Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Officer
			Comments
	1		
DBCA		The Department of Biodiversity Conservation and Attractions (DBCA) - Swan Region Office has no comments on the application. It is DBCA's expectation that the Shire will address any environmental issues associated with the proposal.	Noted.
DPIRD		Thank you for requesting advice from the Department of Primary Industries and Regional Development (DPIRD) on the above proposal.	Noted. As discussed in the report Officers consider that that the scale of the
		DPIRD objects to the proposal for the following reasons.	proposed operations and the context of
		The combined paddock area is 1.585 hectares (ha), on which 22 horses are proposed to be kept.	the site present a proposal that would need careful management to ensure adverse environmental and amenity
		Grazing livestock stocking rates are standardised using Dry Sheep Equivalents (DSE), where a 50 kg wether is the accepted standard. Stocking rates refer to the numbers of stock that can be consistently kept on a piece of pasture all year round with minor additional feed and without causing environmental degradation such as wind or water erosion, tree decline, or increasing nutrients in waterways or groundwater. <sup>1</sup> Light horses are equivalent to 10 DSE each, and hence 22 horses result in a total stocking rate of 220 DSE.	adverse environmental and amenity impacts could be minimised. The application proposes measures captured within the various managemen plans (dust, noise and waste) to be enshrined within the overarching Equine Land Management Plan if implemented in their entirety, are considered to address
		The soil landscape unit is mapped as Pinjarra P1b Phase (213Pj_P1 b), which, according to DPIRD's guidelines is a Pale Sand Flats unit with a maximum dry stocking rate of 6 DSE/ha and a maximum irrigated stocking rate of 20 DSE/ha.	amenity and environmental concerns raised.
		The Bioscience - Equine Land Management Plan attached to the development application (hereafter referred to as the Bioscience ELMP) indicates in section 2.3 that all paddocks except for paddocks L and K, are irrigated. This means there is 0.17 ha of non-irrigated land and 1.415 ha of "irrigated" land.	

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Officer
			Comments
		This results in the total land area being able to support 29.32 DSE. This is less than the 31.7 DSE specified in the Bioscience ELMP, which is based on the entire paddock area being irrigated.	
		Note that irrigated pastures require up to 15,000 kL/ha/year of water and may require separate development approval, as it is a form of intensive agriculture in the Peel-Harvey coastal plain catchment. Before irrigation occurs, the proponent will need to demonstrate that they have contacted the Department of Water and Environmental Regulation (DWER) and/or Water Corporation and obtained approval to access these amounts of water.	
		Simply having a few sprinklers does not constitute proper irrigation. A full property specific irrigation system would need to be designed and installed for the paddocks to be truly counted as "irrigated".	
		The proposed stocking rate of 220 DSE exceeds the sustainable stocking rate of 29.32 DSE for the total paddock area, assuming approvals are gained to irrigate the land.	
		Section 3.3 of the Bioscience ELMP asserts that the stocking rates are "not relevant for the proposed land use." This misrepresents DPIRD's Stocking Rate Guidelines, which are designed to prevent soil and land degradation, not simply to assess whether there is sufficient feed for stock. Preventing and mitigating soil and land degradation is a requirement under the Soil and Land Conservation Act 1945, and this underpins DPIRD's Stocking Rate Guidelines.	
		There needs to be a minimum of 50% groundcover maintained on the property throughout the year to reduce the risks of wind and water erosion.	
		Section 2.4 of the Bioscience ELMP states that "some horses will be placed in the stables overnight while other [horses] will remain in the paddocks." This does not provide sufficient detail (how many horses and how long they are stabled) to assess how much this could reduce the impact on the land.	

