properties.</p>	<p>not a concern given that the adjacent Thomas Road is a greater producer of noise than the proposed development.</p> <p>Please refer to previous comments regarding additional parking bays in response to submission 2.9.</p> <p>The land owner/operator will not be able to operate outside the confines of the approved operating hours without a further application to have these amended.</p> <p>In regards to the management of waste it is noted that appropriate waste disposal opportunities will exist through the provision of bins at certain locations throughout the site. A waste management plan can once again be conditioned on any approval.</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Thomas Road, Oakford (L801) 400473 - Development Application - Rural Travel Stop & IN15/17828

(Period: 4 September 2015 to 2 October 2015)

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Applicant Response and Officer Comment
		Question: Has the Shire scheduled workers to pick rubbish from the verge/easement of Thomas Road and what is the frequency?	
Charlie, Jacque & Joanne Madaffari 197 Kargotich Road OAKFORD WA 6121 (A25216)	2.13	<p>Please find below our objections against the proposed development.</p> <p>Your Strategic Community Plan's mantra is to "Maintain the area's distinct rural character, create village environments and provide facilities that serve the community's needs and encourage social interaction".</p> <p>We don't believe that a Travel Stop at a very busy intersection fits with your Plan, not only will it bring more traffic –including heavy vehicles into the area – it will also be a magnet for groups to hang around, not really the social interaction that we should be encouraging. This in turn will increase the level of criminal activity that is happening in our area.</p> <p>This intersection is already a very dangerous crossing where lives have been lost and many traffic accidents occur. To actively encourage more traffic into this area is irresponsible and not something that this shire should be committed to.</p> <p>We don't need another vet or stockfeed merchant in this area. There is already an over supply of vets (let those that are already here establish their business') and many stockfeed suppliers all within close range of the proposed development.</p> <p>INCREASE OF TRAFFIC</p> <p>The anticipated increase in traffic from Rowley Road into Kargotich Road will create a higher risk than it already is to those in the area that</p>	<p>The proposed development aligns with the Shire's mandate to maintain the area's distinct rural character given that it enhances it by providing services that compliment the rural activities in the locality.</p> <p>Please refer to previous comments regarding traffic impact and demand/competition in response to submission 2.3.</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

**Thomas Road, Oakford (L801) 400473 - Development Application - Rural Travel Stop & IN15/17828
(Period: 4 September 2015 to 2 October 2015)**

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Applicant Response and Officer Comment
		<p>ride horses, bikes and also the many walkers and joggers that also use this area. Kargotich Road is already a race track during peak hours without the thought of having a significant increase in traffic from users traversing to Thomas Road via Kargotich.</p> <p>The increase in traffic flow will impact on our lifestyle in that it will create more pollution and traffic noise, it will be even more hazardous to go horseriding along the street and daily walks with the dogs.</p> <p>PROPERTY DEVALUATION</p> <p>We bought our property (at significant cost) to enjoy the semi rural lifestyle and to be able to pursue our equestrian interests. We believed Oakford would be an area that would allow us to do this without the threat of a huge service station, convenience store on our back door step.</p> <p>There are many anticipated negative implications for those residents within proximity to the proposed development with regard to property prices, I'm sure many people would think twice about buying in our area if they had to put up with heavy traffic, an unsightly service station and the increase of noise that this development would bring with it.</p> <p>OTHER ISSUES</p> <p>Apart from the fact that a Travel Stop in Oakford is not in keeping with the rural and equestrian ambiance, there appears to be a proposal tabled for the redevelopment of the established Oakford Traders site for a service station and convenience store along with a proposal for a Puma service station and fast food development on the corner of</p>	<p>The claims that the proposed use will devalue the land of surrounding land owners are not substantiated.</p> <p>Please refer to the previous comments regarding demand/competition in response to submission 2.3.</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Thomas Road, Oakford (L801) 400473 - Development Application - Rural Travel Stop & IN15/17828
(Period: 4 September 2015 to 2 October 2015)

