| 9 | Submitter | No | Submitter Comments | Officer Comment | Officer |
|---|-----------|----|--------------------|-----------------|----------------|
| | | | | | Recommendation |

| The Department of Biodiversity Conservation and Attractions | 1. | The Department of Biodiversity Conservation and Attractions - Swan Region Office has no comments on the proposal. | Officers note that a submission focused on the District Structure Plan was also received from the Department. | No modifications recommended. |
|--|----|--|---|-------------------------------|
| Department of Fire and Emergency Services IN20/10637 | 2. | Given the proposals seek to fund the purchase and development of land for road widening and related infrastructure including two rail crossings, to improve areas of open space limited to earthworks, grassing including playing field creation and irrigation, fund water monitoring programmes, and for miscellaneous administrative costs per your correspondence, which may not be considered an intensification of land use, the application of State of Planning Policy 3.7 Planning in Bushfire Prone Areas (SPP 3.7) may not be required, in this instance. | The submission has been considered and the contents noted. | No modifications recommended. |
| | | Please note that the application of SPP 3.7 is ultimately at the discretion of the decision maker. | | |
| | | Thank you for providing us with the opportunity to make a submission, DFES has no further comments. | | |

| Submitter | N | No | Submitter Comments | Officer Comment | Officer Recommendation |
|--|----|------------------------------|---|---|---------------------------|
| Department of Water and Environmental Regulation IN20/10812 | 3. | We Wa not In asp | ank you for providing the Scheme Amendment No. 209 – Mundijong Urban and est Mundijong Industrial Development Contribution Plan for the Department of ater and Environmental Regulation (Department) to consider. The Department does to object to the proposal and has no comments. The event there are modifications to the proposal that may have implications or pects of environment and/or water management, the Department should be notified enable the implications to be assessed. | been considered and the contents noted. | racommandad |
| Department of Transport IN20/10764 | 4. | Th | efer to your letter dated 20 May 2020 regarding the above Scheme amendment. Department of Transport has no comment to provide for the proposal. ank you for the opportunity to comment on the application. | The submission has been considered and the contents noted. | rocommondod |
| Department of Planning, Lands & Heritage (Heritage) IN20/10916 | 5. | | e proposed scheme amendment has been considered for its potential impact ritage places within the Scheme area and it raises no concerns. | on The submission has been considered and the contents noted. | racommandad |
| Department of Primary Industries and Regional Development | 6. | Mu The | ank you for the opportunity to comment on the Mundijong Urban and Woundijong Industrial Development Contribution Plans. e Department of Primary Industries and Regional Development (DPIRD) does not be the Mundijong Urban and West Mundijong Industrial Development | been considered and the contents noted. | recommended |

| Submitter | N | o | Submitter Comments | Officer Comment | Officer Recommendation |
|---|----|-------------------------------------|--|---|---------------------------|
| IN20/10812 | | | ontribution Plans as these updates align with the Shire's draft Local Plann rategy. | ing | |
| Department of Mines, Industry Regulation and Safety Resource and Environmental Regulation IN20/12785 | 7. | tha | e Department of Mines, Industry Regulation and Safety (DMIRS) has determined this proposal raises no significant issues with respect to mineral and petroled sources, geothermal energy, and basic raw materials. | | l recommended |
| Environmental Protection Authority IN20/15666 | 8. | (EF Aftd pro En any Ple • F sch req | ank you for referring the above scheme to the Environmental Protection Author PA). ter consideration of the information provided by you, the EPA considers that to posed scheme should not be assessed under Part IV Division 3 of the posed scheme should not be assessed under Part IV Division 3 of the posed scheme at 1986 (EP Act) and that it is not necessary to prove y advice or recommendations. For the purposes of Part IV of the EP Act, the scheme is defined as an assess theme. In relation to the implementation of the scheme, please note the quirements of Part IV Division 4 of the EP Act. There is no appeal right in respect of the EPA's decision to not assess the scheme. | been considered an the contents noted. Officers note that the Environmental Protection Authority provided the Shire with a copy of their decision not to assess these two amendments the was published on Enbruary 2019. | recommended. e y h n e at |

