

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

PA23/177 - L59, L60 and L61 Briggs Road and Lot 62 Thomas Road, Byford – JDAP - Grouped Dwelling (Lifestyle Community)

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Applicant Response	Officer Comment
Water Corporation	1	<p>Thank you for your letter dated 15th March 2023. We offer the following comments regarding this proposal.</p> <p>Water</p> <p>Reticulated water is currently available to the subject area. Water main extension, will be required to the development site, must be laid within the existing and proposed road reserves, on the correct alignment and in accordance with the Utility Providers Code of Practice at the cost of the developer.</p> <p>Wastewater</p> <p>Reticulated sewerage is currently available to the subject area. All sewer main extensions, if required for the development site, should be laid within the existing and proposed road reserves, on the correct alignment and in accordance with the Utility Providers Code of Practice.</p> <p>General Comments</p> <p>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.</p> <p>For further information about building applications, the developer should follow this link: https://www.watercorporation.com.au/home/builders-and-developers/building/lodging-a-building-application</p> <p>If the application is retrospective, approval by our Building Services section is still required.</p> <p>The developer is expected to provide all water and sewerage reticulation if required. A contribution for Water, Sewerage and Drainage headworks may also be required. In addition, the developer may be required to fund new works or the upgrading of existing works</p>	N/A	Noted.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

PA23/177 - L59, L60 and L61 Briggs Road and Lot 62 Thomas Road, Byford – JDAP - Grouped Dwelling (Lifestyle Community)

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Applicant Response	Officer Comment
		<p>and protection of all works. Water Corporation may also require land being provided for works.</p> <p>The information provided above is subject to review and may change. If the proposal has not proceeded within the next 6 months, please contact us to confirm that this information is still valid.</p> <p>Should you have any queries or require further clarification on any of the above issues, please do not hesitate to contact me at matt.calabro@watercorporation.com.au</p>		
Main Roads	2	<p>In response to your correspondence received on 15 March 2023, Main Roads has reviewed the application information and is unable to provide a recommendation at this point in time.</p> <p>The report provided by Allering & Associates proposes that the development will generate 30 vehicle trips in the peak hour. In accordance with the WAPC Transport Impact Assessment Guidelines (2016), this is considered to have a moderate impact which warrants a Transport Impact Statement (TIS).</p> <p>Please prepare a Transport Impact Statement in accordance with the WAPC Transport Impact Assessment Guidelines (2016). The following should also be considered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Briggs Road is planned to be modified to be left-in/left-out as part of the Thomas Road Upgrade project. This will affect the distribution of vehicle trips generated by the proposed development; • Evaluate the need for auxiliary turn lanes on Thomas Rd, to ensure that the impact of turning traffic generated by the proposed development is safely accommodated; • Evaluate the need for convenient and safe pedestrian and cycle facilities in the vicinity of the proposed development to connect the 	Noted. A Transport Impact Statement (TIS) has been prepared and was provided to the Shire on 20 April 2023.	The updated TIS was provided to MRWA, though at the time of the presenting of this report to Council, no response has been received.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

PA23/177 - L59, L60 and L61 Briggs Road and Lot 62 Thomas Road, Byford – JDAP - Grouped Dwelling (Lifestyle Community)

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Applicant Response	Officer Comment
		<p>residents to the surrounding pedestrian and cycle network and nearby public transport.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trip generation rates used in the Transport Impact Statement should be based on rates from a published source (e.g. Transport for NSW, ITE (US)) for the relevant land use. <p>Please provide the above information at your earliest convenience, noting that Main Roads will require 30 days to review this information once received.</p> <p>As stated above, Main Roads is not in a position to support the subject proposal until the above information has been received and reviewed.</p>		
DWER	3	<p>The Department has identified that the development application has the potential to impact on water resource values and management. While the Department does not object to the proposal key issues and recommendations are provided below, and these matters should be addressed.</p> <p>Issue Better Urban Water Management</p> <p>Advice Consistent with Better Urban Water Management (BUWM) (WAPC, 2008) and policy measures outlined in State Planning Policy 2.9: Water Resources, local structure plans should be supported by an approved Local Water Management Strategy (LWMS).</p> <p>The Department previously reviewed the Lot 61 & 62 Thomas Road and Lots 59 & 60 Briggs Road, Byford - Local Water Management Strategy (Rev 5, VDM Consulting, September 2009) and endorsed it in October 2009.</p> <p>Given that the proposed development layout differs from that presented in the approved LWMS in that the area assigned to drainage infrastructure is significantly reduced, the location and number of drainage swales through the development is reduced and there is an overall increase in development</p>	<p>The Applicant would accept a condition of planning approval requiring an updated Stormwater Management Strategy (SWMS) or Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP) to address these items. This would also include the planning and design of the drainage area to the north</p>	Noted.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