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Applicant Response and Officer Comment
		<p>Kardan Boulevard and Thomas Road, surely 3 service stations in less than 3-4 kilometres of each other is unwarranted and unnecessary.</p> <p>We strongly request that you decline this development application, we would like our area to be left as is – as a semi rural lifestyle that will remain so for our children and grandchildren to enjoy.</p>	
<p>John & Miranda Nikolich 303 Kargotich Road OAKFORD WA 6121 (A320144)</p>	2.14	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide a submission relating to Town Planning Scheme No. 2 Ref: PO 8235/02. We, the residents and owners of the five acre rural lifestyle property at 303 Kargotich Road, Oakford, DO NOT and WILL NOT support the proposal to develop Lot 801 Kargotich Road in Oakford as outlined in the Development Application, Rural Travel Stop (prepared by Dykstra Planning) as it will significantly negatively impact on our amenity including traffic safety, the environment, increased traffic noise and volume, visual amenity, access, water management and pollution. Further it is a completely inappropriate use of rural land in a predominantly rural precinct.</p> <p>We believe that a development of this nature would completely change the land use and rural fabric of this beautiful location and deliver nett benefits to the passing traveller and not the residents of Oakford and the Shire of Serpentine Jarrahdale.</p> <p>Further the reconfigured site layout will increase the impact that this development has on our general property and lifestyle amenity – council approved the layout and development of our property, with all our main outdoor (patio and swimming pool, majority of yard) to the front of our property – therefore, council has a responsibility to protect the amenity adjacent to our property. We look directly at the intersection and will have direct line of site from our outdoor facilities and internal living areas to this development including parking, signage and fuel bowers.</p>	<p>It is noted that submitter elaborates further on these issue below. In this regard, please see responses below, listed adjacent to the issues.</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

**Thomas Road, Oakford (L801) 400473 - Development Application - Rural Travel Stop & IN15/17828
(Period: 4 September 2015 to 2 October 2015)**

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Applicant Response and Officer Comment
		<p>Details of submission:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased local traffic: It would be realistic to expect traffic to increase on all legs of Kargotich Road, thereby increasing traffic movements through the already busy and poorly functioning intersection at Thomas and Kargotich roads. This intersection is currently operating beyond its capacity and would be significantly impacted by ANY increased traffic movements. Traffic safety and the safety of our property is our greatest concern. For example, traffic travelling east on Thomas Road will actually need to turn across traffic twice to access the travelstop. Once on entry via Kargotich Road and then on exit to continue east on Thomas Road. So one car travelling east equates to two crossings of the already dangerous Kargotich Road intersection. Therefore, the 'limited' increase turns into a significant increase of traffic movements as opposed to actual vehicle numbers. We note that the report only expects "limited traffic increases" as well as the addition of tourist buses. I am sure that that the planners and other property owners may predict that the increase would be limited, however, any increase to this already dangerous intersection will put people's safety at risk and impact on the properties immediately adjacent to the intersection. Traffic pressure will also limit access to the busy road network for those that rely on access to health and retail services at Byford and Armadale. <p>Plans within the report indicating a roundabout are misleading, Main Roads planning officers confirmed that a roundabout is likely as the intersection treatment in the future, however, there are no costs, no funding and there is no program. Therefore, the roundabout is not a consideration for the Travel Stop and the existing intersection would remain. The safety of road users and</p>	<p>Please refer to previous comments regarding traffic impact and discussions with Main Roads WA regarding contribution to road upgrading in response to submissions 2.3 and 2.9 respectively.</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Thomas Road, Oakford (L801) 400473 - Development Application - Rural Travel Stop & IN15/17828
(Period: 4 September 2015 to 2 October 2015)