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Officer
			Comments
		Assuming that half of the horses (11 horses) are stabled for 12 hours per day, this could reduce the proposed stocking rate to 165 DSE (110 + $110/2$ = 165).	
		This still exceeds the sustainable stocking rate of 29.32 DSE for the total paddock area.	
		Section 4.4 of the Bioscience ELMP identifies that the trees on the north- western side of the property have died or are in the process of dying. The report indicates that the Acid Sulfate Soils (ASS) are likely to be contributing to this.	
		While this may be a factor, another factor that is likely to be contributing to the tree death is the compaction of the soil from the horse's hooves. The tree death on the property is in stark contrast to the nearby trees on the adjacent property on the western side where the trees appear to remain healthy.	
		Western Australia has a mandatory livestock ownership, identification and movement system, known as the National Livestock Identification Scheme (NLIS). This requires owners of cattle, sheep, goats, pigs, horses, ponies, donkeys and hybrids, deer, alpacas, llama, camels, vicuna and buffalo to register, even if these animals are kept as pets. DPIRD's Brands Office then allocates a property identification code (PIC) to owners to indicate who owns the animals and where they are kept.	
		More information about the NLIS can be found at	
		https://www.agric.wa.gov.au/livestock-movement-identification/livestock- ownershipidentification-and-movement-western-australia?nopaging=1	
		For more information please contact Grant Stainer on 90813 113 or grantley.stainer@dpird.wa.qov.au	

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Officer
			Comments
Γ	I		
DPIRD – Second Submission		Thank you for inviting the Department of Primary Industries and Regional Development (DPIRD) to comment on the updated Equine Land Management Plan (ELMP) on the above proposal.	Noted. Discussed in the main report.
		DPIRD objects to the proposal and offers the following comments.	
		Existing land degradation	
		• DPIRD administers the Soil and Land Conservation Act 1945. The purpose of this act is to prevent soil and land degradation.	
		• Aerial photos, both in the ELMP and on Google Earth, indicates that the stocking rates and management have degraded the land with little to no groundcover present, trees dying, and waterlogging issues.	
		• DPIRD has no confidence that the updated ELMP, supplied with the application, will be sufficient to prevent land degradation or that it will be adhered to.	
		Proposed stocking rate	
		• The ELMP is based on the irrigated stocking rate for this soil landscape unit.	
		• DPIRD does not consider irrigation to be appropriate at this location due to the waterlogging, inundation, and the presence of shallow groundwater.	
		• Calculations of stocking rates require established pasture. As the land is currently bare, the relevant stocking rate is zero DSE per hectare.	
		<ul> <li>Pasture needs to be established before grazing commences.</li> </ul>	
		• Section 2.4 (page 9) includes the statement: "Horses do not graze on site. Grazing can trigger pasture-caused laminitis which would be detrimental to the horse performance." This appears aimed at supporting	

Submitter	No	lo Submitter Comments	Officer
			Comments
	T.		
		the practice of keeping horses on bare paddocks, and conflicts with other sections of the ELMP.	
		• It is not clear how BioScience arrived at their conclusions relating to the stocking rate. For example, the calculation in section 3.3.2 (page 11) of the report is numerically incorrect, and it is also unclear why they chose multiplication.	
		• The numbers described in tables 3, 4, and 5 do not cross-reference well, leading to doubts about the calculations.	
		• The stocking rate calculation by BioScience assumes each horse will only access the pastured paddocks for one hour a day before being returned to a stable and enclosure. However, there are inconsistencies in BioScience's ELMP about the activities of the horses.	
		• An example is the shade sails proposed for the paddocks. If the horses are in the paddocks for one hour of exercise each, they will be moving around, and not standing underneath the shade sails, thereby making the sails redundant.	
		• Section 2.4 (page 9) states that some horses will be placed in the stables overnight while other will remain in the paddocks.	
		• Given the high number of horses that all completely rely on imported feed, DPIRD consider the equine activity to be a high intensity land use, analogous to a small feedlot.	
		Nutrient Management	
		• From a nutrient management perspective and the existing historic use of the land for horses, the ELMP should include site-specific soil testing of soil nutrients and Phosphorus Retention Index (PRI), rather than estimating PRI.	