PA23/177 - L59, L60 and L61 Briggs Road and Lot 62 Thomas Road, Byford – JDAP - Grouped Dwelling (Lifestyle Community)

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Applicant Response	Officer Comment
		<p>density, the Department recommends that an amended LWMS be completed and endorsed. The amended LWMS should incorporate the current proposed grouped housing design structure and include details on the expected volumes of stormwater runoff generated from the proposed development, quantification and location of land required for stormwater conveyancing and storage, relevant cross-sections of proposed stormwater infrastructure and how proposed open space is to be irrigated.</p> <p>Upon resolution of the above matter the Department provides the following advice,</p>	<p>of the subject site which will be informed by Main Roads WA once a determination has been made on the design, width and drainage requirements of Thomas Road.</p> <p>Edenlife has successfully produced and provided SWMS reports for a number of developments, most recently with the Australind development which was completed in 2020. The approach adopted at Australind included the use of an inverted internal road network which captures stormwater and uses a network of subsurface StormTech infrastructure which will not only direct and retain stormwater as required but is also capable of allowing water harvesting for use onsite in areas such as the homes and community garden.</p>	

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

PA23/177 - L59, L60 and L61 Briggs Road and Lot 62 Thomas Road, Byford – JDAP - Grouped Dwelling (Lifestyle Community)

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Applicant Response	Officer Comment
		<p>Issue Better Urban Water Management</p> <p>Advice Consistent with Better Urban Water Management (BUWM) (WAPC, 2008), prior to the commencement of subdivisional works, an urban water management plan should be prepared and approved, in consultation with the Department of Water and Environmental Regulation, consistent with any approved Local Water Management Strategy.</p> <p>Issue Native Vegetation</p> <p>Advice Under section 51C of the Environmental Protection Act 1986 (EP Act), clearing of native vegetation is an offence unless:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • it is undertaken under the authority of a clearing permit • 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 <p>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).</p> <p>Based on the information provided, should development approval be issued, clearing required for the majority the proposal is likely to be exempt from the requirement for a clearing permit under Regulation 5, Item 1 of the Clearing Regulations. If the proposed clearing for the Asset Protection Zone (APZ) is considered by the Shire to be appropriate, and clearing of native vegetation</p>	<p>As noted above, all of the matters raised by the Shire in relation to an updated SWMS can and will be comprehensively addressed within a revised SWMS which will be produced as part of the civils design process.</p> <p>Noted. As above.</p> <p>Edenlife's responsibilities in relation to obtaining clearing permits (where required) are noted.</p>	

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

PA23/177 - L59, L60 and L61 Briggs Road and Lot 62 Thomas Road, Byford – JDAP - Grouped Dwelling (Lifestyle Community)