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Applicant Response and Officer Comment
		<p>adjacent residents and the ratepayers of SJ Shire is paramount and the intersection is unsafe without this development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access: Access into and out of our rural lifestyle property and development to and from Thomas Road and Kargotich Road would be impacted negatively by this development. Traffic will increase on Kargotich Road as residents and some through traffic would use this road to access the infrastructure being proposed. Any increase in traffic on this section of Kargotich Road would negatively impact on SAFE access to our property at 303 Kargotich Road (Lot 81), and is unacceptable. We have a young family and use the road network daily to access schools and other services. We also have elderly parents residing with us and an extensive family network that visit our home. These people will all be put at risk by increasing traffic passing our front entry, as well as that trying to turn onto Thomas Road or continue across Thomas Road to Kargotich Road. • Environment: We live in a sensitive rural environment with a high water table used by wildlife livestock and treasured pets. Any spillage and pollution generated by a petrol station would have the potential to have catastrophic consequences should a leak occur or worse. The planning proposal provides inadequate details about the environmental management and approval process that would be required to allow a fuel station to operate. However, my research indicates that the development of new stations is not encouraged by the Department of Environment across Australia due to the environment consequences of such a decision. More details are required about the fuel station and water management process to provide further comment. 	<p>These claims are based on conjecture and cannot be supported. Furthermore, it should be noted that the road surface adjacent to Lot 81 has been recently upgraded improving the standard of the road, subsequently increasing safety levels for access and egress to Lot 81.</p> <p>The environmental concerns raised here can be addressed through similar conditions that were imposed on the previous (current) approval in relation to an Urban Water Management Plan and the appropriate installation of a petrol and oil trap. Furthermore, it is expected that an Operational Management Plan will once again be required in relation to amenity impact.</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Thomas Road, Oakford (L801) 400473 - Development Application - Rural Travel Stop & IN15/17828
(Period: 4 September 2015 to 2 October 2015)

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Applicant Response and Officer Comment
		<p>No information has been provided as to how the development would manage drainage in this low lying environment, subject to frequent flooding. The plans do not indicate the height of sand pad required and any other drainage management, therefore, we are unable to identify the correct elevation of the property and the impact construction will have on the surrounding area. Further details are required, please provide details of elevations and drainage.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land use and zoning: While some of the definitions placed under SJ Shire's town planning scheme No. 2 appear to cover the individual components of the proposed development it should be noted that the culmination of the outlets proposed makes it more of a shopping centre arrangement. The existing Town Planning Scheme does not provide for this style of development at this location. The use of produce store and stock feeds throughout the report is confusing and misleading, what is being installed and is it for humans or livestock? Council must clarify what is being considered to residents. • Future residential development: Development and potential development is strong within the SJ Shire and will continue to be so into the future. Rural lifestyle developments, and the traffic management and safety issues associated with them, will continue to be submitted and considered by council, this is natural and expected. However, this proposal should be defined as a commercial development and as such is not appropriate for this area, as the Rural Travelstop is masquerading as this. This style of development would change the entire fabric of this rural 	<p>It is standard planning practice to assess all of the individual components as separate land uses. This does not mean that the total impact of the site will not be considered. Therefore, the claim that the Scheme does not provide for this type of use is incorrect.</p> <p>The proposed uses must be considered under the use class that the most accurately represent in accordance with the definitions listed in the Town Planning Scheme. In this regard, the zoning allows for such uses in the Rural zone. Therefore, these concerns cannot be supported.</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Thomas Road, Oakford (L801) 400473 - Development Application - Rural Travel Stop & IN15/17828
(Period: 4 September 2015 to 2 October 2015)

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Applicant Response and Officer Comment
		<p>area and take away from the rural lifestyle lots already developed immediately adjacent to the site. There are currently up to six service station/convenience store approvals either before council or approved by council, all are located in more appropriate locations for access and service to the community and do not pose the significant safety risk that this development does. We do not require an additional facility located in an inappropriate location that will increase the burden on SJ Shire and Main Roads and have measureable safety implications.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Future Tonkin Highway and Thomas Road development: Traffic figures will continue to rise, particularly as residential development continues throughout the Byford, Oakford and Mundijong localities. However, the future development of both Thomas Road to a four-lane dual carriageway and the extension of Tonkin Highway further south will have a strong impact on traffic figures and patterns. Furthermore, the connections and/or potential connections at Thomas Road and Orton Road to Tonkin Highway will impact on how traffic will move along Thomas Road and Kargotich Road. All of these things lead back to the current lack of safety at the Thomas Road and Kargotich Road intersection. An issue that will increase should more traffic be introduced and access to and from a major commercial property be allowed. <p>Traffic figures used by the Dykstra report are significantly out of date and provide a misleading account of the current traffic situation. The 2012/13 and 2013/14 figures, freely available on Main Roads website, show steady growth each year of regular traffic and a two percent growth in heavy haulage users as well.</p>	<p>Please refer to previous comments in relation to traffic impact and in relation to figures provided in the report in response to submissions 2.3 and 2.9 respectively.</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Thomas Road, Oakford (L801) 400473 - Development Application - Rural Travel Stop & IN15/17828
(Period: 4 September 2015 to 2 October 2015)