| Submitter | No | Submitter Comments | Officer Comment | Officer Recommendation |
|------------------------------------|--|---|--|---|
| Water Corporation IN20/17281 | M or se th op M re Th dr ac of ali In M | the changes and additional detail to the Mundijong DSP with respect to the Wellundijong area are noted. The DCP provisions do not appear to impact directly or require changes to the Water Corporation's long term planning for water everage and drainage for the Byford area. However, the industrial area footprint let far northern end adjacent to Bishop Road intersects with a Water Corporation of drain (Oaklands Branch Drain 'F'). Oaklands 'F' forms part of the broad lundijong Rural Drainage District. The open drain is located within a 10m will eserve (Lot 1), which is owned by/vested with the Water Corporation. The West Mundijong DSP and the DCP should include a note that this section rain and its hydraulic (flooding) requirements will need to be adequate to commodated in its current location and form, or provision made for the develope if the area to investigate the feasibility of relocating the drain to an alternation ignment acceptable to the Water Corporation. The this regard, the DWMS and any subsequent, more detailed Local Water and the provision of the develope for this area will need to determine the hydraulic levels are drain, overland flow requirements, finished site fill levels, and any additional lateration to be set aside in the area to accommodate flooding. | been considered and the contents noted. The portion of the submission that pertains to the Mundijong District structure plan is addressed in that Schedule of submissions. The West Mundijong DCP should include a note that this section of drain and its hydraulic (flooding) | Recommend text be added to the West Mundijong Industrial DCP to include a note that the Water Corporation open drain "Oaklands Branch Drain F" will need to be adequately accommodated in its current location and form, and that no provision has been made within the DCP relating to investigation or the feasibility of relocating the drain to an alternative alignment. |

| Submitter | No | Submitter Comments | Officer Comment | Officer Recommendation |
|--------------------------|-----|---|---|---|
| | | | acceptable to the Water Corporation. | |
| Main roads IN20/18799 | 10. | 3. Page 12 of the of the Mundijong Traditional Infrastructure Development Contribution Plan (DCP6) document states The following items are not included in the DCP for Bishop Road: "Any intersection treatment with Tonkin Highway. Tonkin Highway is a Primary Regional Road under the MRS and is a responsibility of Main Roads". This statement should be amended as follows: "Any intersection treatment with Tonkin Highway. Tonkin Highway is a Primary Regional Road under the MRS and is a responsibility of Main Roads" Justification for the Amendment to text The comment previously provided above (Item 3) regarding the Byford DCP exclusions applies. | The Shire agrees that it is not always the case that MRWA funds intersection upgrades to state roads and recommends the clause be reworded as suggested. The Shire notes that in this instance, since the section of Tonkin joining Bishop Road is a new construction of Tonkin, that MRWA will be responsible for | MRWA Roads - That the text within the Mundijong Whitby DCP and Amendment for Bishop Road be changed to read: "The following items have not been included in the Mundijong Whitby Urban Traditional Infrastructure Development |

| Submitter | No | Submitter Comments | Officer Comment | Officer Recommendation |
|------------------------------------|-----|---|--|---|
| | | | funding this particula intersection. | r for Bishop Road - Intersection treatment with Tonkin Highway." |
| Department of Education IN20/19362 | 11. | The Department acknowledges that the DCP will help fund the Shire's share of works associated with Public/District Open Spaces that are to be co-located with future public schools. As discussed above, the Department is concerned that there is an insufficient provision of public primary schools within the DSP. The requirement for additional school sites may alter the size and location of the identified Public/District Open Spaces. As such, it is considered necessary that a formal determination on the DCP is not made until the Shire and the Department have agreed upon the final number and provisional locations of future public school sites within the DSP. | The submission has been considered and the contents noted. 1. Officers acknowledge that the current residential densities are higher than anticipated when the original Mundijons District Structure Plan was approved in 2010 Perth & Peel @3.5 million requires a significant increase in population requiring a reassessment of the number of schools. 2. Officers acknowledge the new State Operation Policy | recommended. |