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Applicant Response	Officer Comment
		<p>for this purpose is specified within the Development Approval, it is also likely to be exempt under Regulation 5, Item 1. However, any clearing that is not required for the construction of a building or structure (or corresponding APZ) would not fall under this exemption. Note that this exemption does not apply prior to development approval being issued.</p> <p>Please also note that that clearing for a building/structure, combined with other exempt clearing activities on the property, must not exceed five hectares in a financial year.</p> <p>This exemption is described in the Departments https://www.der.wa.gov.au/images/documents/your-environment/native-vegetation/Guidelines/A%20guide%20to%20the%20exemptions%20and%20regulations%20for%20clearing%20native%20vegetation.pdf . 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.</p> <p>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).</p> <p>Issue Groundwater Licence</p> <p>Advice The subject lot is located within the Serpentine Groundwater Area (Byford 3 sub area) which is proclaimed under the Rights in Water and Irrigation Act 1914. Any groundwater abstraction in this proclaimed area for purposes other than domestic and/or stock watering taken from the superficial aquifer, would be subject to licencing by the Department.</p> <p>It is important to note that the Serpentine groundwater area is currently fully allocated and therefore there is no water available for licensing from the deeper Leederville or Cattamarra Coal Measures aquifers in the area. An</p>	<p>Noted. However, the subject site will be connected to a mains water supply.</p>	

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

PA23/177 - L59, L60 and L61 Briggs Road and Lot 62 Thomas Road, Byford – JDAP - Grouped Dwelling (Lifestyle Community)

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Applicant Response	Officer Comment
		<p>application for a licence to construct a bore to take water from these aquifers would likely be refused.</p> <p>There is also limited availability for licensing from the Superficial (shallower, water table Byford 3) aquifer. Owners considering using groundwater for irrigation purposes should contact the licensing section at the Department's Mandurah office on 9550 4222 for further advice.</p> <p>The issuing of a groundwater licence is not guaranteed but if issued, will contain a number of conditions that are binding upon the licensee. Please contact the water licensing section on 9550 4222 or www.water.wa.gov.au/licensing for further guidance.</p> <p>Where the Department has a statutory role, planning applications should be considered prior to the Department issuing any relevant permits, licenses and/or approvals.</p> <p>In the event there are modifications to the proposal that may have implications on aspects of environment and/or water management, the Department should be notified to enable the implications to be assessed</p>		
DFES		<p>I refer to your email dated 15 March 2023 regarding the submission of a Bushfire Management Plan (BMP) (Version 1), prepared by Allering & Associates and dated 3 March 2023, for the above development application. The BMP is accompanied by a letter from the proponent dated 20 April 2023 for the above development application (DA) with additional information.</p> <p>This advice relates only to State Planning Policy 3.7: Planning in Bushfire Prone Areas (SPP 3.7) and the Guidelines for Planning in Bushfire Prone 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.</p>		

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

PA23/177 - L59, L60 and L61 Briggs Road and Lot 62 Thomas Road, Byford – JDAP - Grouped Dwelling (Lifestyle Community)

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Applicant Response	Officer Comment
-----------	----	--------------------	--------------------	-----------------

		<p><u>Assessment</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The decision maker has considered this to be t a vulnerable land use and would constitute an intensification of development and trigger application of SPP 3.7. • Further clarification is required within the BMP of the requirements of SPP 3.7, and the supporting Guidelines as outlined in our assessment below. <p>1. Policy Measure 6.5 a) Preparation of a BAL assessment OR (ii) Preparation of a BAL contour map</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="546 663 1451 1406"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="546 663 770 724">Issue</th> <th data-bbox="770 663 1227 724">Assessment</th> <th data-bbox="1227 663 1451 724">Action</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="546 724 770 944">Vegetation Classification</td> <td data-bbox="770 724 1227 944">No photographic evidence has been provided to support the vegetation classification (Class G Grassland) within Plots 10-12. It is noted that this area would not influence the BAL ratings at the proposal site.</td> <td data-bbox="1227 724 1451 944">For accuracy, modification to the BMP is required.</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="546 944 770 1225">Vegetation Classification</td> <td data-bbox="770 944 1227 1225">It is noted that Plot 13 has been labelled in two different locations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pre-development (figure 5 & table 1) it is Class A Forest; • Post development (figure 6 & table 2) it is the Multi Use Corridor, Class C Shrubland.. </td> <td data-bbox="1227 944 1451 1225">Modification to the BMP is required.</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="546 1225 770 1406">Vegetation Classification</td> <td data-bbox="770 1225 1227 1406">Evidence to support the exclusion of the Multiple Use Corridor (MUC) and Thomas Road drainage reserve as managed to low threat in</td> <td data-bbox="1227 1225 1451 1406">Clarification required. The decision maker to be satisfied with the</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Issue	Assessment	Action	Vegetation Classification	No photographic evidence has been provided to support the vegetation classification (Class G Grassland) within Plots 10-12. It is noted that this area would not influence the BAL ratings at the proposal site.	For accuracy, modification to the BMP is required.	Vegetation Classification	It is noted that Plot 13 has been labelled in two different locations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pre-development (figure 5 & table 1) it is Class A Forest; • Post development (figure 6 & table 2) it is the Multi Use Corridor, Class C Shrubland.. 	Modification to the BMP is required.	Vegetation Classification	Evidence to support the exclusion of the Multiple Use Corridor (MUC) and Thomas Road drainage reserve as managed to low threat in	Clarification required. The decision maker to be satisfied with the		
Issue	Assessment	Action														
Vegetation Classification	No photographic evidence has been provided to support the vegetation classification (Class G Grassland) within Plots 10-12. It is noted that this area would not influence the BAL ratings at the proposal site.	For accuracy, modification to the BMP is required.														
Vegetation Classification	It is noted that Plot 13 has been labelled in two different locations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pre-development (figure 5 & table 1) it is Class A Forest; • Post development (figure 6 & table 2) it is the Multi Use Corridor, Class C Shrubland.. 	Modification to the BMP is required.														
Vegetation Classification	Evidence to support the exclusion of the Multiple Use Corridor (MUC) and Thomas Road drainage reserve as managed to low threat in	Clarification required. The decision maker to be satisfied with the														