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Applicant Response and Officer Comment
		<p>With the ongoing rapid growth in population and the absence of road upgrades in the area it would be expected that traffic figures will continue to grow at a similar or greater rate. The planning undertaken, using the out of date figures does not adequately reflect the current use and safety of the intersection.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident's property value: Adjacent rural lifestyle residential properties values will decrease with the implementation of such a major commercial proposal directly opposite. Decreases would be attributed to the increased noise and visual pollution the development would create. Furthermore, the environmental impact would reduce the marketability of our lifestyle property and decrease its value. Moreover, from what I can ascertain the nett benefit of this proposal is not its contribution to the Oakford locality or Shire of Serpentine Jarrahdale but the passing motoring public. Property and suburb aesthetics – no provisions have been made to screen the EXISTING RURAL LIFESTYLE residences on the north west and north east corners of Thomas Road and Kargotich Road from this development. In fact, it appears that low gardens etc are only being included between the proposed development and our property to maximize exposure to passing travellers with no consideration given to screening our existing residences and protecting our quality of life. Our property's privacy issues will be considerable and directly link to this development. Currently Lot 801 has a house and outbuildings consistent with a rural residential property and in keeping with the wider rural area. A large parking area and the truck fuel bowers are now situated at the south east corner of Lot 801, 	<p>These claims are not supported by any factual basis meaning that they cannot be considered.</p> <p>This statement is incorrect given that vegetation planting has already been proposed on the corner of the Thomas Rd/Kargotich Rd intersection. Furthermore, it appears that there are also significant lines of existing vegetation along the north western and north eastern sides of the intersection, further enhancing visual screening.</p> <p>Please refer to previous comments regarding architecture in response to submission in response to submission</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

**Thomas Road, Oakford (L801) 400473 - Development Application - Rural Travel Stop & IN15/17828
(Period: 4 September 2015 to 2 October 2015)**

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Applicant Response and Officer Comment
		<p>facing Thomas Road and our property including our swimming pool. Currently our privacy has not been a concern because traffic moves past at 90km/hr and /or turns at the intersection – it DOES NOT PARK at a huge commercial development and fill up with fuel, have lunch or visit the vet or stockfeed! The proposal maximizes the exposure of our residence to this development and its associated increased traffic movements. Furthermore, the “future signage” to be installed at Lot 801 will provide visual pollution facing directly into our property by day and provide a constant glow into our outdoor entertainment area, swimming pool and kitchen family area at night. The barn style nature of the remainder of the development is irrelevant to us as we will be looking at the service station and associated signage. It is important to note that the planning document states that the largest part of this development - the fuel canopy - will be the most significant feature to ensure CALTEX attracts passing trade AND will NOT be constructed in a rural theme.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noise: Existing traffic noise at the Thomas Road and Kargotich Road intersection is already excessive especially truck related noise when moving through the intersection. The extra traffic and land use related noise generated by the Travel Stop and other outlets would significantly increase day and NIGHT noise at our home. Currently traffic is very noisy during the day – we accepted this as residents on a busy road, however, the stop start nature of a Travel Stop and the hours of operation being ALL NIGHT (signage in plans indicates 24 hr operation) or at least late at night would significantly increase the noise levels experienced at our property. Trucks using the intersection already use their air brakes unnecessarily because it is a 	<p>2.9.</p> <p>It is not unreasonable for residents living adjacent to a major road to be impacted by traffic noise. Therefore, such issues cannot be supported, particularly given that the primary noise producer is the road itself and not the proposed facility.</p> <p>It should also be noted that the proposed service station has been proposed as a 5am – 9pm operation.</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

**Thomas Road, Oakford (L801) 400473 - Development Application - Rural Travel Stop & IN15/17828
(Period: 4 September 2015 to 2 October 2015)**