Submitter	No Submitter Comments		Officer
			Comments
		Soil testing should use representative samples from each paddock and from each enclosure outside the stables.	
		• The enclosure yards, used by the stabled horses, should have an impermeable base and a mechanism for collecting nutrient-enriched runoff.	
		• The proposed 100mm fill layer should have an appropriate PRI to assist in nutrient retention on site. This may require the addition of a high PRI amendment.	
		Maintain groundcover	
		• A minimum of 50% groundcover should be maintained evenly across the property at all times.	
		• As there appears to be little to no groundcover on the property, DPIRD recommends the horses are removed until the pasture has re- established so that groundcover can then be maintained at or above the minimum threshold of 50%.	
		Proposed use	
		• The referral from the Shire relates to an 'Equestrian Activity' use class, defined in the Shire of Serpentine-Jarrahdale Local Planning Scheme (LPS) to mean 'any land or buildings used for the showing, competition or training of horses and includes a riding school.'	
		• The ELMP is based on a 'Stable' use class, which means 'any land, building or structure used for the housing, keeping and feeding of horses, asses and mules and associated incidental activities.'	
		• The application appears to include both use classes, as new and existing stables are included in the application as well as other facilities and land used to exercise and spell racehorses.	

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Officer
			Comments
		<ul> <li>Within the Rural Living B zone, Stables are Discretionary uses (AA) and Equestrian Activities use class is not listed as a use class.</li> <li>There is no evidence in the updated ELMP that BioScience has considered the comments and recommendations made by the Department of Water and Environmental Regulation (DWER) in their response to the initial proposal.</li> </ul>	
DWER		<ul> <li>Thank you for providing the development application received with correspondence dated 10 March 2021 for the Department of Water and Environmental Regulation (Department) to consider.</li> <li>The Department has identified that the keeping of horses and associated facilities has the potential for impact on environment and/or water resources values and/or management. The Department has reviewed the proposal and does not support the development due to the following.</li> <li>Issue – Land Capability</li> <li>Advice</li> <li>The site is located within the catchment of the Peel Harvey Estuary System, thus is subject to Statement of Planning Policy (SPP) 2.1: The Peel Harvey Coastal Plain Catchment (WAPC, 2003).</li> <li>Within section 6.2.5 of this policy, "Animal stocking rates shall not exceed the stocking rates recommended by the Department of Agriculture for the pasture type for the policy area."</li> <li>The development application area is located within Pinjarra (P1b) soil type. The Stocking Rate Guidelines for Rural Small Landholdings (Department of Agriculture, 2000), recommends the stocking rate of 6 Dry Sheep Equivalent (DSE) per hectare on dry pasture or 20 DSE on irrigated pasture. The applicant is requesting up to 22 horses be kept on the property. Each horse is the equivalent of 10 DSE (therefore requesting a total of 220 DSE).</li> </ul>	Noted. Advice provided has been considered. If the proposal were to be approved, the applicant would be required to obtain all the permits required to regularise the retrospective keeping of horses. As discussed in the main report, Officers consider the scale of the proposed operations and the context of the site present a proposal that would need careful management to ensure adverse environmental and amenity impacts could be minimised.

Submitter	r No Submitter Comments		Officer
			Comments
	1		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
		With 1.58 ha of dry pasture, the allowable stocking rate is 9.48 DSE which is marginally sufficient for one horse.	
		It should be noted however that Paddocks A-F are unsuitable for stocking due to seasonal waterlogging and at the seasonal highest maximum groundwater intercepts the surface. Within the WQPG 13: Environmental Guidelines for Horse Facilities and Activities (WQPG 13), "Horses should be kept away from swampy or seasonally water covered ground, with a minimum distance of at least 1.2 m above the highest annual groundwater table level". This would not appear achievable within the lot in the absence of bringing in fill.	
		In addition, the Wetlands dataset of the Swan Coastal Plain identifies a 'Resource Enhancement Wetland' (REW) that runs through the majority of the Lot. Figure 1 within the development application indicates that the horse paddocks and stables are located within this REW. Within the WQPG 13, "Horses should not be kept or allowed access to within 200m of wetlands".	
		The applicant proposes to significantly increase the stocking rate and it is noted that an Equine Land Management Plan (ELMP) (Bioscience, October 2020) has been included within this application. The ELMP in its current form does not contain sufficient information to support the significant increase in suitable stocking rates. Please refer to the Department's comments in Attachment 1 of this correspondence.	
		Consistent with SPP 2.1, it is recommended the Department of Primary Industries and Regional Development is consulted regarding this proposal, and any advice regarding stocking rates and land management measures are to be adhered to.	
		Issue – Industry Regulation	
		Advice	
		The Department regulates emissions and discharges from the construction and operation of prescribed premises through a works approval and	