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

PA23/177 - L59, L60 and L61 Briggs Road and Lot 62 Thomas Road, Byford – JDAP - Grouped Dwelling (Lifestyle Community)

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Applicant Response	Officer Comment	
		<p>accordance with AS3959 is required.</p> <p>Specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MUC – Plot 13. The MUC appears to contain an area subject to revegetation. It is unclear how this area is to be managed to low threat in perpetuity. • Drainage Reserve to the north of the site – Plot 8 appears to contain an area subject to revegetation. Evidence has not been provided to validate management of the reserve by the responsible authority/the developer. <p>Alternatively, the vegetation should be classified as per AS3959 (at maturity), or the resultant BAL ratings may be inaccurate.</p>	<p>vegetation exclusions and vegetation management proposed.</p>		
		<p>Landscape Management Plan</p> <p>It is noted that some areas of remnant vegetation are proposed to be retained within the site.</p> <p>A Landscape Management Plan should be prepared to remove ambiguity for the landowner and to provide a compliance mechanism for the Shire to ensure that landscaping will be compliant with Schedule 1: Standards for Asset Protection Zones contained in the Guidelines.</p>	<p>Modification to the BMP is required.</p>		

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

PA23/177 - L59, L60 and L61 Briggs Road and Lot 62 Thomas Road, Byford – JDAP - Grouped Dwelling (Lifestyle Community)

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Applicant Response	Officer Comment
-----------	----	--------------------	--------------------	-----------------