| Submitter | No | Submitter Comments | Officer Comment | Officer Recommendation |
|---|-----|--|--|---------------------------|
| | | | 3.4 and have submitted a response to the Department of Planning, Lands & Heritage in this regard. From a DCF perspective, SPP 3.6 provides for major amendments to introduce or amendincluded infrastructure. Any additional requirement for POS/DOS which falls within DCA2 or DCA3 within the gazetted lifespan of the DCPs can be addressed through this process in the future. | |
| Department of Water and Environmental Protection | 12. | The Department of Water and Environmental Regulation (Department) supports the development of the district structure plan and scheme amendment as an important overarching planning document that guides future planning and development within the subject area. It is noted there may be challenges securing non potable supply for irrigation within | Officers note that the comments provided by the Department were focused primarily or the District Structure | recommended. |

| Submitter | N | 0 | Submitter Comments | Officer Comment | Officer Recommendation |
|---------------------------------------|-----|-------------------------------------|--|--|---|
| IN20/19555 | | un At | e structure plan area in the future due to reducing groundwater allocations and favourable conditions for abstraction. ttachment 1 contains the Department's comments for your consideration, and me recommendations upon addressing issues pertaining to non-potable supply. | Plan with specific reference to the Integrated Water Management Strategy and the District Water Management Strategy. These matters are addressed in the Schedule of Submissions for this document. | |
| Business | | ı | | | |
| Burgess Design Group IN20/16606 | 13. | AN (20 On (#4 on Urb | JBMISSION ON DRAFT MUNDIJONG DISTRICT STRUCTURE PLAN (20: ID DRAFT MUNDIJONG URBAN DEVELOPMENT CONTRIBUTION PL. (20: 1) - LOT 30 SOLDIERS ROAD, CARDUP To behalf of Land Group WA – Cardup Pty Ltd, the registered landowner of Lot (496) Soldiers Road, Cardup (Image 1), we are pleased to make this submiss the draft Mundijong District Structure Plan (2018) (DSP) and draft Mundijo ban Development Contribution Plan (2020) (DCP). This submission is support advice from Transcore, expert transport planning, traffic engineering and transpodelling specialists (see attached). | the contents noted. As the matters raised in principally around Norman road but have implications for the | - Recommend road classifications in the West Mundijong Industrial DCP, Mundijong Whitby DCP and the Amendment, align with those used in Liveable Neighbourhoods, as |

Amendment to Town Planning Scheme No. 2 – Scheme Amendments No 209 Mundijong Whitby Urban Traditional Infrastructure Development Contribution Plan / PA18/780 Responsible Business Unit: Strategic Planning Advertising Date: 21 May to 31 August 2020

| Submitter | No | Submitter Comments | Officer Comment | Officer |
|-----------|----|--------------------|-----------------|----------------|
| | | | | Recommendation |



Image 1: Land Ownership

DISTRICT STRUCTURE PLAN

The draft DSP identifies the land as 'Development Investigation Area 2' (DIA2), for which it specifies the following objectives:

The purpose and intent of DIA2 is to explore the potential for urban expansion with consideration for innovative housing opportunities. A structure plan will be required which addresses the following matters:

• Investigate opportunities for innovative housing typologies that have consideration for best practice sustainability; • Exemplar resource and energy efficiency; • Water minimisation; • Alternate construct methods. • Investigate current zoning and land uses; • Manage the transition of land uses most specifically to the north; • Better utilize available land; • Deliver innovative land use and housing diversity and choice; • Reduce the need for people to travel by car; • Identify infrastructure requirements;

Officers note that this submission is opposed to the extension of Norman road. Officers do not support the statements made in the submission.

Officers agree that terminology used for road classifications should be consistent with Liveable Neighbourhoods.