Submitter	No	Submitter Commen	iments		Officer
					Comments
	-				
		licensing process, Act 1986 (EP Act)	under Part V, Division 3 of the Enviro	nmental Protection	
		J	prescribed premises are outlined in otection Regulations 1987.	Schedule 1 of the	
		prescribed premis discharge from an of a works appro	es a works approval to be obtained be ses and makes it an offence to caus existing prescribed premises unless to val or licence (or registration) and to any conditions to which the licence or		
			elopment application request was revi d licence requirements under Part V D		
		above, the propos	rmation provided, and noting the unc al may cause the premises to be consi Schedule 1 of the Environmental Prot ing categories:		
		Category	Category description	Production or design Capacity	
		63	•	500 tonnes or more per year	

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Officer
			Comments

Category	Category Description	Production or design Capacity	
	"Landfill Waste Classification and Waste Definitions 1996" published by the Chief Executive Officer and as amended from time to time) is accepted for burial.		
61A	Solid Waste Facility: premises (other than premises within Category 67A) on which solid waste produced on other premises is stored, reprocessed, treated, or discharged onto land.	1000 tonnes or more per year	
sufficient to dete subsequent licence capacity. There do accepted at the si site. Should a land or design capacity will need to apply	ided in the development application rmine whether the criteria for a we be are met regarding waste receipt pro- besn't appear to be specific reference te, as opposed to excavation from a re- tifill or waste depot facility that is propo that will exceed the applicable thres for a works approval and thereafter Part V, Division 3 of the EP Act.	orks approval and oduction or design to fill material being aised portion of the sed at a production holds, the applicant	
The applicant is th Industry Regu http://www.der.wa	erefore advised to refer to the information Guide to Licensing .gov.au/ourwork/licences-and-works-a relating to applications for works app	available at pprovals and / or if	

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Officer
			Comments
		registrations please contact the Department at <u>info@dwer.wa.gov.au</u> or phone 6364 7000.	
		In addition, refer to the below Fact Sheet which includes information for utilisation of fill classified as clean or uncontaminated fill <u>https://www.der.wa.gov.au/images/documents/our-work/licences-and-</u> <u>worksapprovals/fact-sheet/Factsheet -amendments to EP Regulations -</u> <u>final.pdf</u>	
		The application will need to demonstrate compliance with the general provisions of the EP Act and all relevant regulations, irrespective of whether the premises is prescribed or not.	
		Note that this advice is provided based on information provided. Should this information change, the works approval and/or licensing requirements may also change. Applicants are encouraged to contact the Department at the above contact details to clarify requirements, should there be changes to information.	
		*'Production capacity' and 'design capacity'	
		<ul> <li>production capacity is the rate at which a product is produced as relevant to the description of the prescribed premises category; and</li> </ul>	
		<ul> <li>design capacity is the maximum capacity / capability for which the facility or equipment is designed to receive, handle, process, contain or emit, as relevant to the description of the prescribed premises category.</li> </ul>	
		In view of the uncertainty regarding regulation under Part V of the EP Act, advice has been provided on environmental risks and mitigation strategies, based on the available information. In the event that the applicant determines that a works approval or licence application is required under Part V of the EP Act, the advice provided in this communication does not prejudice and must not be considered to infer the outcome of the EP Act licence and works approval process.	

