Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Officer Comment
Water Corporation		Servicing	
		The subject land is remote from water and wastewater services.	
		<u>Drainage</u>	
		The subject area falls within the Serpentine Drainage Catchment in the Mundijong Drainage District, a rural drainage system. The Serpentine Branch Drain runs along the western boundary of the subject site.	
		Rural drains are not designed to give flood protection at all times and some inundation of land can be expected. Water Corporation maintains its existing drains to ensure they are capable of clearing water from adjacent rural properties within three days of a storm event, where contours and internal drainage make this physically possible.	The development does not seek to impact upon the existing rural drainage onsite. Condition has bee imposed requiring a Stormwater Managemer Plan to be submitted to ensure post development flows meet pre-development flows and that water along the channel will not be obstructed.
		To determine the flood level the developer should contact the Department of Water and Environmental Regulations regarding the Drainage and Water Management Plan which includes the subject area.	along the charmer will not be escateded.
		Developments within this catchment are required to contain the flows from a one in one-hundred-year storm event on site. Discharge to Water Corporation drains must be compensated to pre-development levels. No adverse discharge or runoff from the subject land would be allowed into our drainage system.	
		Protection of Services	
		It should be noted that an existing drainage channel is located in close proximity to the subject land (plan attached). Due consideration will be required when developing in this area. The developer is required to fund the full cost of protecting or modifying any of the existing infrastructure which may be affected by the proposed development. In accordance with Section 90 of the Water Services Act 2012 whenever development is proposed near Water Corporation assets the applicant/developer/owner needs approval	

E22/6413

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Officer Comment
		prior to construction. This should be done by submitting an Approval of Works application. For information about this application please follow this link: <a href="https://www.watercorporation.com.au/home/builders-and-developers/working-near-our-assets/approval-for-works">https://www.watercorporation.com.au/home/builders-and-developers/working-near-our-assets/approval-for-works</a> General  This 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.	
DPIRD		The Department of Primary Industries and Regional Development (DPIRD) objects to the proposal for the following reasons:  • State Planning Policy 2.5 - Rural Planning in section 5.5 states the following:  • WAPC policy is to:  support small scale tourism opportunities, such as bed and breakfast, holiday house, chalet, art gallery, micro-brewery and land uses associated with primary production, within the rural zone;  The proposed restaurant will have a seating capacity of 1000 and the brewery at full production will annually produce 5 million litres of beer for both the Serpentine and East Perth venues of Bright Tank as well as the wholesale market. This is a large development, and it cannot be described as a small-scale tourism opportunity or micro-brewery.  • The Shire of Serpentine-Jarrahdale Town Planning Scheme No. 2 (TPS2) states in Clause 5.10.1 the following:  • The purpose and intent of the Rural zone is to allocate land to accommodate the full range of rural pursuits and associated activities.  The proposed restaurant and brewery are not rural pursuits and due to their large size, cannot be regarded as associated activities.	Officers are satisfied that the development satisfies State Planning Policy 2.5 which is addressed further in the report. The updated NIMP and cropping plan demonstrates that the nutrient application rates generally align with the Environment Protection Peel Inlet – Harvey Estuary Policy (EEP) nutrient targets. The NIMP also has been amended to recycle water onsite and also hold water during certain periods of the year. A condition has been imposed ensuring the five year wastewater volumes meet the EEP nutrient targets This is discussed further in the Council report.

E22/6413 Page 2 of 72

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Officer Comment	
		The Shire of Serpentine-Jarrahdale Draft Town Planning Scheme No. 3 have the following objectives for the Rural zone:  To provide for the maintenance or enhancement of specific local rural character.  To protect and accommodate broad acre agricultural activities such as cropping and grazing and intensive uses such as horticulture as primary uses, with other rural pursuits and rural industries as secondary uses in circumstances where they demonstrate compatibility with the primary use.  To maintain and enhance the environmental qualities of the landscape, vegetation, soils and water bodies including groundwater, to protect sensitive areas especially the natural valley and watercourse systems from damage.  To provide for the operation and development of existing, future and potential rural land uses by limiting the introduction of sensitive land uses in the Rural zone.  To provide for a range of non-rural land uses where they have demonstrated benefit and are compatible with surrounding rural uses.		
		Due to the magnitude of the proposed restaurant and brewery it is not possible to classify these as secondary uses to agriculture. The brewery (alcoholic beverage manufacturing) is not a rural industry when taking the following planning decisions into consideration:		
		Harvis Capital Pty Ltd v Mid-West/Wheatbelt Joint Development Assessment Panel [2020] WASC 205 - Proposed development fell within use class classification of 'Industry - General'		
		Newco Mills PTY LTD and Presiding Member of The Metro Outer Joint Development Assessment Panel [2021] WASAT 160		
		The application for the proposed restaurant and brewery (non-rural land uses) does not demonstrate benefit or compatibility with surrounding rural uses. For example, the extra vehicle movements into the property and traffic		

E22/6413

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Officer Comment	
		on rural roads associated with the brewery and restaurant will be significantly greater than that of the surrounding rural land. This is consistent with vehicle movements and traffic in industrial and commercial zones.		
		To properly assess the proposed trade waste irrigation scheme outlined in the Nutrient and Irrigation Management Plan (NIMP), the following points need to be considered:		
		<ul> <li>Wastewater irrigation during June – August is not suitable as rainfall exceeds evapotranspiration (DPIRD irrigation calculator) during this period. Insufficient evidence has been provided to demonstrate that groundwater level or quality will not be affected by trade waste leaching, or plant growth by waterlogging during these months. Considering peak trade waste production volumes, winter storage capacity needs to hold 3.51 ML of treated wastewater to store all brewery wastewater produced June – August, inclusive.</li> <li>Minimum separation to groundwater has not been shown for the proposed trade waste irrigation area. Two meters of separation to groundwater is preferred for the irrigation area, but 1.5m separation is permitted with an adequate groundwater monitoring programme.</li> <li>A clear nutrient offtake strategy needs to document how the pasture growth matches nutrient input, this should include: all types of crops grown and their respective yields, method of harvest and disposal method, nutrient and water supplementation to achieve target yield, and any specific agronomic practice (ie re-sowing, weed suppression).</li> </ul>		
		DPIRD found it difficult to find and cross-reference the relevant information in the documents provided.		
		Planning approval should be conditional on the proponent obtaining the required licences from the Department of Water and Environmental Regulation for prescribed premises (Category 25 and 54) licences and works approval.		

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Officer Comment
DWER		Thank you for providing the development application for a proposed brewery and restaurant received with correspondence dated 28 April 2022 for the Department of Water and Environmental Regulation (Department) to consider. The Department has reviewed the application and wishes to advise it does not support the proposal in its current form due to the following issues.  Issue Industry Regulation	An updated NIMP has bee submitted and discussed further in the report. The updated NIMP has demonstrated general alignment with the Environment Protection Peel Inlet – Harvey Estuary Policy (EEP). A condition has been imposed ensuring the five year wastewater volumes meet the EEP nutrient targets This is discussed further in the Council report.
		Advice The Department regulates emissions and discharges from the construction and operation of prescribed premises through a works approval and licensing process, under Part V of the Environmental Protection Act 1986 (EP Act).	
		The categories of Prescribed premises are outlined in Schedule 1 of the Environmental Protection Regulations 1987.	
		The EP Act requires a works approval to be obtained before constructing a prescribed premise and makes it an offence to cause an emission or discharge unless a licence is held for the premises.	
		The provided development referral request was reviewed in relation to works approval and licence requirements under Part V Division 3 of the EP Act.	
		Based on the information provided, the proposed operation's design capacity will cause the premises to be a prescribed premise as per Schedule 1 of the Environmental Protection Regulations 1987 (Regulations) for the following categories:	

E22/6413 Page 5 of 72

Submitter	No	Submitter Comme	ents			Officer Comment	
Submitter	No	Category  25  54  The EP Act mak premise to becor unless the work is an offence under volume of waste,	Category description  Alcoholic beverage manufacturing: premises on which an alcoholic beverage is manufactured and from which liquid waste is or is to be discharged onto land or into waters.  Sewage facility: premises on which sewage is treated (excluding septic tanks) or from which treated sewage is discharged onto land or into waters  es it an offence to undertake me, or become capable of beirg undertaken in accordance with the EP Act to cause an emise noise or odour from the Prescrile with a works approval or lice	More than 100 cubic meters per day  any work which a Prescribe a works appropriate to bed Premises,	ed Premises oval. It is also he nature or unless done	Officer Comment	
		More information	regarding this activity can b sheet – Beverage manufactu				
		The occupier will	also need to comply with the ns 1997 irrespective of whether				
		However, the follo	owing matters require further cla	arification:			
		<ul><li>air emissions.</li><li>Details of the</li></ul>	1 MW steam boiler including the reverse osmosis system including the saling t	cluding its max	ximum daily		

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Officer Comment	
		Detail of any other beverage products produced e.g. cider, fruit juice products and where the juices will be processed or sourced.		
		Details of the expected maximum daily volumes of wastewater produced from the brewery and the restaurant.		
		<ul> <li>Minimal detail is provided on the proposed brewery AND restaurant wastewater treatment and/or disposal systems. It is unclear whether the two waste streams will be mixed for the purposes of treatment and/or disposal. The Department would not support the mixing of the blackwater and the brewhouse waste streams.</li> </ul>		
		<ul> <li>Whether the site is adequately sized and suitable for on-site wastewater disposal given the large daily wastewater volumes requiring disposal even during the wet winter months i.e up to 678kL/day of blackwater and up to 678kL/day of brewery wastewater has been proposed as needing disposal.</li> </ul>		
		<ul> <li>Depth to the highest winter water table in the irrigation areas, given that a 1.5m separation distance is required.</li> </ul>		
		• The site and soil evaluation report concludes "there are no site constraints to an on-site wwtp", despite very shallow groundwater (<1m) and very permeable Bassendean sands (>4.5 m/d) with next to no ability to retain phosphorus. It is proposed to store some wastewater over winter, however no detail of winter storage or off-site disposal is proposed.		
		The Department has concerns that the site may not be suitable for a brewery of this size given the volumes of wastewater that will be produced requiring on-site disposal.		
		A 5000kL/pa brewery will produce up to 678 kL/day of wastewater and there is an intention to irrigate all year round even when rainfall exceeds evaporation, and the site is saturated. In these conditions all applied		

E22/6413

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Officer Comment
		wastewater will simply percolate below the root zone to groundwater in the sandy areas or run off site into drains or wetlands in the inundated areas.	
		The Department's concerns with hydraulic loading and capacity, proposed wastewater treatment and disposal technology, and combined volumes of wastewater requiring on-site disposal throughout the year, were raised with the applicant and consultant during a meeting in July 2021, and further detailed provided within correspondence dated 3 August 2021. Without predetermining any application which may be submitted, if the above matters are not resolved, it is unclear whether the Department would be able to grant a works approval for the proposal as articulated in the scoping meeting and correspondence.	
		The Department received a works approval application on 20 May 2022 for Category 25 to construct the brewery and a brewery wastewater treatment and disposal system and for Category 54 to construct a sewage treatment and disposal system. However, preliminary assessment of the application has found that the detail contained within the works approval application differs to that within this development application, as well as issues with brewery and sewage wastewater treatment and disposal.	
		The Department has written to the applicant on 3 June 2022 detailing concerns with unacceptable risk of harm to the environment as well as inconsistencies between the works approval application and this development application. The Department has stopped the clock on this works approval application pending a response from the applicant. Further communications are to be held between the applicant and the Department.	
		Issue Nutrient Export Risk – Peel-Harvey Catchment	
		Recommendation The proposal is located within the Peel-Harvey catchment. Conventional inground horticulture, such as irrigated wastewater onto ryegrass pasture, has the potential to export significant nutrient loads to the Peel-Harvey Estuary	

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Officer Comment	
		System. Subsequently this development application is subject to the following state policies:		
		• Environmental Protection Peel Inlet - Harvey Estuary Policy (EPP) (EPA,1992); and		
		• State Planning Policy 2.1 (SPP 2.1) Peel Harvey Coastal Plain Catchment (WAPC, 2003).		
		• The below guiding documents and local planning policy provides further specific reference to achieving the intent, and overall nutrient targets, of the aforementioned policies with respect to horticultural practices.		
		Agriculture Futures: Potential rural land uses on the Palusplain (DAFWA 2012);		
		<ul> <li>Hydrological and nutrient modelling of the Peel-Harvey catchment – Water Science Technical Series Report No WST 33 (DoW, 2011);</li> </ul>		
		Horticulture in the Peel-Harvey: A guide for investors and growers (PHCC, 2015);		
		• Local Planning Policy 4.12 – Horticulture (Shire of Serpentine Jarrahdale, 2018);		
		<ul> <li>Water Quality Protection Note 79: Rural restaurants, cafes and taverns near sensitive water resources (DWER, 2006); and</li> </ul>		
		Water Quality Protection Note 22: Irrigation with nutrient-rich wastewater (DWER, 2008).		
		The Local Planning Policy 4.12 is informed by the preceding technical studies by the Department of Primary Industries and Regional Development (formerly DAFWA) and this Department (formerly DoW).		
		The Peel-Harvey EPP establishes phosphorous loading targets for the Peel-Harvey catchment to be adhered to by new or expanding proposals. To comply with these total loading targets, new (or expanding) operations within the Serpentine River catchment would be required to achieve an export rate		

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Officer Comment
		for total phosphorous (TP) of 0.29kg/ha/year, as specified within the Department's report Hydrological and nutrient modelling of the Peel-Harvey catchment (DoW, 2011).	
		The Department's modelling report has also established nutrient input (or application) rates for the Peel-Harvey catchment to achieve the necessary nutrient export loads. These need to be less than 6.5 kg/ha/year for phosphorous and less than 45 kg/ha/year for nitrogen.	
		As per Department of Primary Industries and Regional Development (DPIRD) soil mapping, this site is on Bassendean Sand (sandplain and broad extremely low rises with imperfectly drained deep or very deep grey siliceous sands) which is poorly nutrient retentive. These areas are generally not suitable for annual and perennial in-ground horticulture (including irrigated pasture) due to the high nutrient export risk. Therefore, advice should be sought from DPIRD.	
		The onus of proof will rest with the proponent to demonstrate any proposal meets the objectives of the aforementioned policies and guidance through the preparation and submission of a Nutrient and Irrigation Management Plan (NIMP) to support the development application.	
		The application included a NIMP at Appendix F. However, the detail contained within the NIMP provides no information on nutrient removal and does not demonstrate that the input and export target rates with management practices can be met for nitrogen and phosphorus.	
		Issue Native Vegetation Protection	
		Advice Under section 51C of the Environmental Protection Act 1986 (EP Act), clearing of native vegetation is an offence unless:	
		it is undertaken under the authority of a clearing permit	