The Subregional Framework provides a spatial movement network emphasising the word indicative in spatially depicting the layout. It also provides for:

"Byford—Cardup— Mundijong network Additional linkages will be provided between submission at the end of this document.

| Submitter | No | Submitter Comments | Officer Comment | Officer Recommendation |
|-----------|---|---|---|---------------------------|
| | with new reg Sh No cor Mo pro cor a p Ro DE The for Re ext Ro noi rail SU • S the | pervicing requirements; • Visual/landscape protection; • Bushfire hazard; • Interfact the Bishop Road, Soldiers Road, the future extension of Tonkin Highway and the Bishop Road (Doley and Norman road extensions) required by the sugional framework; and • Any other requirements that may be determined by the irre of Serpentine Jarrahdale or State government agencies. Interpolation of a large urban are overnment of a large urban are overnmented to a planned transit node and district centre, with a high frequency transcribed repolation and eastern boundary. Additionally, the site is bisected planned district distributor linking Norman Road to a planned extension of Dol and along its western boundary. Interpolation of Serpentine Jarrahdale or Serpentine Agency of the Serpentine Jarrahdale or Serpentine Jarrahdale | proposed in the existing Byford and Mundijong district structure plans and will include extension of Doley Road and realignment of the southern portion of Malarkey Road. Some refinement of eastwest connections may be appropriate, including westward extension of Norman Road to connect to Bishop Road." The extension of Norman Road to connect to Bishop Road." The extension of Norman Road is the logical edge to the planning of Mundijong. It provides for an interface between the urban area and the amenity of the larger | |

| Submitter | No | Submitter Comments | Officer Comment | Officer Recommendation |
|-----------|--|--|--|---------------------------|
| | 'RE The Fra pro gel Re So we It is it d Fir: Thi jus out do as con pla con Thi con | JBMISSION 2: REFERENCE OF THE EXTENSION OF NORMAN ROAD AS EQUIREMENT' OF THE SUB-REGIONAL FRAMEWORK (DSP) The DSP makes reference to a purported 'requirement' of the Sub-regional amework to extend Norman Road in its criteria for considering developments of the site and to justify the inclusion of the extension in the DSP memorally. The sub-regional Framework (on page 46) states: The refinement of east-west connections may be appropriate, including the extension of Norman Road to connect to Bishop Road is important to consider this statement more critically, particularly to the extent the does not amount to a requirement. The rest, it identifies 'some refinement of east-west connections may be appropriate in sis is distinct from a requirement, and places a clear burden on a proponent stiffy the need and efficacy of such a proposal as it does not presuppose to the one of the subject site for future urban uses does not permit in a so in an effective and efficient manner – it needs to serve a good purpose. Justin the identification of the subject site for future urban uses does not permit in instruction of dwellings as-of-right without full and proper assessment under the anning framework, so to must changes to the district road network be given consideration. The identification of Norman Road does not make the extension a foregon neclusion. Rather, it identifies it as one of the possible refinements that 'may' insidered. It does not erase the need for due consideration on its individual memoral propers. | at the intersection with Soldiers road where the school is. It is further noted that there is no need to grade-separate the crossing of Norman road until the Metrone passenger rail is extended to Mundijong. The above rationale is also supported by the recently adopted Serpentine Jarrahdale Local Planning Strategy currently being assessed by the Western Australian Planning Commission. Officers confirm that Norman road is not planning as a DCE | |