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Officer
			Comments
	1		
		Issue - Acid Sulfate Soils	
		Advice	
		Acid Sulfate Soils (ASS) risk mapping indicates that the site is located within an area identified as representing a moderate to low / high to moderate risk of ASS occurring within three metres of the natural soil surface. The Department advises that a model ASS related condition is not considered necessary in this instance. However, the following advice is recommended to be applied to the relevant approval.	
		Acid Sulfate Soils (ASS) risk mapping indicates that the site is located within an area identified as representing a moderate to low risk of ASS occurring within three metres of the natural soil surface. Please refer to the Department's acid sulfate soil guidelines for information to assist with the management of ground and/or groundwater disturbing works: <u>https://www.der.wa.gov.au/yourenvironment/acid-sulfate-soils/69- acidsulfatesoils-guidelines</u> .	
		Issue - Groundwater Licence	
		Advice	
		The subject area is located within the Serpentine Groundwater Area (Serpentine 3 subarea) as proclaimed under the Rights in Water and Irrigation Act 1914. Any groundwater abstraction in this proclaimed area for purposes other than domestic and/or stock watering taken from either the superficial or confined aquifers, is subject to licensing by the Department.	
		The Department confirms that the applicant holds a current groundwater licence to abstract 9000kL/ha/year for the purpose of irrigation of up to 1ha of pasture, domestic use and stock watering. However, the applicant has indicated that the potential total paddock sizes for irrigation will be 1.58ha. Water application rates for irrigated pasture are calculated at a rate of	

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Officer
			Comments
		7,500kL/ha/year. Therefore, the applicant may need to apply for an increase to the current groundwater licence in order to meet the watering requirements to maintain the increase in available pasture for stock.	
		The issuing of a groundwater licence is not guaranteed but if issued, will contain a number of conditions that are binding upon the licensee. The landowner is to contact licensing support on 9550 4222 for further advice.	
		Where the Department has a statutory role, planning applications should be considered prior to the Department issuing any relevant permits, licenses and/or approvals.	
		In the event there are modifications to the proposal that may have implications on aspects of environment and/or water management, the Department should be notified to enable the implications to be assessed.	
DWER		Thank you for providing the amended Equine Land Management Plan received with correspondence dated 6 September 2021 for the Department of Water and Environmental Regulation (Department) to consider.	The second submission is noted.
		The Department has reviewed the amended Equine Land Management Plan: 43 Windmill Avenue, Serpentine WA 6125 (Bioscience, August 2021) and it appears the Department's previous comments dated 21 April 2021 have not been addressed in the amended management plan.	
		The Department contacted Bioscience and was informed that they did not receive the comments from the Shire before the amended management plan was compiled to address the Department of Primary Industries and Regional Development's (DPIRD's) and the Shire's comments. As such, the Department's previous advice in correspondence dated 21 April 2021 is still relevant, and the revised proposal in its current form is not supported.	
		For ease of reference, please refer to Attachment 1 which provides the Department's previous correspondence.	

#### PA21/138 – Lot 110, 43 Windmill Avenue, Serpentine - Equestrian Activity - PA21/138

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Officer Comments
		These comments should be reviewed and actioned alongside comments from the Department of Primary Industries and Regional Development and the Shire. If there are any conflicts between comments from different parties, it is expected that document author will mediate an agreed position between the relevant parties. Where the Department has a statutory role, planning applications should be considered prior to the Department issuing any relevant permits, licenses and/or approvals. In the event there are modifications to the proposal that may have implications on aspects of environment and/or water management, the Department should be notified to enable the implications to be assessed.	
A61408		<ul> <li>Addendum to our submission to the Shire of Serpentine Jarrahdale.</li> <li>Re: Equine Land Management Plan: 43 Windmill Avenue, Serpentine WA 6125.</li> <li>This matter relates to our hand delivered submission, delivered to you today 24 February 2021.</li> <li>We respectfully request that the following matters be taken into consideration:</li> <li>1. The training track is too close to our rear boundary - because it is placed right up against the fence posts and the action of horses on Matthew Scott's side is causing a build up of sand against the posts.</li> </ul>	In order to manage dust, the applicatior

We believe that such track should not have been constructed closer than 3 metres to the boundary.
 We once removed all of the sand along our side so that it became level with the better of the poster but it is new back again and we should not

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Officer Comments
		<text></text>	