E22/6413 Page 10 of 72

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Officer Comment
		it is done after the person has received notice under Section 51DA(5) that a clearing permit is not required	
		the clearing is subject to an exemption	
		Exemptions for clearing that are a requirement of written law, or authorised under certain statutory processes, are contained in Schedule 6 of the EP Act. Exemptions for low impact routine land management practices outside of environmentally sensitive areas (ESAs) are contained in the Environmental Protection (Clearing of Native Vegetation) Regulations 2004 (the Clearing Regulations).	
		Based on the information provided, should development approval be issued, the proposal is likely to be exempt from the requirement for a clearing permit under Regulation 5, Item 1 of the Clearing Regulations. Note that this exemption does not apply prior to development approval being issued.	
		If the proposed clearing for the bushfire protection zone is considered by the Shire to be appropriate, and clearing of native vegetation for this purpose is specified within the Development Approval, it is likely to be exempt under Regulation 5, Item 1.	
		This exemption is described in the Departments 'A Guide to the Exemptions and Regulations for Clearing Native Vegetation'. It is the applicant's responsibility to determine compliance with these exemptions and therefore whether a clearing permit is required. If there is uncertainty, then the precautionary principle should be applied, and it is recommended applicants apply for a clearing permit.	
		If further clarification is required, please contact the Department's Native Vegetation Regulation section by email (admin.nvp@dwer.wa.gov.au) or by telephone (6364 7098).	
		Issue Noise Assessment Report	

E22/6413

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Officer Comment
		Advice Please see Attachment 9 of the Council report for the Department's technical review of the Environmental Noise Report prepared by Gabriels Hearne Farrell Pty Ltd.  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.	
		At this point, the Department recommends the proposal is not supported. The Department also recommends that DPIRD is also consulted.	
Department of Health		<ul> <li>The DOH provides the following comment:</li> <li>1. Water Supply and Wastewater Disposal</li> <li>The DOH appreciates the thorough report and the details that were provided for the proposal including the site conditions for the onsite management of wastewater. However, the DOH has concerns as the land is located in an area that becomes inundated during the wettest times of the year and is located within the Estuary catchments of the Swan and Scott Coastal Plains and within 1km of significant wetlands as highlighted in the Government Sewerage Policy (2019). The DOH does not support this proposal until the following can be implemented and demonstrated:</li> <li>1. To consider the Government Sewage Policy requirements:</li> <li>a. The disposal areas appear to be located near potential areas of flooding, onsite dams and winter creek/drain. The disposal area/s need to be designed with a minimum 100 metre setback from sewage sensitive areas including the dams;</li> <li>b. Demonstrate as to whether there is a creek or drain running through the property with appropriate setbacks from the disposal area/s;</li> <li>c. Where areas of land become inundated, (if) land fill is used for these areas they should not be used for disposal areas. Where the use of fill is</li> </ul>	The DoH will be the approval body for the installation of a septic apparatus system to cater for the development. The Shire will be the referral body. Officers have addressed this as part of the Council report.  In terms of mosquito management, a condition has been imposed to manage the risk of mosquito breeding and associated health impacts.

E22/6413 Page 12 of 72

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Officer Comment
		proposed to achieve separation distances, proponents may be required to provide additional information to demonstrate that solutions are effective and do not impact on other lots through water diversion;	
		d. The separation from the base of the irrigation lines or disposal drains require a minimum of 1.5 metres vertical setback from the highest winter water tables;	
		The disposal areas should be dedicated areas that are kept separate and unencumbered by trafficable vehicles, livestock and people;	
		3. To ensure the onsite wastewater treatment plants accommodates peak daily volumes and non-peak volumes, water quality criteria and life of the system (15 years) as Engineer Certified. It was noted in the report volumes were averaged especially in relation to the brewery process.	
		2. Food Act Requirements	
		All food related areas (kitchen, preparation areas, etc.) to comply with the provisions of the Food Act 2008 and related code, regulations and guidelines. Details available for download from: <a href="https://ww2.health.wa.gov.au/Articles/S_T/Starting-a-food-business-in-WA">https://ww2.health.wa.gov.au/Articles/S_T/Starting-a-food-business-in-WA</a>	
		3. Health (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act Requirements	
		All public access areas (dining areas, etc.) are to comply with the provisions of the Health (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1911, related regulations and guidelines and in particular Part VI – Public Buildings.	
		4. Medical Entomology	
		The subject land is in a region that can experience significant problems with nuisance and disease carrying mosquitoes. These mosquitoes can disperse several kilometres from breeding sites and are known carriers of Ross River (RRV) and Barmah Forest (BFV) viruses. Human cases of RRV diseases occur annually in this locality. Developments in locations within proximity to mosquito breeding habitat (either on-site or off-site) present a high risk to	

E22/6413 Page 13 of 72

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Officer Comment
		future residents, workers and visitors contracting the debilitating RRV and BFV diseases.	
		To protect the health and lifestyle of communities, land use planning decisions must include consideration of the proximity to mosquito breeding habitat and other nuisance or biting insects and whether insect management, if required, will be:	
		effective	
		appropriately resourced and	
		approved by the relevant environmental agencies.	
		The proponent must ensure proposed infrastructure and site works do not create additional mosquito breeding habitat as follows:	
		Changes to topography resulting from earthworks (e.g. the installation of pipelines, footpaths, roads etc) must prevent run-off from creating surface ponding as it may become mosquito breeding habitat;	
		<ul> <li>Water tanks and other water-holding containers must be sealed or screened to prevent mosquito access and breeding. Regular monitoring for mosquito larvae and treatment with larvicide may also be required;</li> </ul>	
		Waste items (tyres, drums and other water holding receptacles) should be filled with sand/soil; kept undercover or punctured to reduce the chances of these items holding water and becoming mosquito breeding habitat;	
		Constructed water bodies (drainage infrastructure, infiltration basins and swales, settling ponds, wetlands, etc) must be located, designed and maintained so they do not create or contribute to mosquito breeding;	
		Constructed water bodies (drainage infrastructure, infiltration basins and swales, settling ponds, wetlands, etc) may require regular monitoring and application of herbicides and/or removal of invasive vegetation to prevent the harbourage of mosquito larvae; and	

E22/6413

No	Submitter Comments	Officer Comment
	The Chironomid midge and mosquito risk assessment guide for constructed water bodies (Midge Research Group, 2011) should be referred to during the early stages of planning to ensure that the potential for on-site mosquito breeding is minimised. This document is available at: https://ww2.health.wa.gov.au/Articles/J_M/Mosquito-management	
	<ul> <li>The proponent should use built form design measures in the construction of accommodation and recreational areas to protect future visitors from mosquitoes:</li> </ul>	
	<ul> <li>Public open space with limited vegetation should be located between any mosquito breeding sites and residential areas to create an area that is refractory to mosquito dispersal, thereby reducing the number of mosquitoes impacting visitors;</li> </ul>	
	<ul> <li>Built form design measures (insect screening on doors and windows and screened outdoor enclosures), public education packages and public signage are included as part of the State and local government conditions of approval; and</li> </ul>	
	<ul> <li>Provision of advice and seasonal warnings to protect visitors including dissemination of information on:</li> </ul>	
	<ul> <li>insect screening of accommodation and enclosed workspaces;</li> <li>personal repellents; and</li> </ul>	
	appropriate clothing to enable employees to reduce their exposure to biting insects.	
	I refer to your email dated 5 July 2022 regarding the submission of a Bushfire Management Plan (BMP) (Version 1), prepared by Smith Bushfire Consultants Pty ltd Solutions and dated 24 December 2021, for the above development application.  This advice relates only to State Planning Policy 3.7: Planning in Bushfire	The applicant has submitted an updated Bushfire Management Plan in response to the Department of Fire Emergency Services submission. Conditions have been imposed requiring minor amendments to be undertaken and for the
		constructed water bodies (Midge Research Group, 2011) should be referred to during the early stages of planning to ensure that the potential for on-site mosquito breeding is minimised. This document is available at: https://ww2.health.wa.gov.au/Articles/J_M/Mosquito-management  • The proponent should use built form design measures in the construction of accommodation and recreational areas to protect future visitors from mosquitoes:  • Public open space with limited vegetation should be located between any mosquito breeding sites and residential areas to create an area that is refractory to mosquito dispersal, thereby reducing the number of mosquitoes impacting visitors;  • Built form design measures (insect screening on doors and windows and screened outdoor enclosures), public education packages and public signage are included as part of the State and local government conditions of approval; and  • Provision of advice and seasonal warnings to protect visitors including dissemination of information on:  • insect screening of accommodation and enclosed workspaces;  • personal repellents; and  • appropriate clothing to enable employees to reduce their exposure to biting insects.  I refer to your email dated 5 July 2022 regarding the submission of a Bushfire Management Plan (BMP) (Version 1), prepared by Smith Bushfire Consultants Pty Itd Solutions and dated 24 December 2021, for the above

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Officer Comment
		Areas (Guidelines). It is the responsibility of the proponent to ensure the proposal complies with relevant planning policies and building regulations where necessary. This advice does not exempt the applicant/proponent from obtaining approvals that apply to the proposal including planning, building, health or any other approvals required by a relevant authority under written laws.	preparation of a Bushfire Emergency Evacuation Plan to be submitted.
		Assessment	
		<ul> <li>It is noted the BMP has been prepared in accordance with V1.3 of the Guidelines. V1.3 of the Guidelines has been rescinded and DFES have assessed the BMP against version 1.4 of the Guidelines.</li> <li>DFES notes commentary within the BMP coversheet regarding the proposal not being considered a vulnerable land use. Tourism land uses such as the proposed restaurant and brewery facility are specifically identified as a vulnerable tourism land use as prescribed by Element 5 of the Guidelines.</li> </ul>	
		<ul> <li>Vulnerable land uses located in designated bushfire prone areas require special consideration, especially as visitors may be unfamiliar with their surroundings and bushfire impacts.</li> </ul>	
		<ul> <li>Consequently, and in accordance with our advisory role, DFES have highlighted in the assessment below the residual bushfire risks associated with the tourism development and compliance with the bushfire protection criteria to aid decision making.</li> </ul>	

E22/6413 Page 16 of 72

Submitter	No	Submitter Comme	ents	
		1. Policy Measu	ure 6.5 a) (ii) Preparation of a BAL Contour Map	
		Issue	Assessment	Action
		Vegetation classification	Vegetation Plot 4 cannot be substantiated as Class B Woodland with the limited information and photographic evidence available. The foliage cover appears to exceed 30%.  The BMP should detail specifically how the Class B Woodland classification was derived as opposed to	Modification to the BMP is required.
			Class A Forest.  The BMP states Plot 4 is located 118 metres from the proposal, therefore unlikely to impact the BAL ratings. However, the BMP should be amended to ensure accuracy.	
		Vegetation exclusion	Plot 1 includes the exclusion of an APZ, based on vegetation management associated with the existing dwelling on site. It is not clear from the BMP if the Plot 1 complies with Schedule 1 of the Guidelines. Photo ID 2 depicts classifiable vegetation. While the classification of this vegetation is unlikely to impact on the BAL associated with the proposal, the BMP should be amended to ensure accuracy.	Modification to the BMP is required.

E22/6413 Page 17 of 72

nents		Officer Comment
Measure 6.5 c) Compliance with the Bushfire Protection	Criteria	
Assessment	Action	
A5.14e – not demonstrated  To comply, the BMP states "No new roads will be developed as a component of this subdivision." The BMP should confirm the relevant public road network complies with technical requirements of the Guidelines, including Table 6 Column 1. The decision maker to be satisfied compliance with A5.14e can be achieved.	Modification to the BMP is required.	
A5.14g & A5.14h – not demonstrated Signage requirements and secondary private driveway access provisions have not been addressed in the BMP. The decision maker to be satisfied compliance with A5.14g and A5.14h can be achieved.	Modification to the BMP is required.	
A5.15 Water – not demonstrated To comply, the BMP states "The developer will provide a water tank(s) for commercial and firefighting purposes that meet the Shire's requirements." This is not supported, as the Guidelines require:  A5.15b Provision of a water tanks(s) with a minimum capacity of 10,000 litres per 500 m² of habitable floor space, up to 50,000 litres; and	Modification to the BMP is required.	
	2	
A5 15c The water tank(s) to be constructed in		
accordance with Element 4, Schedule 2 requirements.  The decision maker to be satisfied compliance with Element 5: A5.15 can be achieved.		
	requirements. The decision maker to be satisfied compliance with	accordance with Element 4, Schedule 2 requirements.  The decision maker to be satisfied compliance with

E22/6413 Page 18 of 72

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Officer Comment
		The referral was sent to the DFES Built Environment Branch (BEB) for assessment. BEB have provided the following advice: As the proposed building is to be a Class 9, plans will need to be provided to DFES Built Environment Branch for assessment as required by Regulation 18B of	
		the Building Regulations 2012 (as amended.)	
		The proposed building will exceed 500m2, therefore fire hydrant coverage to this building will be required in accordance with DFES Operational Requirements and as per Australian Standard AS2419. This will require fire pumps and tanks given the site location. The building also requires a fire hose reel system to be installed as per Australian Standard AS2444.	
		Recommendation – insufficient information	
		Given the proposed development application has the potential to increase the threat of bushfire to people, property and infrastructure, the decision maker should ensure the bushfire risk and hazard reduction/bushfire protection measures are established and understood before making a determination.	
		Consequently, the decision maker should require that the BMP addresses the policy requirements of SPP3.7 and the Guidelines to inform decision making.	
DBCA		With reference to your email correspondence dated 28 April 2022, the Parks and Wildlife Service at the Department of Biodiversity, Conservation and Attractions (DBCA) provides the following comments.	
		Wetlands	
		The Geomorphic Wetlands (Swan Coastal Plain) dataset maps a Resource Enhancement wetland (UFI 7551) on portions of Lot 201. DBCA and the Department of Water and Environmental Regulation (DWER) have recently undertaken a review of the environmental values of the wetlands currently mapped in the Geomorphic Wetlands of the Swan Coastal Plain (GWSCP)	

E22/6413 Page 19 of 72

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Officer Comment
		dataset using available data. While this dataset is unpublished, the draft revised mapping indicates that much of this wetland is likely to have values commensurate with a Multiple Use (MU) wetland, including those portions of the wetland located to the north, west and south of the restaurant and brewery, with a vegetated portion of the wetland in the southeast corner of Lot 201 having values commensurate with Conservation category (CCW).	
		The restaurant and brewery are located more than 100 metres from the portion of UFI 7551 which has been identified as having values commensurate with CCW. The Irrigation Area 2 is located approximately 50 metres from the portion of UFI 7551 which has been identified as having values commensurate with CCW, and approximately 30 metres from the current REW boundary (the portion which has been identified as having values commensurate with MU).	
		It is DBCA's expectation that the Shire of Serpentine Jarrahdale and DWER will review the Nutrient and Irrigation Management Plan and consider if the separation distance between irrigation area 2 and the portion of the wetland UFI 7551 located to the southeast of the irrigation area is adequate.	
		DBCA also expects that the Shire of Serpentine Jarrahdale will consider any other environmental issues associated with the proposal.	
A10000		I had heard about this in the wings, but great to hear that a proposal has officially made it to council.	Noted.
		Serpentine and the South Ward need more of this. It is a growing area and often gets forgotten by the ever-bulging Byford.	
		I am in full support of this as a new venue to bring people to and entertainment for the people in the South Ward of the Shire. Hopefully this will be passed quickly without having delays caused by too much box ticking and bureaucracy!	