| Submitter | No | Submitter Comments | Officer Comment | Officer Recommendation |
|-----------|---|---|--|---------------------------|
| Submitter | As corroug doe eas be Thin no • Street SU RE The Street Sol pro spee Ro doe the the | a major strategic planning instrument for which submissions were unsideration for a period of three years, the content of the Sub-regional Framew ght to be considered as deliberate. In this instance, the Sub-regional Framew es not 'require' the extension of Norman Road, nor does it conclude an additionst-west link is even necessary or desirable. It does identify such an extension 'mappropriate', providing for the consideration of such a linkage where justifiat is is an important position to establish because, as detailed in proceeding section substantive justification has been provided for these changes. Submission 2: Reference to the extension of Norman Road as a 'requirement explanation of the extension of Norman Road as a 'requirement explanation of the extension of Norman Road as a 'requirement explanation of the extension of Norman Road between Soldiers Road and Domet as a 'district distributor' and a down-grading of Bishop Road in the satiation. This conflicts with the road network depicted on the Sub-region amework, which shows Bishop Road as an Integrator Arterial connecting idliers Road. It is noted, as discussed above, the Sub-regional Framework of the consideration of the refinement of east-west linkages. However, ecific consideration or justification regarding changes to Norman Road or Bish and has been provided within either the DSP or DCP, or their respective support cuments for that matter. In the absence of any substantive justification to suppless changes, we believe significant concerns need to be addressed. • Material extension does not appear to achieve any notable end. As it currently existences in the supplement of the provided within extension of the provided end. As it currently existences in the provided within extension of the provided end. As it currently existences in the provided within extension of the provided end. As it currently existences in the provided within extension of the provided end. As it currently existences in the provided end. | der ork and Nexus with the planned DCA3, at this time. The extension of Doley Road is covered under Amendment 208 (Byford Traditional DCP). JB- ley me nal to ork no nop ing bort Illy, sts, | Recommendation |
| | aco | est-bound traffic along Norman Road travels south along Soldiers Road to the cess Bishop Road. Under the proposed change, traffic from the Norman Rottension could also travel south along the Doley Road extension to access Bish | pad | |

| Submitter | No | Submitter Comments | Officer Comment | Officer |
|-----------|--|--|---|----------------|
| | | | | Recommendation |
| | • | • | | |
| | diff do Ad to 'Mu cro Ro col No sig roa Ro site exi | pad (noting traffic could still optionally use Soldiers Road). This is, in effect, ferent to the existing situation and therefore offers no improvement – in factories little more than duplicate it, thus resulting in an inefficient use of infrastructural device received from Transcore (attached) affirms this position. It does not apposerve any good purpose, and it is unclear why it is shown. The DSP figure till undijong Proposed Roads and Freight Network' depicts a grade separated sessing will ultimately be constructed over the road near the intersection of Normand and Soldiers Road. This will, presumably, require the intersection annecting roads to be elevated by a number of meters. A westward extension orman Road through the site would therefore need to be elevated and gonificantly impact residential amenity and road safety, particularly for vulnerated users such as pedestrians and cyclists. As such, the elevation of the Normand extension will only serve to exacerbate its impact as a barrier, severing e, and adding significant costs that will impact housing affordability. Retaining isting 'T' intersection at Norman Road and Soldiers Road would alleviate this issue. | t, it ure. ear eled ted nan and of will ble nan the the | |
| | Bis Dis ap Bis tur on inc do col Bis len | In definition of the minimise its impacts on future residential uses. • The removal of a portion shop Road (between the Doley Road extension and Soldiers Road) as a 'Distantibutor' on the DSP Map conflicts with the Sub-regional Framework and does to reflect logical transport behaviour. Namely, downgrading a portion shop Road appears to artificially dictate traffic movements, introducing additions and more indirect routes to major attractors with associated negative impart legibility, when the logical route would be to continue along Bishop Road dicated in the Subregional Framework. It is also noted the DSP Map indicates own-graded portion will still be a 'high frequency transit corridor'. This is furting the shop Road will in fact retain a uniform classification of 'local distributor' for its entire that indicating its function will not actually change as shown on the DSP Mais is compounded by the fact Bishop Road will connect directly to the Tor | rict not not of nal ncts as the her ate tire ap. | |