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Officer
			Comments

|--|--|--|

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Officer
			Comments
A61408		We now respectfully request that the following matters be taken into consideration:	Noted. The report recommends a condition of approval that requires
Second Submission		(1) THE TRAINING TRACK IS TOO CLOSE TO OUR REAR BOUNDARY BECAUSE IT WAS PLACED RIGHT UP AGAINST THE FENCE POSTS AND THE ACTION OF HORSES ON MATTHEW SCOTT'S SIDE OF THE BOUNDARY LINE IS CAUSING A BUILD UP OF SAND AGAINST THE FENCE POSTS.	elimination of all declared and environmental weeds from the subject site. In order to manage dust, the application
		(2) WE BELIEVE THAT SUCH TRACK SHOULD NOT HAVE BEEN CONSTRUCTED CLOSER THAN 3 METRES CLEAR OF THE BOUNDARY.	proposes irrigating the paddocks and training track every morning. It is considered that this practice should assist in stabilising soil and reduce sand drifting
		(3) WE ONCE REMOVED ALL OF THE SAND ALONG OUR SIDE OF THE BOUNDARY SO THAT IT BECAME LEVEL WITH THE BOTTOM OF THE POSTS, BUT IT IS NOW BACK AGAIN AND WE SHOULD NOT BE REQUIRED TO REMOVE IT EVERY YEAR IN ORDER TO FALL INTO LINE WITH FIRE BREAK REQUIREMENTS ON OUR SIDE OF THE BOUNDARY.	to the neighbouring property.
		(4) ALONG THE ENTIRE BACK BOUNDARY THERE IS STRONG GROWTH OF AN UNIDENTIFIED PLANT WHICH WE THINK ORIGINATED FROM MATTHEW SCOTT'S PROPERTY. WE INTEND TO AGAIN REMOVE ALL OF SUCH GROWTH FROM OUR SIDE OF THE BOUNDARY BUT NOT UNTIL THE SHIIRE OF SERPENTINE JARRAHDALE HAS IDENTIFIED THE PLANT AND IS ABLE TO ADVISE US AS TO THE BEST WAY TO DEAL WITH THE MATTER.	
		PLUS ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF OUR DEEP CONCERN REGARDING THE FOLLOWING MATTERS	
		(5) WE ARE WORRIED THAT WATER QUALITY FROM OUR DEEP BORE MAY SUFFER FROM ACTIONS UNDERTAKEN BY MATTHEW SCOTT.	
		(6) WE ARE ALSO CONCERNED THAT DESPITE ANY IMPOSITIONS THAT THE SHIRE OF SERPENTINE JARRAHDALE MAY PUT ON MATTHEW SCOTT WITH REGARD TO WATER QUALITY, AND FLIES RELATED TO HORSE MANURE, WE MAY STILL SUFFER FROM LOSS OF A COMFORTABLE AMENITY.	
		AS YOU DELIBERATE REGARDING THESE MATTERS, PLEASE TAKE INTO ACCOUNT THAT THAT OUR PROPERTY IS THE CLOSEST NEIGHBOUR TO MATTHEW SCOTT'S PROPERTY.	

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Officer
			Comments
A61309		In reference to the Equine Land Management Plan provided to us for comment, we would like to raise the following concerns: The proposed stocking rate for the above property as being listed in the report prepared by Bioscience as holding up to 22 horses. Typically, I would note that we observe those 22 horses already on the property over a considerable timeframe with the impact being felt by surrounding properties. We believe this is a high number of horses for the 2.6ha property and not sustainable. There is already obvious soil erosion evidenced by the drop in land height between our property (no 33 – property adjoining south of proposed development) and no 43, along with historic aerial photos obtained	Noted. Land degradation matters have been discussed in the main report Officers consider that the if the proposed management plans were to be implemented in their entirety, adverse environmental and amenity impacts could be minimised.
		from Nearmaps (see attachment 1) detailing changes to the property over the last ten years with the paddocks primarily now being sand only. The report also mentions the death of trees which is evidenced by the aerial photos.	<b>-</b>
		Our boundary fence has been impacted by the soil eroding on no 43 side, making the fence unsustainable, along with the wooden fence posts are being 'eaten' by horses kept in the small paddocks that adjoin our property. I note that the only two paddocks not provided with reticulation to suppress the dust is the two that are directly located along our boundary line.	The application proposes irrigating the paddocks and training track every morning. It is considered that this practice should assist in stabilising soil and reduce sand drifting to the neighbouring property.
		The lack of grass/plants mean that the property produces a substantial amount of dust – we have planted trees and shrubs along the boundary to attempt to mitigate dust, noise from the business operating there early and late at certain days of the week and also to provide some protection from the damage next door from affecting our property. Additionally, we have noted an increase in fly population that mean we now have to purchase fly traps and fly deterrents to protect our dogs from fly bites. This was never an issue before so many horses were located next door.	The provided information relating to best management practices that would be implemented, like maintaining minimum pasture height, paddock rotations, rotation of feeding areas and water troughs, coverage of bare areas would be implemented.
		I also note the report detailing possible runoff to neighbouring lot/s and leaching into the pond (located close to our property) and into groundwater supplies. We are not convinced that this will be addressed adequately or if	As discussed in the report, the filling of land shall be done in a way that shall not adversely impact on adjoining land.