E22/6413 Page 20 of 72

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Officer Comment
A17300		We are in support of this proposal in the principal but are worried about the potential for increased traffic.	Noted.
		Our hazardous 's' bend and intoxicated patrons driving home from the venue hooning.	
Anonymous		You have wasted "everybody's" time by sending this paperwork out.	Noted.
		This Shire should be ashamed of itself. You have already decided this will go ahead and when the meeting has been planned. You don't allow "open" question time. You choose which ?'s you want to answer.	
		Take a bloody good luck at yourselves. Egotistical & self centred.	
		Do some good for our community. Listen to what people actually want.	
		Kerbside collection	
		Keeping our kerbs in good condition should be your job, not little house blocks either.	
		Street lighting!!	
		Don't send out BS! Paperwork when it's been decided.	
		Idiots the lot of you.	
A17550 We moved to this property approximately 30 years ago to get away from the hustle and bustle of town life.	The development will be subject to road upgrad and robust management plans to ensure ru		
		We are appalled to hear of this proposal.	amenity is maintained. The built form seeks to incorporate rural elements of the locality and has
		We are right in front of the monstrosity. The traffic will be hell and noise and ground water being an issue.	been sited significantly from Karnup Road to address public amenity. This has been addressed in the report.
A19202		As a resident of Serpentine I am totally against this project.	

E22/6413 Page 21 of 72

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Officer Comment
		My objections are:	
		Zoning, bore into aquifer, traffic, sheer size of the project and paddocks irrigated by wastewater. This will be summarised in the following.	
		As a resident of Serpentine I have no objection to progress for the town and I think a small boutique brewery and restaurant would be an asset to the town but the sheer size of this project has a host of problems.	The development will be subject to road upgrades and robust management plans to ensure rura
		1. The logistics of this project will see a major increase in the movement of trucks and cars to Karnup Road which has very bad entries at Rapids Road and very bad corners west of Rapids Road. There has been serious accidents on these corners in the past.	amenity is maintained. The built form seeks incorporate rural elements of the locality and hobeen sited significantly from Karnup Road address public amenity.
		2. This land is zoned rural and I would ask why the Shire knocked back an application for subdivision of this land several years ago but now will have to rezone it to light commercial to allow this to go ahead. As in the case of the greyhound kennels next door there has been building equipment for this project onsite since the sold sign was posted.	The applicant will be required to obtain the necessary licenses from the Department of Wate Environment Regulation.
		3. The amount of water that will be needed for this brewery is absolutely enormous. They are intending to drill into the aquifer to get their supply which will lead to the lowering of the water table in the area which means farmers soaks and bores in the area will suffer. I can give first hand knowledge on as it has happened on my farm at Meelon which the water table has dropped significantly with Alcoa pulling out large amounts of	
		water. An application for a nursery at 456 Rapids Road was turned down by the Shire several years ago because they wished to drill two bores into the aquifer for water for the said nursery.	Any amendments to the development application in the future will likely require development application to be submitted to the Shire.
		4. The size of this brewery is going to need a large amount of power and they propose maybe using wind and solar in the future which will not be suited to the rural aspect of the town and is just another project along with truck depot, dog kennels. This is changing our rural lifestyle that we came here to peruse.	

E22/6413 Page 22 of 72

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Officer Comment
		5. The irrigation of waste water on the paddocks is not a good idea as most	
		of this property is wetland and during the winter months is generally under water and who knows what contaminants will be leached into the underground water table.	The applicant has submitted an updated NIMP responding to concerns raised by DWER. The updated NIMP has demonstrated that the
		In summary I am not against progress in the town of Serpentine but the sheer size of this proposal could cause significant problems for neighbours with sheep, cattle and horses with noise, lowering of the water table and traffic.	wastewaters associated with the brewery waste waters will generally align with the EPP. A condition however, has been imposed to ensure the 5 years volumes/concentrations meet the EEP.
		Hoping the Shire can express our concerns as residents of Serpentine and value our rural lifestyle.	
A33300		I am resident at 410 Rapids Road Serpentine and mentioned within the application as being within 650 metres of the development and included within the acoustic studies.	
		There is no doubt that we as residents are affected by this proposal, aesthetically, acoustically, our amenity, increased traffic and environmentally.	
		Initial Consultation.	
		The proponents state they have had two meetings with the shire of SJ to discuss the content of the Development Application.	The Shire holds pre-development discussions with all prospective applicants to discuss the local and broader planning framework. The meeting is
		Has the shire encouraged the proponents to lodge a submission of this magnitude and guided the construction of this proposal through to its current form?	done to provide no indication of determination however, to speak generally about a proposal.
		What was discussed at these two meeting that encouraged the proponents to lodge for a non-conforming use upon a Resource Enhancement Dampland?	
		Amenity	
		The proposal mentions the development is set back from Karnup Road thereby preserving the streetscape however the streetscape from Rapids	The development will be subject to road upgrades and robust management plans to ensure rural

E22/6413

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Officer Comment
		Road is greatly affected with clear vision of the proposed facility and carpark all the way across the existing farmland landscape. If this proposal were to proceed in its current form and location, from my driveway I will see 250 car bays, bus bays and the facility all day every day along with the background noise associated with same and night time lighting spill.	amenity is maintained. The built form seeks to incorporate rural elements of the locality and has been sited significantly from Karnup Road to address public amenity.
		Noise travels, Serpentine is subject to high levels of easterly winds which would push sound across the farmland toward my property, as residents we are already subject to constant aircraft noise from flight trainers, road noise from haulage contractors and other interruptions of the senses.	An Environmental Assessment Report was submitted demonstrating general compliance with the assigned levels of the <i>Environment (Noise)</i>
		No landscape mitigation has been mentioned in the proposal, screening of the facility and acoustic attenuation should be of paramount consideration in this location especially for the occupants at 409 Rapids Road who are within 350 metres of the proposed structure.	Regulations 1997. DWER have provided a submission on the ENA and have advised that the methodology and noise modelling appeal accurate.
		Why is the proposed development pushed to the rear of the allotment closer to neighbouring properties when they have 2 other on site locations with the same 30m elevation.	
		I invite the shires officers to view the proposed location from where I and my neighbours sit to complete a full assessment of the impact upon us.	
		Purpose	
		Upon reading the submission document it can easily be understood that along with a 1000 seat capacity restaurant the proponents intend to build and operate an industrial scale beverage production facility with some outstanding revelations about beer production numbers.	
		One Million litres of beer in year 1 rising to 5 million litres per annum in year 5 along with a caning line (137 cubes of beer per hour) and keg filling line in order to export off site to service the general	The development has been considered by Officers as meeting the existing and prevailing
		market. An operation of this scale will require considerable transport logistics and servicing using semi-trailers, rigid trucks and waste transfer vehicles.	framework. Noting a Brewery is a discretionary land use in the Rural zone.

E22/6413 Page 24 of 72

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Officer Comment
		137 cubes of beer per hour is roughly equivalent to 4,110 cans of beer hourly. How many hours per day will they can beer?	
		No quantities are forecast for the kegging line.	
		The numbers are mind boggling, in order to produce one litre of beer the proponents state that 4-6 litres of water are used and it can be as much as 10 litres.	
		Five million litres of beer in year 5 would then equate to 30 million litres or 30 mega litres of water per annum, without the additional consumption of the restaurant and ablutions, the proponents do not disclose where they will source the water from and as no public infrastructure is available then I can only assume that groundwater is to be used. This would not be ideal in a resource enhancement location irrespective of the depth of extraction.	
		It appears to me to the restaurant is a façade for a beer production facility located within a rural location.	
		Wastewater	
		Interestingly the hydraulic design mentioned within the proposal is designed to a capacity of four thousand people in order to assure functionality and an increase in use for special events, they are obviously preparing for bigger things in the future that may require expansion.	
		The hydraulic loading formula mentioned equates to a massive 142000 litres of treated wastewater per day for 2000 patrons and staff. This is to be treated and disposed on site, in leaching facilities, all in a location where the ground water level is only 1.2 metres below the surface.	
		I recognize the proponents have done a study however on a 3-day operational week 12 hour per shift 52 weeks a year (156 trading days x 142000 litres) they would leach twenty two million one hundred and fifty two thousand litres (22,152,000) of treated effluent into a resource enhancement landscape that is seasonally water logged.	The applicant has submitted a revised NIMP to demonstrate that the nutrient levels of the EPP will be met. In terms of the waste infrastructure a

E22/6413 Page 25 of 72

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Officer Comment
		In order to treat the effluent, the proponents propose an on-site treatment facility that will comprise the following tank capacities.	condition will be imposed to ensure the structures are internalised to avoid visual impacts.
		<ul> <li>1x230,000 litre Holding tank</li> <li>1x375000 litre Sequential Batch Reactor</li> <li>1x230,000 litre Polishing Tank</li> <li>1x230,000 litre Irrigation tank</li> </ul>	
		The location and screening of these enormous tanks has not been discussed within the application they will however be an eyesore to all who can see them.	
		In addition, there is wastewater accumulated from brewing activities.	
		Total wastewater per month from brewery activities forecast:	
		<ul> <li>Year 1= 4,072 k/l, per annum=4.072 mega litres?? A huge amount.</li> <li>Year 5 = 20,360 k/l, per annum=20.360 mega litres??-An absurd amount to run to waste!</li> </ul>	
		In Year 1, the average daily irrigation rate is 11.13 kl/day,	
		in Year 5 the average daily irrigation rate increases to 55.63 kl/day	
		Also mentioned is additional beer production wastewater storage capacity to counter the wet winter months of June and July an additional 379,000 litres in year one rising to 1,892,000 litres in year 5	
		This will involve additional oversized storage capacity, in the order of 7 x 250,000 litre tanks in year 5, the location and screening also not discussed within the submission.	
		There is also the natural rainwater collection from the building and subsequent dispersal on site.	
		The rear of this building, proposed, will look like the Kwinana industrial strip with potentially 11 enormous tanks and waste storage all along its 60metre length	Large sheds are commonplace within the Rural zone. A condition of planning approval will be requiring a Landscape Management Plan be submitted for approval. The plan will seek to

E22/6413 Page 26 of 72

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Officer Comment
		These are staggering numbers where is this water coming from and how can we justify such high disposal rates being leached back into the superficial aquafer?	screen and improve the visual appearance of the brewery shed from the south.
		It should be noted that no potable water is available to the site nor within 5 Kilometres.	
		The supply of the water is not discussed in any detail within the proposal.	
		Geotechnical investigations	Water supply is a separate process regulated by
		The current geotechnical investigations are inadequate and comprise test pits dug to shallow depths of 1.5 metres confirming the ground water level at 1.2 metres below surface.	the Department of Water Regulation (DWER). In terms of groundwater separation, a condition will be recommended ensuring a 1.5m separation to groundwater.
		Investigation drilling should occur to a depth of at least 10 metres to assess the permeability of the deeper sub soil and its ability to absorb the significant volumes of wastewater proposed to be leached into the environment particularly in the wetter months when the soils will become saturated from rain fall.	groundwater.
		The danger here is an impermeable layer of rock or clay that would prevent leaching and direct the wastewater, assisting in transporting nutrient laden waste water through to the Serpentine river drainage system and ultimately the Peel estuary.	
		Traffic	
		Along with the visual distraction from both Karnup road, looking south and Rapids road looking east, you will inevitably have large volumes of patron traffic, assume 1000 patrons per sitting, 3 patrons per vehicle equals 333 entries and 333 exits per sitting or 666 vehicle movements per sitting with two sittings forecast per day so a potential 1332 vehicle movements per day, a substantial increase on today's vehicle movements in this location and considerably more than implied in the traffic report within the submission.	The submitted Traffic Impact Assessment recommends basic upgrades to Karnup Road to ensure a safe road network. The Shire, however, has recommended a channelised left turn and right turn into the site to be more appropriate noting the volume of larger commercial vehicles that use Karnup Road both east and west bound The upgrades will ultimately ensure that large

E22/6413 Page 27 of 72

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Officer Comment
		In addition, you will have delivery and service vehicles some being semi- trailers although numbers are not forecast by the proponents but five million litres of beer per annum must go somewhere.	commercial vehicles can pass queuing vehicles (both commercial and passenger) waiting to enter the site.
		Waste generated from brewing activities (spent grain) is forecast at 4-5 tonne per week along with waste bins from the restaurant requiring additional transport movements daily.	
		Given the forecast increase in traffic, slip lanes and overtaking lanes would be required on Karnup Road to allow through traffic to continue unabated without accident.	The internal road will have to be constructed to a standard to the satisfaction of the shire. A condition will be imposed requiring the road to be sealed to avoid dust impacts generated from vehicle movements.
		Construction of internal access and parking should be in such a manner that it is impervious to wind erosion and uplifting of particulates to avoid sandstorm events in the inevitable high wind loading experienced in Serpentine.	
		Acoustics	
		We are only one of several nearby properties affected by the potential noise emissions from this development.	
		I note that the brewing process emits little noise however the proposal includes a caning facility and kegging operation along with associated export of product and import of consumables commencing at 7.00am 5 days per week.	
		Noise travels on the wind, in the still of the night and is assisted through inadequate noise abatement measures, I note the inclusions within the acoustic studies however I do not think consideration has been given to local conditions and noise generated from outside activities.	An Environment Nosie Assessment has been submitted which demonstrates that the development aligns with the assigned regulations of the <i>Environment (Noise) Regulations 1997</i> . This discussed in the report.
		From 410 Rapids Rd I can hear the Southwest Highway, the train line, music played at the Serpentine Tavern (when operational), loudspeaker commentary from the Serpentine Polo Cross and Pony clubs, V8 motor vehicles and motorbikes, exhaust brakes from haulage contractors	

E22/6413 Page 28 of 72

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Officer Comment
		emanating from Karnup Road along with flight trainers in the sky above and	
		the normal nuances of agricultural machinery working paddocks.	
		Along with this we have recreational shooters who undertake clay pigeon shooting and professional shooters clearing paddocks during the sunset hours.	
		Resident at 409 Rapids Road are 350 metres from the rear of the proposed building and loading bay they will be subject to waste transfer noises, delivery of consumables, loading of export product and the constant beeping of a forklift and reversing vehicles, this will be an unavoidable noise burden and infringement on their lifestyle and amenity as well as mine and other neighbours.	
		We have enough overspill noise pollution in this area and suggest serious noise attenuation principals be applied to this development to ensure that residents are not inconvenienced, and their amenity is preserved.	The built form of the development is supported by
		This proposal should include outdoor impervious screening, landscape additions, earthen bunding and other means to preserve the amenity.	Officers. A condition requiring a Landscape Management Plan has been imposed to provide
		Aesthetics	filtered views of the development from all vistas.
		The proposed building is 10.11 metres high at the highest point, it is 61 metres wide at its widest point and 62 metres long, you can't hide this especially if you reside at 409 Rapids Rd only 350 metres from the rear loading bay and waste removal area and 410 Rapids Road in direct line of sight.	
		The carpark will be a glistening pad of windscreens and car roofs that you will see from both west and north all day.	
		The facility will be lite up at night for patrons, seen by all north, south and west emitting a light spill night glow like living in a high-density suburb.	
		The carpark proposed to be lite to assist patrons will add to this glow, site lighting needs to be controlled, dimmed, and reduced so as not to affect	