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Applicant Response and Officer Comment
		<p>RURAL area even though there are many residences close by – this will only increase as more trucks stop to use the fuel services. Negatively impacting on our place of residence. We moved out of suburbia in 2011 because we did not want to live in a built up area surrounded by retail outlets. Before we bought our property the Shire of Serpentine Jarrahdale advised that this would not happen adjacent to us other than the potential for similar residential development because of the current town planning scheme. Furthermore, commercial outlets are available in Byford and at the intersection of Nicholson Road/Thomas Road only two kilometres west of this proposed development, with similar facilities now planned for Karden Blvd/Thomas Rd and new fuel facilities for Byford as part of the Coles and Woolworths developments. The existing facilities at Nicholson Road/Thomas Road incorporate a convenience store/travel stop minus the fuel station, although I believe a fuel station was located here previously and a development application is in place to allow a large truck stop at this location, with a recent extension applied for. The Shire of Serpentine Jarrahdale has a duty to uphold its strong rural and planning ethos to ensure any development is carried out sympathetically to its existing residents.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety: Traffic safety is paramount. THE CURRENT INTERSECTION IS UNSAFE. This development will increase traffic flows through the intersection, increasing the likelihood of accidents and deaths at this location. Safe egress to our property would be affected as more traffic would be travelling on the north section of Kargotich Road. As residents at this intersection we already provide aide several times a year to 	<p>Please refer to previous comments regarding demand and competition in response to submission 2.3.</p> <p>Please refer to previous comments in relation to traffic impact in response to submission 2.3.</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

**Thomas Road, Oakford (L801) 400473 - Development Application - Rural Travel Stop & IN15/17828
(Period: 4 September 2015 to 2 October 2015)**

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Applicant Response and Officer Comment
		<p>vehicles involved in accidents, my son and husband were also victims of a rear end collision at the location trying to get home from basketball in 2014. Not all accidents are reported so the actual accident data for the site will be skewed. It needs to be made safer, not have more access points adjacent and more traffic added to it. Work undertaken through the Federal Black Spot funding program has done little to improve the intersection as it needs to be completely reconfigured, so I cannot see how the proposed development would improve an already UNSAFE intersection. The applicant knows that the intersection in unsafe yet is focused only on the monetary gain of such a development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Odour: it should be noted that odours and noise in this area cover great distances as noted with the property located on the south east side of Thomas Road when they move their compost. This is an ongoing issue and has been reported to council regularly surrounding properties – some more than 1 kilometre away are overwhelmed with the foul odours. This raises the concern that fuel odours will travel much greater distances than the planning report has considered • Architecture: The very existence of a service station and Star Mart convenience store and other retail food and tourist outlets at this location, facing existing rural lifestyle properties, regardless of its proposed architecture is NOT in keeping with the current rural nature of the area. <p>Our property faces Thomas Road and our living and entertaining and recreational facilities all face the intersection of Thomas Road and Kargotich Road. We would therefore be severely affected by the TRUCK STOP and LARGE commercial development at 801 Kargotich</p>	<p>The potential impact of odour on the adjacent properties is not considered a major issue given that dwellings are sufficiently setback from the proposed development to ensure that fuel odours will be adequately dispersed to ensure no adverse odour impact.</p> <p>Please refer to previous comments regarding architecture design in response to submission in response to submission 2.3.</p> <p>Please refer to previous comments regarding antisocial behaviour. It is expected that a lighting plan, discouraging antisocial behaviour, will be required as a condition of approval.</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

**Thomas Road, Oakford (L801) 400473 - Development Application - Rural Travel Stop & IN15/17828
(Period: 4 September 2015 to 2 October 2015)**