		<p>2. Policy Measure 6.5 c) Compliance with the Bushfire Protection Criteria</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="546 395 1451 1362"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="546 395 770 456">Element</th> <th data-bbox="770 395 1227 456">Assessment</th> <th data-bbox="1227 395 1451 456">Action</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="546 456 770 1362">Location</td> <td data-bbox="770 456 1227 1362"> <p>A1.1 – not demonstrated</p> <p>The BAL ratings cannot be validated, as the vegetation classification inputs require modification as per the above table.</p> <p>There are areas of the site exposed to BAL-40/BAL-FZ which represents an extreme risk which does not comply with A1.1.</p> <p>Specifically, the BAL Contour Map identifies proposed buildings in BAL-FZ which means “direct exposure to flames from the fire front in addition to heat flux and ember attack” (AS3959). In a ‘no notice’ bushfire event “radiant heat levels and flame contact are likely to significantly threaten building integrity and result in significant risk to residents who are unlikely to be adequately protected.” A redesign of the proposed development to increase setback between bushfire hazard and habitable buildings should be undertaken. Development plans should be updated to ensure consistency between all plans.</p> </td> <td data-bbox="1227 456 1451 1362">Modification to the BMP is required.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Element	Assessment	Action	Location	<p>A1.1 – not demonstrated</p> <p>The BAL ratings cannot be validated, as the vegetation classification inputs require modification as per the above table.</p> <p>There are areas of the site exposed to BAL-40/BAL-FZ which represents an extreme risk which does not comply with A1.1.</p> <p>Specifically, the BAL Contour Map identifies proposed buildings in BAL-FZ which means “direct exposure to flames from the fire front in addition to heat flux and ember attack” (AS3959). In a ‘no notice’ bushfire event “radiant heat levels and flame contact are likely to significantly threaten building integrity and result in significant risk to residents who are unlikely to be adequately protected.” A redesign of the proposed development to increase setback between bushfire hazard and habitable buildings should be undertaken. Development plans should be updated to ensure consistency between all plans.</p>	Modification to the BMP is required.		
Element	Assessment	Action								
Location	<p>A1.1 – not demonstrated</p> <p>The BAL ratings cannot be validated, as the vegetation classification inputs require modification as per the above table.</p> <p>There are areas of the site exposed to BAL-40/BAL-FZ which represents an extreme risk which does not comply with A1.1.</p> <p>Specifically, the BAL Contour Map identifies proposed buildings in BAL-FZ which means “direct exposure to flames from the fire front in addition to heat flux and ember attack” (AS3959). In a ‘no notice’ bushfire event “radiant heat levels and flame contact are likely to significantly threaten building integrity and result in significant risk to residents who are unlikely to be adequately protected.” A redesign of the proposed development to increase setback between bushfire hazard and habitable buildings should be undertaken. Development plans should be updated to ensure consistency between all plans.</p>	Modification to the BMP is required.								

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

PA23/177 - L59, L60 and L61 Briggs Road and Lot 62 Thomas Road, Byford – JDAP - Grouped Dwelling (Lifestyle Community)

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Applicant Response	Officer Comment		
		<p>Siting and Design</p>	<p>A2.1 - not demonstrated</p> <p>It is noted that the BMP at section 5.1 seeks to exempt the community infrastructure from a requirement to be in BAL-29 or below as it is considered ancillary to the proposed development. DFES does not agree with this statement; all habitable buildings should be located in areas of BAL-29 or lower and the community infrastructure proposed is considered to be an integral part of the development proposal. There do not appear to be any site constraints that prevent this from being achieved. Siting and design should respond to hazards on and around the site to ensure bushfire protection measures can be achieved and to minimise the level of bushfire impact to people that are considered vulnerable.</p>	<p>Modification to the BMP is required.</p>		
		<p>Vehicular Access</p>	<p>A3.2a - not demonstrated</p> <p>Information provided within the transport assessment indicates that future access arrangements will be modified so that access to the site from Briggs Road will be limited to left in / left out and further right turns towards / away from the site will be limited along Thomas Road and Indigo Parkway, effectively creating a no through road.</p>	<p>Decision maker to be satisfied that compliance with A3.2a can be achieved.</p>		

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

PA23/177 - L59, L60 and L61 Briggs Road and Lot 62 Thomas Road, Byford – JDAP - Grouped Dwelling (Lifestyle Community)

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Applicant Response	Officer Comment		
			<p>This is not discussed within the BMP and timeframes associated with the modifications are not defined but believed to be reliant on development in the surrounding area.</p> <p>The Decision Maker should be satisfied that compliance with A3.2a can be satisfied at all stages of development on the site and in the area, noting that if a no through road travels through an area of BAL-LOW or a residential built out area, then compliance is considered to be achieved as per the Guidelines.</p>			
		Vehicular Access	<p>A3.2b – not demonstrated</p> <p>The Acceptable Solution provides for Emergency Access Ways (EAWs) to be used where it is demonstrated that A3.2a cannot be achieved. In this case, there appears to be no reason why an EAW is proposed in lieu of an alternative road access.</p> <p>The BMP should consider incorporating a second public road intersection, or provide justification for why not.</p>	Modifications to the BMP is required.		
		Vehicular Access	<p>A3.3 / A3.4a – not demonstrated</p> <p>It is noted that the proposal is for a grouped dwelling, however it is</p>	Modifications to the BMP is required.		