E22/6413 Page 29 of 72

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Officer Comment
	1	amenity of surrounding neighbours and wildlife. Artificial night lighting can	
		be disorientating to wildlife and is known to effect migratory species.	
		The building materials comprise recycled bricks and Colourbond cladding along with large areas of glass to showcase the views over what will be, once was our picturesque landscape, in return we will get to admire a monolith to man's endeavour to produce beer on a resource enhancement rural allotment. Similar materials have been used in Byford for the new National Storage units and are not pretty.	Officers are satisfied that the closed system of the brew process provides the Shire with a high degree of certainty that the development will not result in odour impacts form this process.
		Odour management	
		Little has been said about odour management, with 2000 meals per day exhausted into the environment, 4 tonne of spent grain, accumulated waste at bins, effluent leaching and beer waste, I am sure there will be odours emitted.	The applicant has submitted an updated NIMP which demonstrates that the environmental values of the wetlands onsite and the broader Peel Harvey Coastal Plain Catchment will not be
		Environment	impacted upon. A condition has been imposed ensuring the development meets the EEP. This is
		The proponents have not made any commitment to the natural landscape, they have not detailed any plans relating to environmental restoration of any portion of the property or provided any ecological proposals to link existing vegetation corridors.	discussed further in the report.
		The shire of SJ has a Biodiversity strategy that seeks to enhance, improve and preserve our natural environment within the shire inclusive of wetlands, damplands and other significant areas of remnant and protected vegetation complexes.	Officers support the development and consider the revised NIMP to demonstrate that the development will be undertaken in a manner to not impact upon the values of the wetlands.
		The proposal is within close proximity of a Bush Forever site that has listed Threatened Ecological Communities (TECs).	
		TECs, Seasonally Inundated Wetlands and Rare Declared Flora are also located at 410 Rapids Rd, downstream ecological communities comprising Paperbark, Marri and Jarrah, rely on the purity of natural inundation to preserve themselves, replenish and fortify themselves against long hot summers.	

E22/6413 Page 30 of 72

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Officer Comment
		How can the sanctioning of the extraction of potentially 50 million litres of ground water per annum and the subsequent leaching of 40 million litres of treated wastewater per annum be an acceptable practise in this location listed as resource enhancement?	
		This proposal does not commit to any of the shires Biodiversity Strategy or the important ecological initiatives that the shire has committed to implement.	The development has a substantial
		The proponents only wish to dispose of enormous volumes of wastewater, 40 mega litres per annum, so that they may service retail markets.	commencement timeframe as per the Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015.No condition has been imposed
		The proponents have no environmental licence.	in relation to the development being completed
		Financial Ability	within a certain time.
		As discussed, the proposal is for a substantial development both in physical size and supporting technical infrastructure.	
		It is common today to hear about supply chain interruptions, unavailability of building materials and long wait times for contractors and labour. If approved in any form or shape what assurances, guarantees, can be sought and given by the proponents that this development will be commenced and completed within a set timeframe and not left to languish as an uncompleted eyesore sitting on the horizon for extended periods of time due to shortages of material, labour or financial failings?	
		Conclusion	
		This proposal is too big, it is relying on councils' discretion to get approval for a non-conforming use "production facility", upon a rural allotment that exports large quantities of finished product off site. This is not a rural pursuit.	Officers support the proposal for the reasons outlined in the report.
		The proposal is incomplete without disclosure of above ground waste storage locations and their position in the landscape.	
		The proposal does not discuss the source of water supply to sustain an operation of this magnitude.	

E22/6413 Page 31 of 72

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Officer Comment
		Traffic forecasts are understated and cannot be determined without disclosing total volumes of beer to be exported off site.	
		The proponents forecast a total of 42,512,000 (42.512 Mega litres) of combined effluent and production waste will be leached back into the environment annually at year 5. How is this acceptable?	
		The proponents have not committed to any environmental enhancement initiatives.	
		The industrial facility will have ongoing construction activity over five years in order to reach forecast capacity thereby continually interrupting the amenity of adjacent owners.	
		It's a factory!	
		When a local brewery was first mentioned in our community many residents were positive about the concept however a development of this size and with an industrial scale production facility located upon a resource enhancement seasonally waterlogged rural allotment is a non-conforming use for this location and any approval has the potential to set an undesirable precedent and would amount to uncontrolled planning and land use.	
		The shire has allocated Light Industrial land use in the West Mundijong precinct, a large-scale brewery production facility producing 5 million litres per annum belongs in that location where it can ensure supply and access without intruding on existing residents, the environment and a fragile local road network. The shire has worked for years to implement a well-planned industrial area for ventures such as this and the proponents should be compelled to occupy this industrial location for a beer production facility of this magnitude	
		A boutique brewery and associated restaurant with a lower patron capacity showcasing farm to plate cuisine and environmental best practises for waste disposal and wetland creation would require a smaller footprint, less consumption of natural resources, reduce road impacts and be less	

E22/6413

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Officer Comment
		obtrusive. It would also reinforce the proponent's commitment to the environment and allow for the potential of patrons to participate in a learning experience whilst enjoying a day out with family.	
		The current proposal is out of place, out of character and a huge consumer of resources, energy and an obtrusion into the lives of adjacent neighbours and the local road network.	
		I can say that I may be in support of a smaller micro, boutique well-balanced development that is more sympathetic to rural pursuits and the environment however in its current form this development is too big for this location, it is non-conforming, energy hungry, waste emitting, water consuming, noise generating and an eyesore, I cannot support it.	
A32600		Noise I believe the noise level has been underestimated, 1000 patrons could entering and leaving the venue possibly 2 or 3 in a vehicle could equal 500/330 vehicles and 500/330 vehicles leaving, this could possibly be doubled if there are 2 sittings on any given day.  Traffic	The submitted Environment Noise Assessment generally demonstrates compliance with the assigned levels of the <i>Environment (Noise)</i> Regulations 1997. A Noise Management Plan has also been conditioned to manage all noise sources and noise from speakers and bands.
		As indicated above the amount of traffic on Karnup road will push it to maximum, but the increased traffic on feeder roads (Rapids road) could be excessive for such secondary standard roads in the area.	
		Site Suitability The majority of the property "the boundary of the Resource Enhancement wetlands also encompasses the low-lying areas of the site" this area is water logged for some time during the winter months and could be flooded in a significant rain event. Other higher areas which have been designated for landscaping are:	The conducted NIMD is some artist beautiful Office In
		GHD I Report for Shire of Serpentine Jarrahdale - State of the Environment, 6137907 I 55 Table 3-2 Soil landscape systems (DPIRD)	The updated NIMP is supported by the Shire. It also includes new measures to reduce the loading on the land and to hold wastewaters during the wetter months of the year.

E22/6413 Page 33 of 72

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Officer Comment
		Bassendean System Sand dunes and sand plains with flats and swamps. Sandy alluvium over sedimentary rocks. Pale deep sands, semi-wet soils and wet soils.	
		This soil type is fragile during a large part of the year and is prone to wind erosion, is non wetting and would require large quantities of water to establish an acceptable level of land scaping. The vegetation described in the submission along Karnup road is indigenous to the area, Bush Forever managers have spent considerable time and money trying to remove it from their sites.	
		Effluent Disposal Given the soil type and the potential for water logging it is difficult to accept that there will be no contamination from the effluent disposal and will not impact on adjoining properties or the Serpentine river.	This is a process regulated by the Department of Health.
		Potable Water There is no fresh water (WA Water Authority) available to the site, it is not clear where the water will provided for the restaurant, let alone the large quantity of water required produce beer.	The applicant will be required to source an adequate water supply for their operations.
		Serpentine Rural Landscape Whilst a restaurant in the Serpentine may be considered an added attraction to the area and given the right size and construction a commercial brewery of this size does not fit with rural landscape.	Officers consider the development to not impact the rural landscape and/or amenity for the reasons outlined in the report.
		For several environmental requirements that are long understood the development is surrounded by small rural holdings and there little or no chance that this could be changed in the medium to long term.	
		A commercial brewery of this size should be located in a designated industrial area that are available within the Shire and would have access to all the required utilities.	
A52702		We are property owners at 145 Walker road Serpentine.	

E22/6413 Page 34 of 72

Submitter No	Submitter Comments	Officer Comment
	The PROPOSED Brewery located on Lot 201, 1284 Karnup Road adjoins our boundary on the western side.  Our concerns are listed below.  After looking at the proposed site map, included with submission form, I am at a loss as to ask why it will be located so far back from the residence already on this block?  Could it be that the noise and impact of this PROPOSED Brewery would impact the family residing there already? Whilst there is no choice given to those already residing on adjoining properties?  Our Concerns.  Amount of traffic using already dangerous "s" bends on Karnup Road.  Amount of people attending, music and noise.	The development aligns with the existing and prevailing framework of the Shire of Serpentine Jarrahdale.  A condition has been imposed requiring the applicant to undertake road upgrades to allow for a channelised left and right turn into the site. Officers are satisfied this will ensure that there are no adverse impacts upon the road network.  The submitted Environment Noise Assessment generally demonstrates compliance with the assigned levels of the <i>Environment (Noise)</i> Regulations 1997. A Noise Management Plan has also been conditioned to manage all noise sources and noise from speakers and bands.  The revised NIMP demonstrates that brew waste will be treated and irrigated onsite. During the year wastewaters will be recycled though the restaurant (toilets) or held in tanks during the wetter months of the year.

E22/6413 Page 35 of 72

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Officer Comment
		Our quiet lifestyle has been upended by councillors, transport yard to our south, detonator storage to the east and north, a racing greyhound kennel to our north, and now you are proposing a brewery to our west which will be rezoned light industrial.  Well done Councillors for omitting the equine theme you so proudly claim is Serpentine.	Officers support the development in its proposed form.
		We would support a smaller and better balanced boutique brewery/restaurant.  We do not support this PROPOSAL.	Noted.
A33600		Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this application (Ref: PA22/383:HOB;wj).  I have the following concerns about this proposal and oppose it on the following grounds:  The potential impact/s on groundwater quality and its suitability for human consumption, especially as our family draws drinking water at our property (439 Rapids Road) which is within 600 m of the proposed facility. Brewery wastewater and human waste from an estimated 1000 persons per day.	A revised NIMP has been submitted to demonstrate that the development generally meets the EEP nutrient targets of the Peel Harvey Plain Catchment. A condition has been imposed to ensure the year 5 volumes and concentrations are met.
		The noise pollution expected from activities (industrial, social, music, vehicles) from 1000 persons per day. My home is within 600m of the facility and I am very concerned for the impact from the increased noise and activities resulting from this brewery and up to 251 vehicles and up to 1000 patrons per day will have on nesting kookaburras, pink and grey galahs, magpies and black cockatoos on my property. While Environmental Noise Management measures have been floated, it does not address vehicle noise pollution and outside of venue concerns. In addition, the rural location will	The submitted Environment Noise Assessment generally demonstrates compliance with the assigned levels of the <i>Environment (Noise)</i> Regulations 1997. A Noise Management Plan has also been conditioned to manage all noise sources and noise from speakers and bands.

E22/6413 Page 36 of 72

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Officer Comment
		ensure noise is amplified and will travel considerable distance prior to waning.	
		The likelihood of negative interaction with native fauna in the region, especially given wild kangaroos are seen on a daily basis on Karnup and Rapids Road. This would include vehicle collision and driving the animals from their native habitat and grazing areas.	Noted.
		Bandicoots and possums are only two additional native species that will be negatively impacted by noise and increased human activity (1000 persons per day and 251 cars per day) and could drive these from their natural habitat. While I note that the Development Application prepared by Taylor Burrell Barnett included a Biological Assessment (Section 2.8. p.10-12), this was inadequate and in no way suitably researched. The desktop review did not reference aquatic species of concern (see Beatty et al., 2021) and the field assessment was very cursory, without any mention of kangaroos present and certain to traverse the site.	Officers have recommended approval of the development and satisfied with the information presented to the Shire as part of the process.
		I draw attention to the increased risk to freshwater species in the nearby Serpentine River (within ~3km of the facility site) and drainage to this waterway, especially from waste outflow to the natural environment. Sampling by Beatty et al. (2021) found ~47% of fish captured were native species and there were four south-western Australian endemic freshwater fishes and one native estuarine species along with two introduced species. In addition, Carter's Freshwater Mussel (Westralunio carteri), the only known threatened (Vulnerable under the EPBC Act 1999) freshwater faunal species in the lower reaches of the Serpentine River was recorded. This species was listed by the Federal Government in 2018. It is also internationally listed as Vulnerable under the IUCN Red List. The proposed facility could provide an unreasonable risk to the survival of the EPBC listed species.	The updated NIMP has demonstrated alignment with the EEP of the Peel Harvey Coastal Plain Catchment . A condition of approval has been imposed to ensure the NIMP is amended to ensure the five year nutrient concentrations meet the EEP requirements.
		Beatty, S.J., Ryan, T., Summers, V., Ma, L., Lear, K. & Morgan, D. (2021). A river health assessment of the Serpentine River, Western Australia: Restoring the Serpentine River. A report to the Peel-Harvey Catchment	

E22/6413 Page 37 of 72

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Officer Comment
		Council. Freshwater Fish Group & Fish Health Unit, Centre for Sustainable Aquatic Ecosystems, Harry Butler Institute, Murdoch University, Murdoch, WA  A Water Corporation open drain is within 50m of the land application area, with car parks (and likely spill flow from vehicles, including fuel and oil leaks) within 100m of the drain. The risk of pollution to this drain water is unacceptable in the current proposal. This drain traverses my property and provides drinking water for my livestock for a considerable portion of the year. This drain and the water course is also home to a number of native species which will likely be negatively affected by the proposed brewery and restaurant.	The development will be subject to a Stormwater Management Plan which incorporates water sensitive urban design guidelines. the Stormwater Management Plan will be referred to Water Corporation for comments.
A328701		We, are the owners of Lot No. 200, 335 Rapids Road, Serpentine, located on the corner of Rapids Road (south) and Karnup Road, with much of the western boundary of our property along Rapids Road (south) being opposite the Bush Forever Site No. 74. We utilize our property for the production of Ultra-fine wool from Merino sh6 and each year we rotationally conserve hay from the wetter parts of the property to feed to our sheep. Our property adjoins the entire western boundary of Lot 201, 1248 Karnup Road, Serpentine and the Water Corporation Open Drain that services our land and the subject land runs parallel to our common boundary fence. Our residence is located about 650 metres from the site where the Restaurant and Brewery are proposed to be established.	The updated NIMP has demonstrated alignment with the EEP of the Peel Harvey Coastal Plain Catchment . A condition of approval has been imposed to ensure the NIMP is amended to ensure the five year nutrient concentrations meet the EEP requirements. This is discussed further in the report.
		We are both professional agricultural scientists and have a PhD in our respective agricultural disciplines. Maneerat conducted research on Nitrogen Cycling in WA soils for her PhD and later worked in the Soil Health Group at UWA. She was subsequently employed in the CSBP soil analysis lab to develop quite specialized technology for the analysis of WA soils including the determination of available phosphorus.	
		In 2014, John and a colleague conducted the review of the Agronomic and Environmental Management systems employed by Rio Tinto to produce	