| Submitter | No | Submitter Comments | Officer Comment | Officer |
|-----------|-----------------------|---|--------------------|----------------|
| | | | | Recommendation |
| | | | | |
| | | ghway extension, undermining its function as the primary east-west connector, a inging into question the accuracy and legitimacy of the changes proposed in SP. | | |
| | an exp be | e believe the changes proposed to the road network are illogical and ineffect of no supporting technical information or commentary has been provided to plains the objectives behind these changes. As such, we ask that the DSP Note modified to remove the Norman Road extension and reinstate Bishop Road astributor. | hat lap | |
| | Bis | Submission 3: The extension of Norman Road and associated down-grading shop Road should be reversed because it is illogical, ineffective and no support formation has been provided to justify this change. | | |
| | | JBMISSION 4: NORMAN ROAD EXTENSION PROVIDES AN INEFFICIE JPLICATION OF INFRASTRUCTURE (DSP) | NT | |
| | alroson est fac | the extension of Norman Road indicated on the DSP Map duplicates a treatment of the provided and costed for Bishop Road, which is located approximately 40 to the uth. This is an inefficient use of infrastructure for which no need has be tablished and a waste of capital that would be better invested in communicilities. Rather, supporting information prepared for the DSP indicates the rectwork will function satisfactorily without it. | Om een nity | |
| | she she mi | reable Neighbourhoods (2009) and draft Liveable Neighbourhoods (2015) sort of prescribing a standardised spacing of arterial/distributor streets. However ould be noted that both depict a typical urban residential structure based on nimum 800m x 800m cell; that is, bounding arterial roads spaced at least 80m one another. In our experience, this structure generally provides for an effective | r, it n a 0m | |

| Submitter | No | Submitter Comments | Officer Comment | Officer |
|-----------|--|--|--|----------------|
| | | | | Recommendation |
| | | | .1 | |
| | str | ovement network and the delivery of residential cells with an appropriate inter- ucture (e.g. not bisected by major roads and sufficient for the efficient delivery pan uses). | | |
| | pro cla as No Th sei pos | is highly irregular and inefficient to duplicate high order roads within such classified roads in the DSP are spaced in excess of 800m (most in excess of 1k would be expected. The TIA prepared in support of the DSP also shows orman Road extension is not necessary to the proper function of the road networks roads spaced at 800m or more are similarly shown to be sufficient. This rives to demonstrate the extension of Norman Road occupies an anomale sition, is wasteful, and does not contribute to the efficient or effective delivery velopment. | arly m), the ork. all ous | |
| | ine | Submission 4: The extension of Norman Road should be removed because it is efficient use of resources (noting it effectively duplicates Bishop Road) and is eded for the proper function of the road network. | | |
| | | SUBMISSION 5: IMPACTS OF THE EXTENSION OF NORMAN ROAD MENITY AND EFFICIENT USE OF URBAN LAND (DSP) | ON | |
| | No Loc [cc obj res is i | onsideration must be given the broader impacts of the proposed extension orman Road. The Shire has foreshadowed its position in this regard within its discal Planning Strategy (2019) that the 'extension of Norman Road through the sould serve] as a potential boundary to the urban expansion'. Though no specific was identified, we infer this aims to protect the amenity of existing residential uses adjacently north of the site by imposing a hard boundary. We fee important to reiterate the following points that were set out in our submission of Strategy dated 18 December 2019: | raft site cific ural el it | |

| Submitter | No | Submitter Comments | Officer Comment | Officer Recommendation |
|-----------|--|--|--|---------------------------|
| | pre the ac | uch an arrangement would effectively sterilise half of the site for urban uses on emise that would provide the best possible outcome to maintain the character area. However, we believe an objectives-based approach is better suited thieve the Shire's goals. Ontextually, it is important to note that the site is identified for 'Urban Expansion | r of to | |
| | the for Arc registres the Strand protection of the calculations are the calculated as a second protection of the calculated are | e South Metropolitan Peel Sub Regional Planning Framework (2018), where the northern tip of a major urban area and abuts a 'State Planning Investigate ea', being the rural residential estate located directly north. These factors, a gional level, indicate a significant change in land use will occur in the area, be introduction of a major urban centre into what is currently a rural area. The Shir rategy is laudable in its intent of safeguarding the character of its existing a anned future rural precincts, and the objectives set out in much of the Strate ovide a strong framework to guide the design and consideration of proposals at regard. Furthermore, we agree that a change of this magnitude poses significallenges for the Shire, and due consideration is warranted to protect the so pital of its existing and future communities. However, the prescription of a spassponse does not provide scope to consider truly responsive solutions. | e it ion it a ing re's and egy s in ant cial | |
| | in bu is res | dditionally, we note the remainder of Development Investigation Area 2 (comprise excess of 50% of the Area) is not impacted by any significant land use interfallifers. As such, this position appears somewhat anomalous and arbitrary in the being applied inconsistently and without regard to actual site conditions; instead applied inconsistently and without regard to actual site conditions; instead appears to deficiencies being introduced by the DSP, when the cause of the ficiencies appears to serve no good purpose as detailed herein. | ace at it ead | |
| | wit | egard should also be given to the identification of the site as 'Urban Expansi thin the Subregional Framework, and particularly, how that is distinct from 'Urb vestigation' or 'Planning Investigation'. Investigation areas are typically subjec | oan | |