Submitter         No         Submitter Comments	Officer Comments
---	---------------------

erosion having exposed sulphides shrubs along that boundary (to mit also provide privacy from the employ the fact it is unsightly) and are con impact on our plantings. While we acknowledge that the t income, we do not feel that at this for the zoning or land size and wo kept on the property, along with ar soil, proper management of runoff,	d occur. The report also discusses the s. We have spent money on trees and gate the impacts already mentioned and byees working on the property, noise and cerned the same effect could occur and raining of the horses is the occupants number of horses it is an activity suitable ald look to see a reduced rate of horses expectation around rehabilitation of the manure and other impacts and a stocking e land management practises that would broperties.
--	--

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Officer
			Comments



## NEW SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS PA21/138 – Lot 110, 43 Windmill Avenue, Serpentine - Equestrian Activity - PA21/138

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Officer Comments

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Officer
			Comments



Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Officer
			Comments



## NEW SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS PA21/138 – Lot 110, 43 Windmill Avenue, Serpentine - Equestrian Activity - PA21/138

		• •	<i>,</i> ,	-	
Submitter	No	Submitter Comments			Officer
					Comments



Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Officer
			Comments
A61303		I have recently become aware the owner of the above property has	Noted. Issues raised have been
Willison		submitted a retrospective application to manage equestrian activity keeping up to 22 horses on site.	the main report, Officers consider the scale of the proposed operations and the context of the site present a proposal that would need careful management to ensure adverse environmental and amenity impacts could be minimised. The report recommends active weed management to occur in order to avoid the deleterious impact that exposed soils can have to attracting and spreading weeds. This aspect has been conditioned and would be further enforced by the Shire's Compliance Section. Devaluation of properties is not a valid planning consideration, what is a relevant planning consideration is protecting amonity, both europet and intended future
		I live at 23 Windmill Avenue, the second property from this address some 200m away. Why was I not informed of this application when the Shire's policy is to inform all residents owning land within 500m of the subject site. I also note comments were asked for no later than 09 March 2021 but would like my objections noted and informed of when this will go to council.	
		I am concerned should the application be approved for the following reasons:	
	1. 2. 3.	1. Since the owner has purchased the property, it has steadily degraded due to overstocking.	
		Most paddocks are now bare dirt which during summer become a dust problem and winter become waterlogged. After the recent rains some of the horses are already standing in flooded paddocks. I am willing to take photos of the horses in waterlogged paddocks should you wish.	
		2. The trees (Eucalyptus Robustus or Swamp Mahogany) in the north western corner appear to have been ringbarked and dying, further contributing to the degradation of the land.	
		3. Due to the absence of stable ground cover, weeds in the form of crown beard have become prominent on the property. While this is not a declared weed, it is invasive and is spreading to the road verge and neighbouring properties. I am aware this weed has become a problem in the Geraldton region. The owner has made no attempt to manage this weed outbreak.	
		4. There is minimal shelter for the horses and many of the horses are exposed to the extremes of weather.	

Submitter	Νο	Submitter Comments	Officer Comments
		<ul><li>5. I believe the management of this property has been poor and as such has devalued all properties nearby.</li><li>I would like to be kept informed of the outcome of this application.</li></ul>	