E22/6413 Page 38 of 72

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Officer Comment	
		Rhodes grass hay using fertigated mine water as part of the Hamersley Agricultural Project in the WA Pilbara. In view of our professional expertise and concern for the environment, we wish to primarily comment on the potential undesirable consequences that irrigating land at Lot 201, 1248 Karnup Road, Serpentine may have on the Peel-Harvey Estuary.		
		The subject site is in the Peel-Harvey Catchment and is mapped as being in a sewage sensitive area as the site is within 1.0 km of significant wetland. It is well accepted that a lot of the nutrients in the water from the Peel-Harvey catchment ultimately end-up in the Peel Harvey Estuary (P-HE). The P-HE is part of the Peel-Yalgorup wetland system which is a "Wetland of International Importance" under the RAMSAR Convention on Wetlands. The Peel-Harvey Estuary Protection Plan (P-HEPP, Bindjareb Djilba) provides a collaborative framework that will guide the protection of the system. As outlined in the P-HEPP, there is an ongoing need to continue to reduce nutrient inputs, especially of Nitrogen (N) and Phosphorus (P). The part of the Gull Road Drainage system that carries water from south to north in the Water Corporation Open Drain along the western boundary of the subject site discharges its water into the Serpentine river about 2.5 km from the subject site and ultimately, via this river, into the P-HE. With regard to nutrient status in the P-HEPP, the Gull Road Drainage system is rated very high for both Total N and Total P. Further, the P-HEPP considers treated effluent via infiltration or discharge to drainage may add nutrients to the estuary. In view of these sensitive environmental issues we have concerns that the Development Application (DA) does not address or give appropriate consideration to the factors outlined below that could contribute to undesirable environmental consequences for the Peel-Harvey Estuary.		
		While gathering Geotechnical Data on the subject site six Test Pits (TP) were dug, with 3 of the 6 TP encountering groundwater at a depth of less than 2.0 metres. On Page 129 of the DA it is stated "Groundwater encountered at TP4 (at 1.2m depth), TP5 (at 1.2m depth) and TP6 (at 1.7m depth)." On Page 134 of the DA it is stated "Based on the type of Soils encountered on site with a shallow bedrock, stormwater shall be discharged		

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Officer Comment	
		offsite into swale drains or detention basin." On page 210 of the DA it is stated "The soil types of the irrigation areas are sandy, with an average infiltration rate of 4.32m/day however it is acknowledged that the soils have a low PRI and shallow clearance to groundwater, hence the		
		thorough treatment of the wastewater prior to irrigation to land." With groundwater encountered at a depth of less than 2.0 metres in 3 of the 6 Test Pits and the use of the words 'shallow bedrock' and 'shallow clearance to groundwater' in the statements on Pages 134 and 210, respectively it is pretty obvious there is bedrock running under the subject site fairly close to the soil surface.		
		The person who constructed the northern boundary fence of the subject site along Karnup Road as well as between our property and the subject site adjacent and parallel to the Water Corporation Open Drain stressed to us that impervious bedrock (termed coffee rock) was frequently encountered at a depth of 1.0 metre or less when digging the post holes for these fences. From this it is reasonable to expect that this impervious coffee rock forms the base of the Water Corporation Open Drain. Small pieces of coffee rock that were probably chipped off the bedrock when the drain was constructed are still evident along the banks of this Open Drain. The northern boundary fence of the subject site along Karnup Road abuts the proposed 7.93 hectare Irrigation Area 1, so it seems reasonable to expect that Irrigation Area 1 has the same impervious coffee rock not too far from the soil surface. Figure 7 on Page 225 of the DA shows the proposed 2.11 hectare Irrigation Area 2 is located between the two dams that were dug-out some time ago. The material on the banks of these dams has large chunks of bedrock material that had to be removed to establish the dams. Consequently, it is reasonable to expect this bedrock material also runs under the proposed 2.11 hectare Irrigation Area 2.		
		On Page 212 of the DA under Nutrient Balance it is stated "The average biomass yield of annual ryegrass is calculated to be 6.68 tonne per hectare per year, based on various studies referenced in Table 12. According to		

E22/6413 Page 40 of 72

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Officer Comment	
		Reuter, Robinson and Coleman (1986), the biomass contains 3.15% of nitrogen and 0.14% of phosphorus. Therefore, annual ryegrass can uptake 210 kg/ha of nitrogen and 9.3 kg/ha of phosphorus."		
		These amounts of N and P retained in the 6.68 tonnes/ha of annual ryegrass biomass represent only a fraction of the amount N and P that would need to be applied, in addition to that from the treated brewery wastewater, to grow this amount of ryegrass biomass with these quantities of retained N and P. In short, the N and P retained in the annual ryegrass biomass has to come from somewhere and with the soil's high infiltration rate of 4.32 m/day and very low PRI, most of the N and P that will need to be applied will not be taken-up by the shallow roots of annual ryegrass (probably less than 20 cm deep). Consequently, these elements will rapidly move in solution down the soil profile until the bedrock is reached. Once on the bedrock, the N and P rich solution is likely to flow across this impervious bedrock until it reaches the Water Corporation Open Drain. From there these nutrients will be deposited in the Serpentine river and ultimately in the Peel-Harvey Estuary.		
		To this point we have only considered the significant leaching and removal of N and P from the irrigation areas. However, with the sandy soil across the site being such nutrient-poor soil, very high inputs of other essential Macro elements such as Potassium, Sulphur, Calcium and Magnesium along with a number of essential Trace elements will also need to be applied to the irrigation areas each year to grow the 6.68 tonne/ha of annual ryegrass biomass. It is entirely reasonable to expect that most of these other essential elements that will need to be applied, mostly as synthetic fertilizer, would have a fate similar to the large amounts of the N and P that need to be applied to the proposed Irrigation Areas 1 and 2 within the subject site. The ultimate result would be that large quantities N and P plus the other Macro as well as Trace elements applied as fertilizer will end-up in the Peel-Harvey Estuary with a potentially catastrophic outcome. In view of what we have outlined based on our own expertise and the obvious shortcomings and deficiencies in the DA, when you consider this proposed development, it is essential that appropriate, independent professional advice be sought.		

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Officer Comment	
		Such expertise should be available through the Peel-Harvey Catchment Council and the WA Department of Primary Industries and Regional Development.		
		As residents very close to the subject site we also have concerns about the number of car movements, the capacity of Karnup road to handle the traffic and the noise from the subject site.		
		The DA indicates the restaurant can accommodate 1,000 patrons and there will be 250 car parking bays.		
		If each of the 250 cars that occupy the parking bays arrives with 4 restaurant patrons this will bring 1,000 patrons to the restaurant. On Page 16 of the DA under 3.9 it shows for Saturdays and Sundays the restaurant will be open from 8.00 AM to 10.00 PM (14 hours each day). We have been informed that patrons consuming Craft Beer of high alcohol content while having something to eat may stay in a venue for an average of 3.5 hours. Being open for 14 hours on a Saturday and Sunday this would allow four (4) patron turn-overs through the restaurant on each of these days (14/3.5 = 4.0). With a restaurant capacity of 1,000 patrons, this represents a total of 4,000 patrons on each of these days. It is noteworthy that this is the maximum number of restaurant patrons the proposed Septic System is to be designed to handle which, in itself, gives credence to our numbers of car movements on a Saturday and Sunday.		
		Each car that arrives must also depart the site, so the 250 cars that arrive and park will depart the site on average every 3.5 hours. Therefore, there could be a total of 2,000 car movements (14/3.5 x 250 x 2) into and out of the site each Saturday and Sunday. In addition, on Page 17 of the DA it states "The onsite brewery will produce brewed beverages that will supply the restaurant and will be available to purchase and takeaway." If this means people can drive into the site, purchase cans of brewed beverages and drive out again, the number of car movements into and out of the site will be of a much greater magnitude and not controlled by the capacity of the restaurant. The sheer number of car movements, even without		

E22/6413

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Officer Comment
		takeaways, is alarming and especially as all of these cars will have to travel on Karnup road. Based on this inordinate 2,000 additional car movements on a Saturday and a Sunday, the projected future traffic numbers for Karnup Road in the DA are grossly underestimated. Therefore an upgrade of Karnup Road, much more significant than that considered in the DA, will be required to accommodate all of the additional traffic while at the same time minimizing accidents on this road.	
		With bedrock near the surface throughout the subject site there will be considerable reverberation and amplification of all noises across the landscape and into the neighbouring properties when vehicles of any type travel within the subject site. The notorious easterly winds that are common in Serpentine will help carry any noises arising from the site and with the reverberations the amplified noises will be delivered to the nearby properties west and south-west of the subject site. The same will apply to the noises arising from the restaurant as well as the banging of car doors when patrons get out of their car on arrival and into their car on departure from the restaurant. Both of these serious matters concerning reverberations and easterly winds have not been given due consideration within the DA or taken into consideration with respect to noise abatement.  We thank you for consideration of our comments.	
A32700		We reside and farm at Lot 494 Rapids Road and in response to your letter dated 13 May 2022 provide bullet points of objection in the strongest possible terms to this application.  1. It is unreasonable for the Shire to give only 28 days timeframe to provide a meaningful, detailed response to this application.  2. This area is fully rural and adjoining close by landowners who comply	Consultation has been undertaken in accordance with The Local Planning Policy 1.4- Public
		2. This area is fully rural and adjoining close by landowners who comply with the rural definition for the business and pursuits they conduct. This proposal is NOT compatible with those pursuits and would have a	Consultation

E22/6413 Page 43 of 72

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Officer Comment
		serious adverse effect to those landowners including the bulk, scale, orientation and appearance of this application.  3. This application seriously breaches the local environment and has enormous environmental impacts to the area and is totally out of character with rural zoning. The social impact to the area would create substantial and serious issues and impact the current landholders of their current and long established pursuits.  4. This development application has not been adequately researched or full detail provided, the effect of the water resource if the applicants are to use groundwater for their activities, then no details are provided in addressing the future effects. The high potential to contaminate the water resource such as drains and creeks feeding into the Serpentine River and then onto the Peel Catchment area. The whole area is sitting on coffee rock which has no leaching qualities. The projected production results in huge wastage outflows and the proposal does not address adequately the wastage issues. This has a serious potential affect on the natural water and environment. A full specialists report should be obtained before Shire could possibly make any decision or comment on the huge water usage to produce the level of production applicable and to adequately deal with the waste material.	Officers consider that the development is considered consistent with the existing and prevailing framework  The updated NIMP has demonstrated alignment with the EEP of the Peel Harvey Coastal Plain Catchment. A condition of approval has been imposed to ensure the NIMP is amended to ensure the five year nutrient concentrations meet the EEP requirements. This is discussed further in the report.
		5. Landscaping appears not to be seriously addressed and certainly trees and vegetation should be retained and further plantings should complete to enhance the site. The application shows no enhancement to the natural landscape of the area particularly to screening the huge carpark, tanks and actual building to attempt to make the site more aesthetically pleasing and therefore redeeming the huge disastrous impact and safety it would have on adjoining properties.	Minor vegetation clearing has been proposed. A landscape Management Plan has been proposed to provide filtered views of the development from certain vistas.
		The proposal has no acknowledgement to the Landowners directly adjoining Lot 1248 and to be allowing a 250 car carpark within	

E22/6413 Page 44 of 72

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Officer Comment
		350metres of a residence, numerous tanks, a large eyesore non rural building is not in line with the total Shire strategy to enhance, improve and preserve the natural environment within the rural area.	Officers have addressed built form in the body of the report. Based on the setbacks of the development support the development.
		6. The site is not suitable for this commercial project and could create fire risks, soil erosion, noise issues, safety issues for humans and livestock and on this scale, should be re-located to the designated industrial area of Kargotich Road.	The merits of the application are discussed in the body of the report.
		7. Traffic flows - Karnup Road does not have the capacity to handle the proposed traffic flow i.e 250 car carpark with turnover by 3 or 4 times daily. Plus commercial traffic, providers vehicles and delivery vehicles.	A condition has been imposed requiring upgrades to occur on Karnup Road to safely facilitate the
		The research completed was incorrect and excluded a large number of accidents which have occurred on Karnup Road and in the vicinity. Because there are no public transport services the traffic in and out flows is a very serious safety issue and would create high safety risk areas.	development.
		8. Storage, management and collection of waste is also a serious issue and once again a full specialist report should be obtained by Council before they comment.(see point 4 above). It is inadequate to propose that part of the waste material would provide feed to develop the proponents own cattle to provide a paddock to plat concept. This is unrealistic and not practicable on a sustainable basis.	The development is subject to a Waste Management Plan to be approved by the Shire.
		9. The application does not address or consider the effect of existing businesses in the area ie; food outlets, hotel, bottle shop etc. This area should be considered by Council.	The development is considered to meet the objective of the Rural zone as detailed in the report.
		10. Noise Issues - To allow this application to proceed, the noise issue would shatter he rural environment and affect the adjoining lots. We are able to hear the Pony Club functions clearly and they are further away. Anti social behaviour is unwanted and would put pressure on existing services such as Police, Fire Brigade. This contravenes the definition of rural living.	The submitted Environment Noise Assessment generally demonstrates compliance with the assigned levels of the <i>Environment (Noise)</i> Regulations 1997. A Noise Management Plan has also been conditioned to manage all noise sources and noise from speakers and bands.