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

PA23/177 - L59, L60 and L61 Briggs Road and Lot 62 Thomas Road, Byford – JDAP - Grouped Dwelling (Lifestyle Community)

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Applicant Response	Officer Comment
		<p>considered that it effectively contemplates a subdivision.</p> <p>For the purposes of assessment against SPP 3.7, it is considered that the internal network should be assessed as a public road and that no through roads should be avoided. In particular, it is noted that the central east-west orientated avenue extends from the entrance to the east and it is only at this point that access is provided for the northern section of the site. An alternative connection should be provided for the northern section either looping back to the central avenue or to Briggs Road.</p>		
		<p>Water</p> <p>A4.2 – comment only</p> <p>It is noted that compliance with requirements of SPP 3.7 appears to be achievable.</p> <p>It should be noted that additional provision may be needed for addressing structural fire response needs, including confirmation of hydrant layout and availability. The proponent should engage with DFES' Built Environment Branch to understand future requirements.</p>	<p>Comment Only</p>	
		<p>3. Policy Measure 6.6.2 Vulnerable and High-Risk land uses in areas where BAL-40 or BAL-FZ applies</p>		

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

PA23/177 - L59, L60 and L61 Briggs Road and Lot 62 Thomas Road, Byford – JDAP - Grouped Dwelling (Lifestyle Community)

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Applicant Response	Officer Comment									
		<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 25%;">Issue</th> <th style="width: 45%;">Assessment</th> <th style="width: 30%;">Action</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Extreme bushfire hazard and/or BAL-40/BAL-FZ applies</td> <td> <p>Subdivision and development applications for vulnerable or high-risk land uses in areas of BAL-40/BAL-FZ will not be supported unless they comply with policy measure 6.7, clause 6.7.1 / 6.7.2 of SPP3.7.</p> <p>The proposal is not considered to meet the definition of minor or unavoidable development as the development is of a large scale with 202 dwellings and is introducing vulnerable people to a bushfire prone area. DFES believes that redesign would enable compliance with the guidelines.</p> <p>DFES recommends that the decision maker require a redesign to avoid the exposure of habitable buildings on the site to BAL-40/BAL-FZ.</p> </td> <td>Modification of the BMP is required</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Bushfire Emergency Evacuation Plan (BEEP)</td> <td>The referral has not included a 'Bushfire Emergency Evacuation Plan'. The decision maker has confirmed this to be a vulnerable use and therefore consideration should be given to the Guidelines Section 5.5.4 'Developing a Bushfire Emergency Evacuation Plan'. This contains detail regarding what should be included in a BEEP and will ensure the appropriate content</td> <td>Comment Only</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Issue	Assessment	Action	Extreme bushfire hazard and/or BAL-40/BAL-FZ applies	<p>Subdivision and development applications for vulnerable or high-risk land uses in areas of BAL-40/BAL-FZ will not be supported unless they comply with policy measure 6.7, clause 6.7.1 / 6.7.2 of SPP3.7.</p> <p>The proposal is not considered to meet the definition of minor or unavoidable development as the development is of a large scale with 202 dwellings and is introducing vulnerable people to a bushfire prone area. DFES believes that redesign would enable compliance with the guidelines.</p> <p>DFES recommends that the decision maker require a redesign to avoid the exposure of habitable buildings on the site to BAL-40/BAL-FZ.</p>	Modification of the BMP is required	Bushfire Emergency Evacuation Plan (BEEP)	The referral has not included a 'Bushfire Emergency Evacuation Plan'. The decision maker has confirmed this to be a vulnerable use and therefore consideration should be given to the Guidelines Section 5.5.4 'Developing a Bushfire Emergency Evacuation Plan'. This contains detail regarding what should be included in a BEEP and will ensure the appropriate content	Comment Only		
Issue	Assessment	Action											
Extreme bushfire hazard and/or BAL-40/BAL-FZ applies	<p>Subdivision and development applications for vulnerable or high-risk land uses in areas of BAL-40/BAL-FZ will not be supported unless they comply with policy measure 6.7, clause 6.7.1 / 6.7.2 of SPP3.7.</p> <p>The proposal is not considered to meet the definition of minor or unavoidable development as the development is of a large scale with 202 dwellings and is introducing vulnerable people to a bushfire prone area. DFES believes that redesign would enable compliance with the guidelines.</p> <p>DFES recommends that the decision maker require a redesign to avoid the exposure of habitable buildings on the site to BAL-40/BAL-FZ.</p>	Modification of the BMP is required											
Bushfire Emergency Evacuation Plan (BEEP)	The referral has not included a 'Bushfire Emergency Evacuation Plan'. The decision maker has confirmed this to be a vulnerable use and therefore consideration should be given to the Guidelines Section 5.5.4 'Developing a Bushfire Emergency Evacuation Plan'. This contains detail regarding what should be included in a BEEP and will ensure the appropriate content	Comment Only											