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Applicant Response and Officer Comment
		<p>Road. The 134 car parking bays (double that required) are more than that currently provided at the large commercial precinct at Byford Shopping Centre on the corner of South Western Highway and Abernethy Road, Byford. This will only provide an opportunity for hoons to use the area out of hours as a burn out pad. Evidence of this is the service station/bottle shop facility on the corner of Armadale Rd and Nicholson Road. They have had to install ringlock fencing criss crossing throughout the car park to stop burnouts and hoons congregating in the area.</p> <p>Furthermore, the size, scale and nature of the proposed businesses should not be located here and provide the proposed services and still be in keeping with the rural dynamic of Oakford. Oakford currently has two stockfeeds, two vets and as such the replication of these facilities at this location would duplicate services and add to the sprawl of unplanned and ad hoc services the Shire has been trying to avoid.</p> <p>Such a proposal would change the land use and traffic management within the area and will significantly impact on the rural way of life we enjoy.</p> <p>We DO NOT agree or support the development application given to us to comment on in any way. In fact the proposed development contradicts the Shire of Serpentine-Jarrahdale’s mission and ethos. It also contradicts the entire reason for us moving to the area and purchasing our property four years ago. At this time we did extensive research through the Department of Planning, Shire of Serpentine-Jarrahdale and Main Roads Western Australia to identify potential developments for the area as we did not want to reside adjacent to commercial or environmentally unfriendly developments. We were happy with the information provided indicating that as it was zoned rural an undertaking of the size and nature of this proposal would not be considered for the area immediately adjacent to our property.</p>	<p>Please refer to previous comments in relation to the zoning in response to submission 2.9.</p> <p>The proposed uses can be approved within the Rural Zone, and therefore, it is incorrect to say that such a development at the subject land should not be considered.</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Thomas Road, Oakford (L801) 400473 - Development Application - Rural Travel Stop & IN15/17828

(Period: 4 September 2015 to 2 October 2015)

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Applicant Response and Officer Comment
		Thank you again for providing us with an opportunity to put this submission forward. Please contact us with further information as it becomes available. We would also like to be advised when this matter will be heard before council. We look forward to hearing from you.	
M Trimble 68 Swamp Gum Rd OAKFORD WA 6121 (A320120)	2.15	I do not think a rural area requires the extra traffic and noise with the proposed development.	Please refer to previous comments in relation to traffic and noise impact in response to submissions 2.3 and 2.10 respectively.
A Mason 68 Swamp Gum Rd OAKFORD WA 6121 (A320120)	2.16	Widen the road is good for safety reasons, I say no to the proposed rural stop, it will only build the area up, rural should be open with limited businesses and buildings in rural living.	Please refer to previous comments in relation to the permissibility of the proposed uses in the rural zone in response to submission 2.9.
EJ Merrick 6 Old Dairy Crt OAKFORD WA 6121 (A252208)	2.17	I have lived at this address for twenty years and seen the exponential growth of traffic on Thomas road. When awaiting to turn off Thomas onto Kargotich Road to Byford, you are nearly blown away by passing trucks from both directions.	Please refer to the previous comments regarding traffic impact in response to submission 2.3.
H Broughton 117 Peet Road ROLEYSTONE	2.18	I am strongly apposed to the proposal situated at my front door. The proposed development will alter the quiet family friendly neighbourhood we sought when purchasing our land and if we had known this was a possibility we would not have chosen to build here.	Please refer to previous comments in relation to the permissibility of the proposed uses in the rural zone in response to submission 2.9.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Thomas Road, Oakford (L801) 400473 - Development Application - Rural Travel Stop & IN15/17828
(Period: 4 September 2015 to 2 October 2015)

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Applicant Response and Officer Comment
<p>D Fenton 13 Elmhurt Way Greenwood WA 6024 (A403757)</p> <p>L793, 18 Guraga Way</p>	3.1	<p>My name is David Fenton, my partner Hine Broughton and I decided in December last year to build a family home for ourselves and our baby Delilah Fenton who was born in May. It has been one of the most exciting times of our lives and we cannot wait to move into our new home. However, receiving the Development application for a service station and fast food on Lot 857 Thomas road Byford has tarnished our happiness, if I was informed that there were plans in the near future to build an 8 bowser petrol station and drive thru fast food outlet I would have built elsewhere. Below I will explain my concerns about how it will have a negative affect on my family and the community. Thank you for reading my concerns.</p> <p>The World Health Organisation (WHO) have listed exposure to benzene as a major public health concern (Reference http://www.who.int/ipcs/assessment/public_health/benzene/en/) stating human exposure to benzene has been associated with a range of acute and long-term adverse health effects and diseases, including cancer and aplastic anaemia. Exposure can occur from petroleum products spilt at service stations. Benzene is highly volatile and exposure mostly occurs through inhalation. WHO says public health actions are needed to reduce the exposure of both workers and general population to benzene, this makes me wonder if the Shire of Serpentine Jarradale did any research or had the health of the public in mind when they approved a service station to be built with 20 or even 10 metres of residential property. Was there any environmental or health impact studies done before approving this? I am very concerned there was not.</p>	<p>All submission from here on in appear not to relate to this proposal, but to another similar proposal that has already been approved by the Shire.</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Thomas Road, Oakford (L801) 400473 - Development Application - Rural Travel Stop & IN15/17828
(Period: 4 September 2015 to 2 October 2015)