E22/6413 Page 45 of 72

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Officer Comment
		<ul> <li>11. The applicants make no comment on the ability of the proponents to actually fund his project. It would be a bigger disaster if the project could not complete and thereby leaving an incomplete construction site creating all sorts of issues. None of which fit to a rural setting.</li> <li>We believe this proposal should be rejected after various expert reports are obtained to verify the contradictions in the application.</li> <li>This would be consistent with the previous proposals rejected by Shire because of strategy and policy in retaining the environment and rural setting.</li> <li>Please acknowledge receipt of our comments in not supporting this proposal.</li> </ul>	The development as per the planning framework will have a substantial commencement clause. No condition has been imposed to providing a timeframe in which the full development will need to be constructed by.
A32801		We are the owners of Lot No. 200, 335 Rapids Road, Serpentine, located on the corner of Rapids Road (south) and Karnup Road, with much of the western boundary of our property along Rapids Road (south) being opposite the Bush Forever Site No. 74. We utilize our property for the production of Ultra-fine wool from Merino sheep and each year we rotationally conserve hay from the wetter parts of the property to feed to our sheep. Our property adjoins the entire western boundary of Lot 201, 1248 Karnup Road, Serpentine and the Water Corporation Open Drain that services our land and the subject land runs parallel to our common boundary fence. Our residence is located about 650 metres from the site where the Restaurant and Brewery are proposed to be established.	The updated NIMP has demonstrated alignment with the EEP of the Peel Harvey Coastal Plain Catchment. A condition of approval has been imposed to ensure the NIMP is amended to ensure the five year nutrient concentrations meet the EEP requirements. This is discussed further in the report.
		We are both professional agricultural scientists and have a PhD in our respective agricultural disciplines. Maneerat conducted research on Nitrogen Cycling in WA soils for her PhD and later worked in the Soil Health Group at UWA. She was subsequently employed in the CSBP soil analysis lab to develop quite specialized technology for the analysis of WA soils including the determination of available phosphorus.	
		In 2014, John and a colleague conducted the review of the Agronomic and Environmental Management systems employed by Rio Tinto to produce	

E22/6413 Page 46 of 72

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Officer Comment	
		Rhodes grass hay using fertigated mine water as part of the Hamersley Agricultural Project in the WA Pilbara. In view of our professional expertise and concern for the environment, we wish to primarily comment on the potential undesirable consequences that irrigating land at Lot 201, 1248 Karnup Road, Serpentine may have on the Peel-Harvey Estuary.		
		The subject site is in the Peel-Harvey Catchment and is mapped as being in a sewage sensitive area as the site is within 1.0 km of significant wetland. It is well accepted that a lot of the nutrients in the water from the Peel-Harvey catchment ultimately end-up in the Peel Harvey Estuary (P-HE). The P-HE is part of the Peel-Yalgorup wetland system which is a "Wetland of International Importance" under the RAMSAR Convention on Wetlands. The Peel-Harvey Estuary Protection Plan (P-HEPP, Bindjareb Djilba) provides a collaborative framework that will guide the protection of the system. As outlined in the P-HEPP, there is an ongoing need to continue to reduce nutrient inputs, especially of Nitrogen (N) and Phosphorus (P). The part of the Gull Road Drainage system that carries water from south to north in the Water Corporation Open Drain along the western boundary of the subject site discharges its water into the Serpentine river about 2.5 km from the subject site and ultimately, via this river, into the P-HE. With regard to nutrient status in the P-HEPP, the Gull Road Drainage system is rated very high for both Total N and Total P. Further, the P-HEPP considers treated effluent via infiltration or discharge to drainage may add nutrients to the estuary. In view of these sensitive environmental issues we have concerns that the Development Application (DA) does not address or give appropriate consideration to the factors outlined below that could contribute to undesirable environmental consequences for the Peel-Harvey Estuary.		
		While gathering Geotechnical Data on the subject site six Test Pits (TP) were dug, with 3 of the 6 TP encountering groundwater at a depth of less than 2.0 metres. On Page 129 of the DA it is stated "Groundwater encountered at TP4 (at 1.2m depth), TP5 (at 1.2m depth) and TP6 (at 1.7m depth)." On Page 134 of the DA it is stated "Based on the type of Soils encountered on site with a shallow bedrock, stormwater shall be discharged		

E22/6413

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Officer Comment	
		offsite into swale drains or detention basin." On page 210 of the DA it is stated "The soil types of the irrigation areas are sandy, with an average infiltration rate of 4.32m/day however it is acknowledged that the soils have a low PRI and shallow clearance to groundwater, hence the		
		thorough treatment of the wastewater prior to irrigation to land." With groundwater encountered at a depth of less than 2.0 metres in 3 of the 6 Test Pits and the use of the words 'shallow bedrock' and 'shallow clearance to groundwater' in the statements on Pages 134 and 210, respectively it is pretty obvious there is bedrock running under the subject site fairly close to the soil surface.		
		The person who constructed the northern boundary fence of the subject site along Karnup Road as well as between our property and the subject site adjacent and parallel to the Water Corporation Open Drain stressed to us that impervious bedrock (termed coffee rock) was frequently encountered at a depth of 1.0 metre or less when digging the post holes for these fences. From this it is reasonable to expect that this impervious coffee rock forms the base of the Water Corporation Open Drain. Small pieces of coffee rock that were probably chipped off the bedrock when the drain was constructed are still evident along the banks of this Open Drain. The northern boundary fence of the subject site along Karnup Road abuts the proposed 7.93 hectare Irrigation Area 1, so it seems reasonable to expect that Irrigation Area 1 has the same impervious coffee rock not too far from the soil surface. Figure 7 on Page 225 of the DA shows the proposed 2.11 hectare Irrigation Area 2 is located between the two dams that were dug-out some time ago. The material on the banks of these dams has large chunks of bedrock material that had to be removed to establish the dams. Consequently, it is reasonable to expect this bedrock material also runs under the proposed 2.11 hectare Irrigation Area 2.		
		On Page 212 of the DA under Nutrient Balance it is stated "The average biomass yield of annual ryegrass is calculated to be 6.68 tonne per hectare per year, based on various studies referenced in Table 12. According to		

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Officer Comment
		Reuter, Robinson and Coleman (1986), the biomass contains 3.15% of nitrogen and 0.14% of phosphorus. Therefore, annual ryegrass can uptake 210 kg/ha of nitrogen and 9.3 kg/ha of phosphorus."	
		These amounts of N and P retained in the 6.68 tonnes/ha of annual ryegrass biomass represent only a fraction of the amount N and P that would need to be applied, in addition to that from the treated brewery wastewater, to grow this amount of ryegrass biomass with these quantities of retained N and P. In short, the N and P retained in the annual ryegrass biomass has to come from somewhere and with the soil's high infiltration rate of 4.32 m/day and very low PRI, most of the N and P that will need to be applied will not be taken-up by the shallow roots of annual ryegrass (probably less than 20 cm deep). Consequently, these elements will rapidly move in solution down the soil profile until the bedrock is reached. Once on the bedrock, the N and P rich solution is likely to flow across this impervious bedrock until it reaches the Water Corporation Open Drain. From there these nutrients will be deposited in the Serpentine river and ultimately in the Peel-Harvey Estuary.	
		To this point we have only considered the significant leaching and removal of N and P from the irrigation areas. However, with the sandy soil across the site being such nutrient-poor soil, very high inputs of other essential Macro elements such as Potassium, Sulphur, Calcium and Magnesium along with a number of essential Trace elements will also need to be applied to the irrigation areas each year to grow the 6.68 tonne/ha of annual ryegrass biomass. It is entirely reasonable to expect that most of these other essential elements that will need to be applied, mostly as synthetic fertilizer, would have a fate similar to the large amounts of the N and P that need to be applied to the proposed Irrigation Areas 1 and 2 within the subject site. The ultimate result would be that large quantities N and P plus the other Macro as well as Trace elements applied as fertilizer will end-up in the Peel-Harvey Estuary with a potentially catastrophic outcome. In view of what we have outlined based on our own expertise and the obvious shortcomings and deficiencies in the DA, when you consider this proposed development, it is essential that appropriate, independent professional advice be sought.	

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Officer Comment	
		Such expertise should be available through the Peel-Harvey Catchment Council and the WA Department of Primary Industries and Regional Development.		
		As residents very close to the subject site we also have concerns about the number of car movements, the capacity of Karnup road to handle the traffic and the noise from the subject site.		
		The DA indicates the restaurant can accommodate 1,000 patrons and there will be 250 car parking bays.		
		If each of the 250 cars that occupy the parking bays arrives with 4 restaurant patrons this will bring 1,000 patrons to the restaurant. On Page 16 of the DA under 3.9 it shows for Saturdays and Sundays the restaurant will be open from 8.00 AM to 10.00 PM (14 hours each day). We have been informed that patrons consuming Craft Beer of high alcohol content while having something to eat may stay in a venue for an average of 3.5 hours. Being open for 14 hours on a Saturday and Sunday this would allow four (4) patron turn-overs through the restaurant on each of these days (14/3.5 = 4.0). With a restaurant capacity of 1,000 patrons, this represents a total of 4,000 patrons on each of these days. It is noteworthy that this is the maximum number of restaurant patrons the proposed Septic System is to be designed to handle which, in itself, gives credence to our numbers of car movements on a Saturday and Sunday.		
		Each car that arrives must also depart the site, so the 250 cars that arrive and park will depart the site on average every 3.5 hours. Therefore, there could be a total of 2,000 car movements (14/3.5 x 250 x 2) into and out of the site each Saturday and Sunday. In addition, on Page 17 of the DA it states "The onsite brewery will produce brewed beverages that will supply the restaurant and will be available to purchase and takeaway." If this means people can drive into the site, purchase cans of brewed beverages and drive out again, the number of car movements into and out of the site will be of a much greater magnitude and not controlled by the capacity of the restaurant. The sheer number of car movements, even without		

E22/6413

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Officer Comment
		takeaways, is alarming and especially as all of these cars will have to travel on Karnup road. Based on this inordinate 2,000 additional car movements on a Saturday and a Sunday, the projected future traffic numbers for Karnup Road in the DA are grossly underestimated. Therefore an upgrade of Karnup Road, much more significant than that considered in the DA, will be required to accommodate all of the additional traffic while at the same time minimizing accidents on this road.	
		With bedrock near the surface throughout the subject site there will be considerable reverberation and amplification of all noises across the landscape and into the neighbouring properties when vehicles of any type travel within the subject site. The notorious easterly winds that are common in Serpentine will help carry any noises arising from the site and with the reverberations the amplified noises will be delivered to the nearby properties west and south-west of the subject site. The same will apply to the noises arising from the restaurant as well as the banging of car doors when patrons get out of their car on arrival and into their car on departure from the restaurant. Both of these serious matters concerning reverberations and easterly winds have not been given due consideration within the DA or taken into consideration with respect to noise abatement.  We thank you for consideration of our comments.	
A20100		As a professional horse trainer the noise would be an unwanted distraction to the horses who need rest and quiet.  This is a quiet, rural area hence why we chose it.  Karnup Road is already dangerous without added traffic.  It would ruin any chance of the Serpy pub surviving once re-opened.	The development is considered to meet the existing and prevailing framework. Technical studies have been submitted demonstrating that noise generally meets the assigned levels of the Environment (Noise) Regulations 1997. The development will also be subject to a Noise Management Plan to further reduce noise emitted form the development.
Resident		I am dead set against this proposal.	The development is considered to meet the existing and prevailing framework. Technical

E22/6413 Page 51 of 72

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Officer Comment
		I have lived here at this place more than thirty years and have loved the peace of the rural lifestyle.  This is rural farmland, not industrial and should not even be considered.	studies have been submitted demonstrating that the development can be undertaken in a manner to not impact the existing rural activities occurring within the locality.
A18000		Noise from cars and brewery.  Fly's caused by by-product of brewery and restaurant.  Traffic caused by trucks, cars for restaurant and buses which Karnup Road has had numerous accidents, deaths because of the bends in the road.  Being open 7 days a week this proposal should be in an industrialised area.  Also, where is the water coming from to make beer?  I have a business training racehorses which will be affected by this business.  The fly's and noise and lights will affect performance of the racehorses.  This area is promoted as family lifestyle living in a rural area.  Also I have had conversations with four independent realtors that have all said the value of my property will be affected in a negative way by devaluing my property.  The proposed road into the property will be straight across from my farm and will cause accidents.  Traffic noise and the lights which will be on 24/7 will affect my sleep and that of my racehorses.  Also 45 staff is not a boutique brewery.	The development is consistent with the existing and prevailing planning framework.  Matters relating to noise, traffic and environment are addressed in the report. In relation to water, it is the responsibility of the operator to source an adequate supply of water.  This is not a valid planning consideration.  The development will be subject to road upgrades through a condition of approval.
Resident		The option of another family restaurant and brewery that adds jobs to the local area is positive.	Noted.
Resident		I think it would be an amazing addition to our community	Noted.

E22/6413 Page 52 of 72

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Officer Comment
Resident		This will be great. We have a young family. We would love somewhere close that will serve great food and great drinks and somewhere safe and exciting for the kids to play! Bring it on!	Noted.
Resident		I believe there will be no impact to my family or myself, we all look forward to application being approved.	Noted.
Resident		Will be great to have somewhere else to go on weekends that we don't have e to drive an hour for.	Noted.
Resident		Won't be impacted at all. FANTASTIC idea.	Noted.
Resident		I think it's a great idea it will bring more tourism to the area	Noted.
Resident		Would be great for the community	Noted.
Resident		The increased traffic and noise will certainly have a negative impact on my enjoyment of my home. The intended quiet rural lifestyle in moving to Serpentine is increasingly degraded by development in this area. Additionally King Rd Brewery is 5 min away and I do not see a great need for such a similar, large operation. I believe locals want a convenient, pleasant place to enjoy and drink and a meal but this could be achieved by re-opening the tavern. Please stop destroying our farm/bush outlook with pointless, unnecessary infrastructure.	The development is considered to meet the existing and prevailing framework. Matters relating to noise traffic and environment is captured within the body of the report.
Resident		What an amazing opportunity for the community. We desperately need more traffic through town and a local watering hole to call our own. I feel this will bring in much needed tourists and visitors to our gorgeous little town.	Noted.
Resident		We live directly across from the property in proposal. I have a newborn baby and love how quiet it is here. I strongly disagree with having a brewery across the road from me. Will mean increased traffic and loud noise! This is	The development is considered to meet the existing and prevailing framework. Matters

E22/6413 Page 53 of 72

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Officer Comment
		a quiet town and I want it to stay that way. We would be looking out of our lounge room window straight into the proposed 6m driveway! Please so not let this happen or quite frankly we would consider moving. It would be bad for the environment as I Hurd they would be dumping large quantities of wastewater.	relating to noise traffic and environment is captured within the body of the report.
Resident		My wife and I and 5 month old baby live directly adjacent the proposed site listed. On the map attached "Figure 5: Town Planning Scheme No. 2 Zoning (Plan WA2022) it indicates in yellow that our property is "Public and Community Services" which it is not. 1259 Karnup road has 2 dwellings, that of my wife's parents and that which is ours which is private property. 1233 Karnup road which is my wife's Grandmothers property and Aunty and uncle living there, which is also private property. The reason I am pointing this out is this proposal for commercial use would greatly disrupt our quality of life.	The development is considered to meet the existing and prevailing framework. Matters relating to noise traffic and environment is captured within the body of the report.
		We have 4 generations living here on these properties as well as livestock and have done for some time (more than 20 + years) We are already able to our neighbours when they have guests around until all hours (which we get and don't mind) but If this proposal goes ahead it will be a constant thing we will consider very strongly about relocating due to the increasing noise, volume of people and privacy.	
		If you would like to speak more about my objection to this proposal please don't hesitate to contact me.	
Resident		This is a great idea and venture. I worry about the longevity of the business for the owners, however, we have seen rural breweries and restaurants thrive in other outer suburbs. There really hasn't been a long lasting eatery facility or pub that has lasted very long in Serpentine but I will support it and keep my fingers crossed. There is much positive it can bring to the community.	Noted.