| Submitter | No | Submitter Comments | Officer Comment | Officer |
|-----------|---|---|--|----------------|
| | | | | Recommendation |
| | | | | |
| | cha rep not it is inn ong inn in v | unificant constraints and require further detailed planning to determine whether a large to current zonings is appropriate. Expansion areas, on the other has bresent a logical expansion of existing urban centres where suitability is general to a concern – they are, in effect, next in line for urban development. In this instant is also noted Development Investigation Area 2 is uniquely placed to deligovative housing models aimed at maximising sustainability in construction a going use, and affordability in delivery and operation. It should be noted the novations have not been imposed on the site, but rather spearheaded by our climbat will be an exemplar of a new housing model for Perth. Whilst | nd, ally ce, ver and ese ent | |
| | of t | derestimated, noting the Commonwealth Bank has reported nearby Byford as of the top 10 post-codes in the nation for being in arrears on mortgages. The delive sustainable, affordable housing is an aspiration we believe should be propensidered and championed within the DSP, not undermined. | ery | |
| | and pro cor urb sui spe inn pos | erilising half of the subject site conflicts with the overarching objectives of Ped Peel@3.5million (2018) and the Sub-regional Framework that together aim ovide for the efficient delivery of urban uses, noting the site is otherwise free enstraints and fit for purpose. Though there is no current shortage in the supply oan land in Mundijong, a long-term view must be taken to ensure land that itable is used appropriately to avoid urban encroachment in the future. Mecifically, it also significantly undermines the integrity and viability of deliver novative housing on the site by introducing constraints that appear to serve sitive purpose and have been presented with no justification (rather, they apple to presented with contradicting information as detailed elsewhere herein). | n to e of / of t is ore ing no | |

| Submitter | No | Submitter Comments | Officer Comment | Officer |
|-----------|--|---|---|----------------|
| | | | | Recommendation |
| | | | | |
| | pre | Submission 5: The extension of Norman Road should be removed because esents barriers to the successful implementation of future urban uses and livery of an exemplary and innovative housing model. | | |
| | | JBMISSION 6: INCONSISTENCIES IN DEPICTED FUNCTIONS OF THE RO ETWORK (DSP & DCP) | AD | |
| | Do loc | e DSP Map depicts an extension of Norman Road between Soldiers Road abley Street as a 'district distributor' and a down-grading of Bishop Road in the sacation. It is noted there are multiple conflicts within the DSP and DCP with regroad classifications that make the framework unclear. For example: | me | |
| | Disis used belong the control of the | Whilst the DSP Map does not show the relevant section of Bishop as a Dist stributor, it does show it as part of a contiguous 'high frequency transit corridor unclear how the actual function of the road, in terms of traffic volumes and transphaviours, will be controlled to divert movements away from the most logical road. continuing straight along the same road to reach the same destination cilitating movements to and from Tonkin Highway) and instead toward tension of Norman Road. The DSP figure titled 'Mundijong Proposed Roads are light Network' depicts Bishop Road as 'local distributor' along its entire length, the classifications used in this figure differ to those on the DSP Map, such the Map identifies the majority of Bishop Road as a 'district distributor' where the lacks this classification and instead designates 'local distributor'. This confuses actual role the roads will play in the movement hierarchy (for example, Solding and shares its classification under the DSP Map, but is shown as a higher or gional distributor' on the figure). It is also inconsistent in that it does not char | '. It bort ute on, the and yth. hat the ses ers | |