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Applicant Response and Officer Comment
		<p>The health of my family is my number one concern, a study in Spain found that petrol stations pollute their immediate surroundings. Researchers found that the effects of contamination at gas stations is potentially harmful to health and can be noticed in buildings less than 100 meters from service stations. (Reference; http://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2011/02/110204130315.htm) "Some airborne organic compounds -- such as benzene, which increases the risk of cancer -- have been recorded at petrol stations at levels above the average levels for urban areas where traffic is the primary source of emission," Marta Doval, co-author of the study and a researcher at the UM, said. The study, which has been published in the Journal of Environmental Management, shows that the air at petrol stations and in their immediate surroundings is affected by emissions stemming from evaporated vehicle fuels (unburnt fuels from fuel loading and unloading operations, refuelling and liquid spillages). The research team measured the levels of "typical traffic" pollutants in different parts of the urban area of Murcia, and calculated the quotients for the levels of an aromatic compound (benzene) and a hydrocarbon (n-hexane) at three Murcia petrol stations (near the petrol pumps and surrounding areas) to find the distance at which the service stations stop having an impact. "In the three cases studied we obtained maximum distances of influence of close to 100 metres, although the average distance over which this contamination has an effect is around 50 metres," Enrique González, the UM researcher who led the research team, said." This worries me as my daughter is only four months old and I don't want to bring her up in an environment that increases her risk of cancer or increases the risk of cancer for my partner and myself.</p> <p>Another major concern of mine is having a fast food outlet situated so close to my house and the local primary school. It makes it more challenging for the community to support healthy when fast food opens up right where children go to school and congregate. The World Health Organisation labelled childhood obesity as one of the most serious public health challenges of the 21st century and the extensive array of convenient/pre-packaged foods high in fat, sugar and salt will make eating healthily even more challenging. I fear that the fast food outlet and the service station will also alter the quiet atmosphere of the area as it will encourage people to travel from further afield to buy the widely advertised and popular fast food.</p>	

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Thomas Road, Oakford (L801) 400473 - Development Application - Rural Travel Stop & IN15/17828
(Period: 4 September 2015 to 2 October 2015)

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Applicant Response and Officer Comment
		<p>I am also worried about different types of pollutions caused by the 24 hour a day, 7 days a week service station which include but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Toxic fumes/Air pollutants – benzene being a major concern • Soil pollution – leaking into water supply below the earth • Light pollution – constant 24 hour a day 7 day a week inescapable fluorescent light • Sound pollution – from constant traffic 24/7 and music if being played by customers or the establishment themselves <p>Increase in crime in the local area is another concern of mine, the Australian government, Australian Institute of Criminology did a report on Service station armed robbery in Australian (Reference; http://www.aic.gov.au/media_library/publications/tandi_pdf/tandi373.pdf) which identified commercial outlets to as being particularly vulnerable suffering 45% of all armed robberies. Between 1993 and 2000 incidence of armed robbery of service stations increased by 214 percent. My question is how far away is the local police station and has the council considered this when approving a service station in this area?</p> <p>Massive increase in traffic in my area concerns me greatly also, what will the council do to insure the quiet family friendly neighbourhood remains that way once we have people lining up to refuel their cars or trucks or drive thru food? Will the council consider putting a wall along Kalyang loop to seperate the local housing and the commerical development? This would address some of my concerns including sound and light pollution maybe.</p> <p>Overall I am very disappointed in the location choice for this new development and desperately hope it does not go ahead as it decrease the quality of life for my family and I. It may also decrease the value of our home, which we are working very hard to buy. Please feel free to ring me if you have any questions or comments on my letter and also please keep me updated on the project outcome.</p>	
C & K Moulton 160 Comic Court DARLING DOWNS WA 612		<p>We object to this proposal on the basis that it will significantly increase the noise and light pollution into our property and decrease its market value.</p> <p>We have given further consideration to our submission regarding the DA for Lot 857 Kardan Boulevard. While we still object to the development,</p>	