E22/6413 Page 54 of 72

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Officer Comment
Resident		I think it could only help the community, somewhere to gather, somewhere to for kids to play, somewhere to dine out and keep money in the town.	Noted.
Resident		The enormity of this commercial business proposed for this farming area will have a major impact on environment and the ground water supplies. The increase in traffic flow on the substandard road conditions of Karnup and Rapids Roads will create a major health and safety risk not to mention the social impact it will have on the local residence. A business of this size and scale should be restricted to commercial areas where it won't impact socially or have environmental consequences.	The development is considered to meet the existing and prevailing framework. Matters relating to noise traffic and environment is captured within the body of the report.
Resident		Totally not in keeping with the Rural Area that Serpentine is. If this application was for the brewery only it would be allowed only in an industrial area. Massive in its scale with implications of future expansion.  Traffic on Karnup road which on this section where the entrance is proposed is already a known accident black spot which has unfortunately experienced regular incidents, some fatal. Water table impact and contamination.	The development is considered to meet the existing and prevailing framework. Matters relating to noise traffic and environment is captured within the body of the report.
Resident		The location seems to be unsuitable to increase the volume of traffic, the plans do not blend into the dynamic of the area	The development is considered to meet the existing and prevailing framework. Matters relating to noise traffic and environment is captured within the body of the report.
Resident		Not compatible with the rural nature of our shire and particularly Serpentine. Not compatible with the majority of rural operations in the vicinity of proposed location. As a landowner, I am most concerned with the amount of water that a business that size will deplete from our underground water source. Karnup Road is renowned as a hazardous road so what measures will be put in place for those of us that travel through for business, services and leisure? If it had been a proposal for a boutique establishment, in line with the existing amenities and character of Serpentine, I most definitely would have been supportive.	The development is considered to meet the existing and prevailing framework. Matters relating to noise traffic and environment is captured within the body of the report.  The applicant will be required to obtain the necessary licenses from DWER to extract water.

E22/6413 Page 55 of 72

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Officer Comment
Resident	Resident  The increase in noise and traffic in a rural setting a big concern. The application claims that there has been no fatalities on this corner - may be they should come and view the roadside shrine. My wife has Parkinson disease and is super stressed by the idea of having a pub across the roads.		The development is considered to meet the existing and prevailing framework. Matters relating to noise, traffic and environment is captured within the body of the report.
Resident		What a fantastic addition this will be to the Serpentine area.	Noted.
Resident		I think it will be amazing for the community and will also bring in lots of tourists, great for everyone.	Noted.
Resident		Local venue to bring jobs and further the progression of the town	Noted.
Resident		I'll finally have some were to eat out and socialise	Noted.
Resident		Great for the community, will support this business	Noted.
Resident		I support the proposal, however I have a few concerns. The property is much smaller than the property at King Rd, however it is going to be larger than King Rd brewery. What precautions are being implicated to protect the direct neighbours of the property?  Karnup road is a very busy road, that has already had several accidents, some fatal, in the 70km section, what is proposed for the driveway turn in? At the moment there are large trucks who already travel above the speed limit! If done well, this could be the thing Serpentine needs, however the shire needs to make sure that the town is supported, Karnup road and surrounding supporting roads need serious up keep and maintenance and the local town needs regular maintenance to make it enticing for visitors, so this becomes not only a great business for the owners but helps other local small businesses.	The development is considered to meet the existing and prevailing framework. Matters relating to noise traffic and environment is captured within the body of the report.
Resident		I am concerned about the amount of ground water this venture will draw, from our ever declining water supplies.	The applicant will be required to obtain the necessary licenses from DWER to extract water.

E22/6413 Page 56 of 72

Submitter	No	Submitter Comme	nts	Officer Comment
Resident			about the amount of ground water this venture will draw, lining water supplies.	The applicant will be required to obtain the necessary licenses from DWER to extract water.
Resident		Local jobs, bring t	he community together	Noted.
Resident		personal reasons Serpentine towns that this zoning commercial busin distressing. The v concern. Then se realised that we w the loss of prope spending many expanded as we could have on the and inconsistencie	ose the DA. Originally our motivation was simply for . We are both full time employees and moved from the hip and purchased a rural property to enjoy the lifestyle offers. Receiving notification of a DA for a largescale ess that does not align to traditional rural activities was isual impact and disruption of peace was our number one econdly, as we are both advanced in our careers, we will not be able to recover from the financial impact due to retry value once we decide to retire and downsize. After hours reading this document however, our concerns started to comprehend the potential impact this venture environment and community. The technical inaccuracies es of the DA do little to reassure the Serpentine community is been carefully considered.	The development is considered to meet the existing and prevailing framework. Matters relating to noise traffic and environment is captured within the body of the report. An updated NIMP was provided by the applicant during the assessment process.
		Impact	Summary comment	
		Noise	<ul> <li>□ No modelling or assessment after 10pm.</li> <li>□ Proposed management measures unworkable and unrealistic.</li> </ul>	
		Visual impact	<ul> <li>□ Not assessed.</li> <li>□ Required to be addressed under State Planning Policy.</li> </ul>	
		Vehicle parking	☐ Insufficient car parking spaces	
		Traffic	☐ Peak traffic based on 10 people per vehicle?	
		Dust	☐ Not addressed for construction or operation.	

E22/6413 Page 57 of 72

Submitter	No	Submitter Commen	ts	Officer Comment
		Water supply	<ul><li>□ It is inferred but not stated that groundwater will be used.</li><li>□ Impacts not addressed.</li></ul>	
		Wastewater	<ul> <li>□ Dispersion of effluent spray during irrigation not addressed.</li> <li>□ Analysis too simplistic and inconsistent loading rates.</li> <li>□ Irrigation area grossly understated.</li> </ul>	
		Environmental	☐ Business operation impact on the surrounding land and Peel Harvey Estuary	
		Bushfire Prevention	□ No risk measures provided for surrounding properties	
		Site Plan	☐ Inconsistent plans need to be addressed	
		Consultation	☐ Discussion with Shire Planning Officers does not comprise adequate community consultation	
		Personal	□ Impact on lifestyle	
		Local Planning Scheme Regulations 2015	□ Overview of DA status vs regulations	
		** Refer below for f	further Submission:	
Resident		Great for the comm	nunity.	Noted.
Resident		not impacted at all.		Noted.

E22/6413 Page 58 of 72

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Officer Comment
Resident		not impacted	Noted.
Resident		Please note I make these comments as I will be moving to Serpentine in the next couple of months. From what I've seen of the area, Serpentine needs more leisure and social facilities close to the residential hub, and the proposed development would offer these. I would therefore support the application.	Noted.
Resident		I am concerned about parking as the street is adjacent to the pony club grounds. This is a high traffic area during competitions and pony club days. Parking on the verge in from of this area would become dangerous as it is difficult to pull out onto the street. Parking no go signs would need to be erected so you can see oncoming traffic. As the proposal would have high vehicle movement and trucks will be using the road at this location. This would become a hazard as there can be up to 100 floats etc moving in the area.	The development will be subject to road upgrades to ensure the road network is not adversely impacted upon.
Resident		So close to the Serpentine town is not the place for such a large scale commercial property. That land should be kept for hobby farmers with cattle, horses sheep. Etc. a lot of the residents who travel along Karnup Ed, myself included are travelling with horse trailers for pony club etc and thus will bring too much traffic from people who have no idea of livestock transporting and the need for time in turning, signalling etc. 400 metres from the nearest resident is a joke for the Serpentine lifestyle and the plans say "possible vegetation" protecting these. One residents from looking out at a commercial plant. Disgraceful. A boutique sized business would have been more appropriate for this sized property. What will the noise levels be like for these residents? I say they need to move further out on Karnup Road to a larger property where they can be properly shielded and in keeping with our Shire's beautiful rural aspect.	The development is considered to meet the existing and prevailing framework. Matters relating to noise traffic and environment is captured within the body of the report.
Resident		It will be great for the area	Noted

E22/6413 Page 59 of 72

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Officer Comment
Resident		I'm thankful for the investment in our community and the rewards of local employment, more visitors which equates to more money spent in the community. I fully endorse this and wish the proposers success	Noted.
Resident		I think it's a wonderful idea for our community	Noted.
Resident		I am concerned about higher traffic volumes on Karnup road. We already tolerate high noise levels from tyres on the very rough road surface as most cars and trucks speed past our home doing well over the speed limit of 60km per hour. Can the council consider resurfacing a 500 metre section with hotmix, and maybe install a fixed speed monitoring sign similar to those in use elsewhere like Byford.	The development is considered to meet the existing and prevailing framework. Matters relating to noise traffic and environment is captured within the body of the report.
Resident		Only issue would be traffic. May need to make dual lanes or speed limit dropped to 60km/hr.	Road upgrades have been recommended by Officers to ensure there is no adverse impact upon the road network.
Resident		Reference planning submission PA22/383 by Bright Tank Brewing Co  We have been residents and ratepayers of Serpentine for 29 years with one of the main attractions of moving, living and staying here being the unspoilt rural aspect, ambience and strong community spirit. We were both volunteer fire brigade members for the shire for 1993 and 2020 years respectively, Pamela still now with the ESG.  The 5 year forward plan for SJ has always maintained that Serpentine and Keysbrook would remain Rural. The development as it is proposed, is not compatible with the existing character of either the site location or the Shire.  Having read it, (twice albeit not all 499 pages!) we can see that a considerable amount of time and money has already been spent commissioning reports and opinions from external sources on environmental, noise and other impacts. I would like to hope that this is not an automatic presumption that this development will go ahead.	The development is subject to a merits-based assessment. As part of the assessment technical information is required to be submitted to demonstrate the merits of the application.

E22/6413

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Officer Comment
		We sincerely hope that those tasked with considering the PA take a strong look at the many areas that are vague and inaccurate. There are very few commitments and lots of references to further detail and applications after PA has been approved.  There are artists impressions of the restaurant venue but not of the industrial style shed of the brewery. Please consider the materials to be used in construction, again very vague and certainly not the re-purposed Collie railway structure that is referenced in the opening part of the application.	This is addressed in the Report.
		<ul> <li>If this was a Planning Application for a brewery only it would be in an industrial area.</li> <li>We would like to voice our strong objection to the proposed development on the following grounds.</li> <li>1. The proposed development certainly does not fit in with the rural area which Serpentine is. It is massive in scale both in its current proposal form and more so if you consider the references to future expansion.</li> </ul>	The development is considered to meet the existing and prevailing planning framework. This is addressed further in the report.
		2. The location entrance on Karnup Road for such an enterprise is inappropriate and dangerous. It is on one of the busiest and dangerous sections of Karnup Road (between Walker and Rapids Rd) which over the years has seen multiple accidents and even fatalities. We do not believe the external report to be a true reflection of the safety risk this facility poses to local residents.	The development will be required to undertake road upgrades as detailed in the report to ensure the local road network is not adversely impacted upon.
		The higher volume of customer traffic will become a hazard and more so when patrons perhaps hundreds (some likely intoxicated) leave at closing time which we have witnessed at a similar venture King Road Brewery. The 1000 patron capacity may not represent a daily turnover which could be many times more.	As mentioned above road upgrades are required to be undertaken as a condition of approval.

E22/6413 Page 61 of 72

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Officer Comment
		3. A massive scale commercial brewery and cannery will have a large volume of trucks delivering supplies and picking up product, again increasing risk on that section of road. What changes will be made to Karnup Road to accommodate this traffic? The canning line alone will have a 137 cube per hour capacity. (137,000 ltr. per hour)	This forms part of the NIMP requirements to be amended which forms a condition of approval.
		The proposed brewery (1400m) does not include the external grain storage siloes, water tanks, pallet produce storage etc.	Water extraction is a separate process regulated
		4. The Brewery side of the proposal will require a large amount of water and any bore sunk into a suitable aquifer will likely draw down the water tables with long term effect not only on locals but the environment as well.	by the Department of Water Environment Regulation Water extraction is a separate process regulated
		<ol> <li>The State Government will impose reduced garden sprinkle use from September so this highlights the strain the water tables are already under.</li> </ol>	by the Department of Water Environment Regulation
		6. Effluent from such a venture will need to be disposed of and again could have an impact on the water table. The proposal reports that the water table in some locations on the site is as little as 1200mm and this was in December 2021	The Department of Health will be responsible to approve the human waste treatment system for the development. In terms of the brewery wastewaters this will be subject to an amended NIMP which must also demonstrate that irrigation areas must maintain a 1.5m separation from winter groundwater at all times.
		7. A 'Farm to Fork' aspect is mentioned, I challenge this as likely non-commercial and submitted only as a 'trendy phrase' to bolster the development proposal. This area is predominantly Bassendean A 'hungry sand' and not suitable to grow commercial vegetables without the import of large and regular amounts of manure and fertiliser, not to mention reticulated water and labour to cultivate. Through no fault of the current owners, historically this particular property has had minimal investment in maintaining the soil structure and pasture quality. It is	The application does not include a proposal to grow/produce food. This may be subject to a separate application at a later date.

E22/6413 Page 62 of 72

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Officer Comment
		<ul> <li>well known by locals for having eroded land, high weed burdens and ill thrifty livestock.</li> <li>8. Noise. We see an audible 'concept' report was conducted which could only be hypothetical on a project which has not even been built. It also only produced data inside on a building with the windows and doors closed. This is unrealistic as it will be hard to balance safety (for evacuation purposes) and noise reduction for such a large crowd. The health and welfare of the surrounding homes should be an immediate concern to the shire.</li> </ul>	The development will be subject to a Noise Management Plan. The Environment Noise Assessment submitted by the applicant generally shows compliance with the assigned levels of the Environment Protection (Noise) Regulations 1997.
		9. I would imagine that it is only the restaurant component which is enabling a large-scale commercial development such as this to be considered in a rural zone otherwise due to the capacity of the brewery, it would have automatically and logically been directed to an industrial site.	The development is considered consistent with the existing and prevailing planning framework.