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

PA23/177 - L59, L60 and L61 Briggs Road and Lot 62 Thomas Road, Byford – JDAP - Grouped Dwelling (Lifestyle Community)

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Applicant Response	Officer Comment
		<p>is detailed when finalising the BEEP to the satisfaction of the Shire.</p> <p><u>Recommendation – Compliance with Acceptable Solutions not demonstrated – modifications required</u></p> <p>It is critical the bushfire management measures within the BMP are refined, to ensure they are accurate and can be implemented to reduce the vulnerability of the development to bushfire. Development plans and associated supporting documents should be updated to reflect required modifications.</p> <p>1. The Development Application has not demonstrated compliance to:</p> <p>Element 1: Location, Element 2: Siting and Design, Element 3: Vehicular Access, and Element 4: Water.</p> <p>As this planning decision is to be made by a Joint Development Assessment Panel (JDAP) please forward notification of the decision to DFES for our records.</p>		
A398231	4	<p>This letter is written in comment to the Proposed Grouped Dwelling Development (lifestyle Village).</p> <p>As the owner of property on Larsen Road Byford, I wish to comment that I am not in favour of the proposal.</p> <p>The proposal is too much for the area considering that it backs onto an area within very close vicinity to our property and is affecting the rural style of living that we have here.</p> <p>The proposal hence creates an overall planning layout of proposed new small blocks directly behind our larger Rural living A lots and is not a good design as these properties are quite large and have sheds, animals, etc already established on them and so having small properties and grouped</p>	<p>The subject site is zoned Urban under the Metropolitan Region Scheme and Urban Development under the Shire's Local Planning Scheme No. 2, requiring the establishment of a structure plan to facilitate urban development.</p>	<p>Thank you for your submission. Your concerns have been addressed within the Local Structure Plan and Form of Development and Amenity sections of the Council report.</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

PA23/177 - L59, L60 and L61 Briggs Road and Lot 62 Thomas Road, Byford – JDAP - Grouped Dwelling (Lifestyle Community)

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Applicant Response	Officer Comment
		<p>dwelling directly behind and in close vicinity next to these existing properties will create trouble and privacy issues for these properties.</p> <p>It should be proposed that another row of larger rural blocks can back onto the existing Rural Living A blocks and then have the access road in front of them and move the proposed grouped dwellings site into another area of Byford where there are no rural living larger blocks. This will create good privacy and a rural environment for both the existing and new proposed lots. This needs to be addressed as this proposal and overall structure plan will create a lot of problems for these larger blocks, that are already existing, and to maintain the existing privacy of these larger blocks with the higher density living, the proposed grouped dwellings in this location is not supported.</p> <p>This proposal will adversely affect these existing properties, which should not be allowed considering that these properties have been established in place for many years already and the new proposed plan needs to provide minimal disruption and changes to these existing properties.</p> <p>If you require any further information or comment relating to this comment please feel free to contact me.</p> <p>I trust that these comments will be taken into consideration and not dismissed as it should be the right of us to make comment and changes made accordingly if required.</p>	<p>Local Structure Plan <i>Lots 61 and 62 Thomas Road and Lots 59 and 60 Briggs Road, Byford Local Structure Plan</i> has been prepared and approved for the subject site and allocates a residential density of R20 under the R-Codes Vol. 1. The proposed development has been designed in accordance with this residential density.</p> <p>Therefore, having regard to the above, the planning for the subject site to accommodate residential development of this nature is well established and is entirely in keeping with the broader structure planning for the urbanisation of the Byford locality more broadly.</p> <p>It is also noted that the lot directly adjacent to the west of the subject site (Lot 9504 Briggs Road) is currently the subject of a</p>	