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Thomas Road, Oakford (L801) 400473 - Development Application - Rural Travel Stop & IN15/17828
(Period: 4 September 2015 to 2 October 2015)

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Applicant Response and Officer Comment
		<p>if it is going to proceed we would like to see it managed properly by the Shire.</p> <p>We have proposed conditions below which we would like to see imposed on the proposal in order to limit the impact on our property:</p> <p>We require the SJ Shire to place the following conditions on the approval of the Development Application for Lot 857 Thomas Road:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · That the proponent builds a solid wall of at least 2 meters (or higher if necessary) in height across the northern boundary of the proposed development that eliminates light from headlights and noise from cars entering our property, particularly while they are queuing or parked at either the service station or fast food outlets. · That the Shire conducts detailed traffic flow modelling on the Kardan Boulevard / Thomas Road intersection to understand what impact the development will have due to increased traffic flow through this intersection. · That the proponent conducts baseline modelling of current peak and average sound emissions from Thomas road behind our properties. Should the Shires traffic modelling indicate that this will lead to increased noise emissions into our property then an earthen bund or solid wall is required to be constructed behind our properties to eliminate this increase in noise. · The proposed 9m monolith be reduced to less than 4m and ensure that it is not visible from our property, nor does it cause increased light emissions.” 	
<p>M Betteway 22 Scythestreet Willeton WA 6155</p>		<p>Whilst I can see the need for a service station at the corner of Kardan Boulevard and Thomas road, I believe the location of a fast food outlet in close proximity to a Primary School is undesirable given the issue of</p>	

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Thomas Road, Oakford (L801) 400473 - Development Application - Rural Travel Stop & IN15/17828
(Period: 4 September 2015 to 2 October 2015)

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Applicant Response and Officer Comment
<p>D Woo 1/219 Midland Rd HAZELMERE WA 6055</p>		<p>childhood obesity.</p> <p>We act for the owners of Lot 9500 Briggs Road, Byford and object to the Proposed Commercial. Development on Lot 857 Thomas Road, Byford for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thomas Road is classified as a "Reserve - Other Regional Roads" under the Metropolitan Region Scheme. Additional land is required to the north of the subject site to be ceded for the purpose of widening Thomas Road to 50 metres. • The proposed Take-Away Food, Puma Convenience Store, Service Bins and Drive-through are located within metres from the future adjoining composite lots to the west and residential lots on Kalyang Loop. Having a 24/7 commercial development with traffic noise, odour and light spill into adjoining residential properties does not represent orderly and proper planning. It is requested that the hours of trading be restricted to 10pm at night and not be allowed to operate 24/7. • 3. The designated 'Mixed Use' under the Redgum Brook Estate North Local Structure Plan is not considered to be an Activity Centre under the State Planning Policy No. 4.2 Activity Centres for Perth and Peel. Therefore, having fuel trucks and semi-trailers accessing via Kalyang Loop through a local residential street is not considered to be appropriate for the amenity of the future residents living across the road. The constant beeping of trucks noise, headlights glaring into habitable living and bedroom windows would have an adverse impact on the residential area. • Any proposed signage should not be allowed to have neon flashing or illuminated after 10pm in order to protect the amenity 	

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

**Thomas Road, Oakford (L801) 400473 - Development Application - Rural Travel Stop & IN15/17828
(Period: 4 September 2015 to 2 October 2015)**

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Applicant Response and Officer Comment
		<p>of the residential area both within Redgum Brook Estate North or Darlings Downs residents.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the interest of protecting the future local residents, LPG and fuel storage tanks must be located well away from the residential area in accordance with the requirements of the Department of Health and the Department of Mines and Petroleum. • Does the Fast Food Take Away have any capacity for dine-in customers and if yes, then the car parking provision would be inadequate potentially resulting in verge parking on Kalyang Loop, Kardan Boulevard and even Thomas Road verge. This would create an undesirable impact on the amenity of the area. 	