#### \*\* Full Submission

Topic	DA ref.	Issue	Comments and required actions	Officer Comment
Noise	3.10	The statement that noise management measures are in place to minimize potential noise impacts is simply not correct.  The proposed operational measures will not ensure compliance to the Environmental Protection (Noise) Regulations 1997.	□ Refer to comments below.	
		"Dwelling at 409 Rapids Road approximately 350 meters from the subject site." (DA ref 3.10)	<ul> <li>□ Correct DA.</li> <li>□ State distance of the "Site" boundary from 15 m from the house (about 135 m).</li> </ul>	The noise contour plans as part of the submitted Environment Noise Assessment demonstrate

E22/6413 Page 63 of 72

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments		Officer Comment
	at 409 approxi	osest dwelling is located Rapids Road which is imately 400 meters south proposed development DA ref. 2.1)	<ul> <li>State distance from the closest facility (car park), about 220 m.</li> <li>Conflicting references to distance to closest home throughout the DA.</li> </ul>	noise levels received at the identified sensitive receptors.
	shall be		<ul> <li>□ Management personnel cannot be relied on to:         <ul> <li>use and maintain a calibrated noise level meter;</li> <li>monitor the noise levels; and</li> <li>close the doors and windows.</li> </ul> </li> <li>□ 409 Rapids Road does not reach compliance in noise Scenario 2A</li> </ul>	☐ The development will be required to comply with the required Noise Management Plan at all times. Where there is evidence of any exceedance ,compliance through a separate process can be undertaken.
	entertal pm at ri venue, dB(A) d	event that amplified inment occurs beyond 10 night within the hospitality it shall not exceed 90 on the basis of windows ors being closed."	<ul> <li>□ Where shall it not exceed 90 dB(A)?</li> <li>□ Appendix J, "Environmental Noise         Assessment" does not address conditions after         10 pm on any day.</li> <li>□ Management personnel cannot be relied on to:         • use and maintain a calibrated noise         level meter;         • monitor the noise levels; and         • close the doors and windows.</li> <li>□ How can patrons be stopped from opening         doors and windows?</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>□ The operating times of the development has been restricted up to 10pm</li> <li>□ The development will be subject to a Nosie Management Plan which will be required to be complied with at all times. As mentioned above where an exceedance has been identified this is subject to a separate compliance process.</li> </ul>
		utdoor speakers shall be ed off prior to 10 pm"	<ul> <li>Management personnel cannot be relied on to ensure that the speakers are turned off at this time.</li> </ul>	The development will be required to comply with a Noise Management Plan at all times. As mentioned above where an exceedance has been identified this is subject to a separate compliance process
	log boo	gement will maintain a ok for any complaints ing noise and disturbance area."	This does not ensure that any timely and effective action would be undertaken.	□ This is to ensure the operator refines practices to ensure compliance with the Noise Management Plan and general compliance with the Environment Protection (Noise) Regulations 1997
Арр Ј	Noise g	generation after 10 pm delled.	Adjusted noise level <u>above the limit</u> <u>before</u> 10 pm for:	<ul> <li>A condition has been imposed restricting operating hours as detailed in the report.</li> </ul>

E22/6413 Page 64 of 72

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments		Officer Comment
			<ul> <li>scenario 2A;</li> <li>Adjusted noise level on the limit after 10 pm for:         <ul> <li>scenarios 1, 2C;</li> </ul> </li> <li>Adjusted noise level above the limit after 10 pm for:         <ul> <li>scenarios 2A, 2B, 2C, 3A;</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
	the mo case si prevail the wo may or	Ind directions selected for odel must cover the worst- ituation, as well as the ing wind direction, even if rst-case wind direction of the time." – EPA	<ul> <li>"Worst-case" conditions not modelled.</li> <li>Serpentine is renowned for strong easterly winds.</li> <li>Insufficient vegetation for noise from foliage to be dominant.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Officers and DWER are satisfied with the methodology used within the submitted ENA. Noise emissions are discussed further in the report.</li> </ul>
	Conflic	ting data	☐ It is not credible that the noise level is lower in Scenario 2A (with amplified music eg a DJ) than Scenario 2A (without DJ)	<ul> <li>Officers and DWER are satisfied with the methodology used within the submitted ENA. Noise emissions are discussed further in the report.</li> </ul>
			<ul> <li>Only 4 cars driving along the access road and 8 cars driving within the carpark as per Scenario 3A is not a realistic scenario for a 1000 capacity restaurant plus staff.</li> <li>There is no justification for the use of this value.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Officers and DWER are satisfied with the methodology used within the submitted ENA. Noise emissions are discussed further in the report.</li> </ul>
			<ul> <li>No commitment or management plan to ensure patrons leave the car park in a prompt and orderly fashion at 10pm.</li> </ul>	☐ The development will be subject to a Noise Management Plan to ensure noise emitted from the development complies with the Environment Protection (Noise) Regulation 1997 at all times.
			<ul> <li>Other than management practices (which are unreliable) there are no provisions of noise limiting devices such as screen walls to protect existing residents from obvious non-compliance with the Noise Regulations.</li> </ul>	☐ The development will be subject to a Noise Management Plan to ensure noise emitted from the development complies with the Environment Protection (Noise) Regulation 1997 at all times.

E22/6413 Page 65 of 72

Submitter		No	Submitter Comments		Officer Comment
Visual impact	Not addressed	under the No. 2: E	ed to be addressed he State Planning Policy Environment and Natural ce Policy' for Western ia (WAPC 2003).	The existing rural visual amenity would be severely impacted by construction of an industrial facility visible from both our home and property.	☐ The development is considered to reflect a rural aesthetic which elevates the rural characteristics of the Shire. Due to the setbacks proposed especially from Karnup Road, the built form of the development is considered acceptable.
	2.1 fig 2 3.6.2	"Featur "Respe	nce to Landscape funities"  The landscaping is likely"  Contribute to the grural character of the	<ul> <li>There is no actual commitment to rural landscaping in this DA.</li> <li>No commitment to address the visual impact from the development on the most exposed side which is Rapids Road (South)</li> </ul>	☐ The development will be subject to a Landscape Management Plan as detailed in the report.
	3.2.2		ureto harmonise with al character"	<ul> <li>Subjective, however it is unlikely that if consulted, the community would classify a double-storey, industrial style restaurant, signage, commercial brewery/cannery and well-lit carpark as indicative of existing "rural" character of SJ.</li> </ul>	☐ The development is considered to reflect a rural aesthetic which elevates the rural characteristics of the Shire. Due to the setbacks proposed especially from Karnup Road, the built form of the development is considered acceptable.
	3.6.1	Large v installed	vater tanks will be d	<ul> <li>Location not identified and size needs to be clarified.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Location of tanks will be identified within the relative management plans requiring to be submitted as conditions of approval.</li> </ul>
	3.7	waste".	"material and brewing"located at the rear of wery to minimise impact irs, sounds and unsightly	No plan provided to minimise the three identified issues on surrounding residents?	☐ The development will be subject to a Waste Management Plan which provide more detailed design and provisions of the proposed waste area
Vehicle parking	3.3.2	Insuffici	ient parking spaces	<ul> <li>1 bay per 4 people is impractical for a 1000 seat restaurant and 45 staff.</li> </ul>	□ Car parking is subject to the Shire of Serpentine Jarrahdale Town Planning Scheme

E22/6413 Page 66 of 72

Submitter		No	Submitter Comments		Officer Comment
				☐ There is no justification for the use of this value.	No.02 parking requirements and assessed against the prevailing framework.
Traffic	3.3.3 App D		our based on 10 trips per ats; 10 people per ?	<ul> <li>Needs clarification.</li> <li>No commitment for crossover treatment of Karnup Rd as per Figure 15, Appendix D.</li> <li>Traffic impact needs to be broadened to include the notorious S bend, west of Rapids Road up to the Golf Course crossing and Pony Club area east of Walker Road.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Officers support the Traffic Impact Assessment submitted. Road upgrades are required and have been imposed as conditions of approval.</li> </ul>
	2.1	Austral of site	ind train line 2.4Km East	<ul> <li>Misleading. There is no public transport to get to/from the venue from the Serpentine station</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>The applicant is seeking to arrange for buses to provide transport from key areas of Byford, Rockingham and Armadale.</li> </ul>
Dust	3.5		anagement not sed in <i>Site Work</i> s.	<ul> <li>Needs to be addressed with performance criteria provided.</li> </ul>	Dust will have to be managed through all stages of the development.
	Not addressed	be seal Not cle	ted if the access road will ed. ar how much of the area will be sealed.	<ul> <li>Provide clarifications and dust management plans.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Parking areas and internal driveways are to be sealed as per condition imposed.</li> </ul>
Water supply	3.4		dressed	<ul> <li>It is inferred but not stated that groundwater will be used.</li> <li>Due to the enormous size of this commercial business, the source of such vast quantities of water needs to be clear.</li> <li>Impact on surrounding rural properties has not been addressed</li> </ul>	☐ The applicant is working through the regulatory process with DWER to obtain a license to extract water.
Wastewater	3.4	during i Large of Mislead	sion of effluent spray irrigation not addressed. differences in volumes. ding rainfall data and too tic analysis.	<ul> <li>Dispersion and quality of effluent spray during irrigation to be addressed.</li> <li>Impact of groundwater levels not addressed in App E or F.</li> <li>Inconsistent wastewater volumes between App E and App F by at least two.</li> </ul>	The Department of Health are the approval body for the system associated with human waste. This forms a separate process as detailed within the report.

E22/6413 Page 67 of 72

Submitter		No	Submitter Comments		Officer Comment
				□ Rainfall for 2021 (938) just above average of 918.	
Wastewater	Site layout plan	Locatio shown.	n of irrigation areas not	<ul> <li>□ Irrigation areas are about eight times the area of the vehicle parking area.</li> <li>□ The site layout plan states that the scale is 1:100 at A3; though it is approximately 1:2600 at A3</li> </ul>	☐ The development will be subject to a revised NIMP which proposes a range of measures to reduce the loading of wastewaters within the irrigation area.
	Appendix E Fig. 8	about 0	oplication area shown as 0.45 has and protruding resource enhancement nd wetland.	<ul> <li>□ Land application area required</li> <li>□ is 10 ha; about 22 times larger than shown.</li> <li>□ Area shown protrudes into the wetland.</li> </ul>	The development will be subject to a NIMP. The wastewaters are required to meet the EEP nutrient targets at all times. DBCAs response has been provided as part of the report.
	Appendix F 3.4.1	will be	stewater infrastructure located outside all d areas."	<ul> <li>This is clearly not feasible with an irrigation area of about 10 ha.</li> </ul>	☐ The development will be subject to a revised NIMP. Irrigation and associated infrastructure will be required to stay outside of the wetlands onsite.
	Appendix F 3.5	Locatio shown	ns of irrigation areas not	<ul> <li>Stated that the two irrigation areas (total of 10ha) are shown on Figure 7; however, they are not shown</li> </ul>	□ Refer to report
		Storage	e facilities not described	□ Type and locations not shown	This will be identified through the relevant management plans.
Environmental	4.3.1		able farming and food ion model	□ No details or commitment on how this will be achieved. Considering the scale of the restaurant (1000 seats with multiple sittings per day) it needs to be addressed prior to approval as the infrastructure, water and effluent for a business of this scale will be significant.	□ Not proposed as part of this application.
		Impact residen	on livestock and ts	The strategy to minimise flies from these extra activities has not been included.	<ul> <li>The development will be subject to relevant management plans including a Mosquito Management Plan.</li> </ul>

E22/6413 Page 68 of 72

Submitter		No	Submitter Comments		Officer Comment
		Peel Ha	arvey Estuary	☐ The DA is conflict with the principles of the PH Estuary protection plan	<ul> <li>An amended NIMP is required to demonstrate full compliance with the EEP nutrient targets as detailed in the report.</li> </ul>
Bushfire Prevention		during s weathe	crowds in a social setting summer and/or windy r. ay longer than 200m	<ul> <li>Steps for bushfire minimization strategy to surrounding properties from likelihood of a public mishap at an entertainment venue not provided.</li> <li>No commitment to passing bays for Bushfire services.</li> </ul>	☐ The development will be subject to a Bushfire Management Plan supported by Officers and as detailed in the report, once approved.
Site Plan	Appendix J fig 1 Appendix K fig 2	Conflict	ting site plans provided	<ul> <li>Location and orientation of site needs clarification.</li> </ul>	□ Development will be required to comply with the submitted site plan and elevations.
Personal		Detrime	ental impact on lifestyle	<ul> <li>Rural outlook compromised</li> <li>Advice received that property value will decline and potential number of buyers will reduce.</li> <li>Total operational hours of both the commercial and tourist venue remove (we are full time employees, one in emergency services) impact weekend relaxation time</li> </ul>	☐ The development is considered to comply with the existing and prevailing planning framework. The development will be subject to a Bushfire Management Plan.
		Amend	ed DA	<ul> <li>We would support a boutique establishment in fitting with the rural nature of SJ</li> <li>No has no impact on the environment.</li> <li>Relocated to a more central location on the block to minimize impact on all existing residents</li> </ul>	☐ The development is considered to comply with the existing and prevailing planning framework.
Consultation	1.2	Officers	sion with Shire Planning s does not comprise of ate community ation.	□ Engage in consultation with the community	☐ The Shire provides a pre-lodgement service to all prospective applicants to broadly discuss the planning framework.
	Appendix I		Tankhas engaged residents within 2 km to	□ Simply not true.	□ Noted

E22/6413 Page 69 of 72

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments		Officer Comment
	how the	them on progress and eir concerns are being ered in planning and	409 Rapids Rd received first notification of DA from the Shire on 18 <sup>th</sup> May via correspondence dated 13 <sup>th</sup> May. No communication received from Bright Tank Brewery Co to date	

E22/6413 Page 70 of 72

Submitter No Submitter Comments Officer Comment
---

Planning and Development Act Planning and Development Regulations 2015 Sch 2, Part 9

cl 67	"The local government to have due regard to"	Expected in the DA?	In the DA?  Addressed adequately in the DA?		
а	The aims and provisions of this Scheme	No	Not applicable		
b	Advertising	No	Not applicable		
С	State planning policy	No	Not applicable		
d	Any environmental protection policy	Yes	No No		
е	Any policy of the State	No	Not applicable		
f	Any local planning strategy for this Scheme endorsed by the Commission	No	Not applicable		
g	Any local planning policy for the Scheme area	No	Not applicable		
h	Any structure plan or local development plan that relates to the development.	No	Not applicable		
i	Any report of the review of the local planning scheme.	No	Not applicable		
j	In the case of land reserved under this Scheme, the objectives for the reserve and the additional and permitted uses identified in this Scheme for the reserve.	No	Not applicable		
k	The built heritage conservation of any place that is of cultural significance;	Yes	No No		
I	The effect of the proposal on the cultural heritage significance of the area in which the development is Yes No No located.				
	the compatibility of the development with its setting, including —	Yes	No No		
m	the compatibility of the development with the desired future character of its setting; and the relationship of the development to development on adjoining land or on other land in the locality including, but not limited to, the likely effect of the height, bulk, scale, orientation and appearance of the development.				

Refer to Officers Tech Assessment

E22/6413 Page 71 of 72

Submitter N	No	Submitter Comments	Officer Comment	
-------------	----	--------------------	-----------------	--

E22/6413 Page 72 of 72