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

PA23/177 - L59, L60 and L61 Briggs Road and Lot 62 Thomas Road, Byford – JDAP - Grouped Dwelling (Lifestyle Community)

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Applicant Response	Officer Comment
			JDAP approval for a neighbourhood shopping centre and residential development. Within 55m to the east of the site is a residential estate that consists of a single residential housing typology. To the south, the site abuts rural residential land, noting that much of this land is subject to structure planning that will result in greater housing density, consistent with the proposal.	
A398407	5	<p>This letter is written in comment to the Proposed Grouped Dwelling Development (lifestyle Village).</p> <p>As the owners of property on Larsen Road Byford, I wish to comment that I am not in favour of the proposal.</p> <p>The proposal is too much for the area considering that it backs onto an area within very close vicinity to our property and is affecting the rural style of living that we have here.</p> <p>The proposal hence creates an overall planning layout of proposed new small blocks directly behind our larger Rural living A lots and is not a good design as these properties are quite large and have sheds, animals, etc already established on them and so having small properties and grouped</p>	Refer to comments above.	Thank you for your submission. Your concerns have been addressed within the Local Structure Plan and Form of Development and Amenity sections of the Council report.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

PA23/177 - L59, L60 and L61 Briggs Road and Lot 62 Thomas Road, Byford – JDAP - Grouped Dwelling (Lifestyle Community)

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Applicant Response	Officer Comment
		<p>dwelling directly behind and in close vicinity next to these existing properties will create trouble and privacy issues for these properties.</p> <p>It should be proposed that another row of larger rural blocks can back onto the existing Rural Living A blocks and then have the access road in front of them and move the proposed grouped dwellings site into another area of Byford where there are no rural living larger blocks. This will create good privacy and a rural environment for both the existing and new proposed lots. This needs to be addressed as this proposal and overall structure plan will create a lot of problems for these larger blocks, that are already existing, and to maintain the existing privacy of these larger blocks with the higher density living, the proposed grouped dwellings in this location is not supported.</p> <p>This proposal will adversely affect these existing properties, which should not be allowed considering that these properties have been established in place for many years already and the new proposed plan needs to provide minimal disruption and changes to these existing properties.</p> <p>If you require any further information or comment relating to this comment please feel free to contact me.</p> <p>I trust that these comments will be taken into consideration and not dismissed as it should be the right of us to make comment and changes made accordingly if required.</p>		
A398230	6	<p>We bought this property / land 7 years ago as it was a quiet and almost rural area.</p> <p>The proposed plan will increase noise, traffic and population.</p> <p>As a family we strongly object to the proposed plan.</p>	Refer to comments above.	Thank you for your submission. The concerns raised regarding amenity, traffic and density have been considered within the relevant sections of the report.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS**PA23/177 - L59, L60 and L61 Briggs Road and Lot 62 Thomas Road, Byford – JDAP - Grouped Dwelling (Lifestyle Community)**

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Applicant Response	Officer Comment
A401003	7	I am in favour of this development as it would be an asset to the area. Also something I may need in the future being a senior citizen.	Noted.	Thank you for your submission.
A400550	8	We confirm we have no objection to the lifestyle village complex as proposed by Edenlife Communities. Look forward to the village proposal being approved. The design and layout appears to be well designed for the area – Corner Briggs Road and Thomas Road.	Noted.	Thank you for your submission.