| Submitter | No | Submitter Comments | Officer Comment | Officer Recommendation |
|-----------|---|--|---|---------------------------|
| | fur not ext sup inte the and info app wit affi No (no cla ins (su Ne Str Th pla Bis | e classification of Bishop Road in the way the Map depicts. This suggests its act action will It change and therefore undermines both the purpose and legitimacy of tension of Norman Road. • The Transport Impact Assessment (2020) prepared pport the DSP notes the 'Soldiers Road/Norman Road' 'Doley Road/Norman Road' resections are considered sufficient to accommodate future growth. Howeverse are not shown in the 'Intersection Sufficiency Map' and no details of technicallysis is provided for either that would allow for any review or interrogation orm submissions on the merit of such a claim. Conversely, modelled traffic figure pear to demonstrate that the road network will function to an acceptable stand thout the extension of Norman Road. Advice received from Transcore (attach irrims this position. This undermines the purpose of including the extension of road altogether. • The DCP does not include the extension of Norman Road altogether. • The DCP does not include the extension of Norman Road altogether. • The DCP does not include the extension of Norman Road and Freight Network' figure, it also fails to make a distinction in assification of Bishop Road between the Doley Street extension and Soldiers Roated noting Bishop Road will have a minimum width of 35.6m for its entire lend ufficient to accommodate a dual-carriageway Integrator A street under Livea eighbourhoods (2009)). This again suggests the actual planned function of Bish reet undermines the inclusion of the Norman Road extension. The various conflicts within and between the DSP and DCP with regard to anned road network, and the extension of Norman Road and classification shop Road in particular, undermine and obfuscate the strategy that the cuments intend to present. As discussed elsewhere herein, this is exacerbated | the d to ad' ver, ical to res ard ed) of bad bing the ad, gth bile hop the of ese | |

| Submitter | No | Submitter Comments | Officer Comment | Officer |
|-----------|-----------------|--|------------------|----------------|
| | | | | Recommendation |
| | | | | |
| | | what circumstances they might be delivered. This poses significant challenges implementation of these documents as it is unclear what needs to be done. | s to | |
| | res | Submission 6: Inconsistencies within and between the DSP and DCP must solved to ensure a coherent framework is put in place to guide development, at the must clearly demonstrate the need for the Norman Road extension. | | |
| | | JBMISSION 7: NORMAN ROAD EXTENSION NOT PROPERLY ASSESSED OT NEEDED (DSP) | 0 & | |
| | ap No | ne Transport Impact Assessment (2020) (TIA) prepared in support of the Dipears to provide no assessment of the impacts or justification for the extension forman Road, nor Doley Road for that matter, bringing into question the purpod efficacy of the changes proposed to the road network. | n of | |
| | ext mo Th | one of the modelling presented in the TIA includes the Norman Road or Doley Rottensions. Both are omitted from figures and the results set out under Section 5 and the contained within Appendix C of the TIA, and neither is costed in the Dole TIA nonetheless concludes the network is expected to operate at an acceptate of service and with sufficient capacity. This clearly | and CP. | |
| | Ad dis Ro | dicates the extension of Norman Road is not necessary and is not warrant divice received from Transcore (attached) affirms this position. Conversely, and scussed elsewhere herein, the existing arrangement of Bishop Road/Soldi pad/Norman Road is demonstrated to be sufficient and provide a logical and legitute for traffic movements, and that can accommodate the expected level of grow | as ers ble | |
| | the ne | s such, in the absence of a deficiency that needs to be resolved, it is unclear version of Norman Road has been included, particularly given the costs a gative impacts on amenity associated with it (discussed elsewhere herein). A some other imperative has driven the inclusion of Norman Road, that has not be | and nd, | |

| Submitter | No | Submitter Comments | Officer Comment | Officer |
|-----------|--|---|--------------------------------|----------------|
| | | | | Recommendation |
| | | | | , |
| | no | ommunicated and it has not been properly assessed or considered in the TIA, and opportunity has been given for that purpose to be reviewed as part of advertising process. | | |
| | | Submission 7: The extension of Norman Road should be removed as the epared to support the DSP demonstrates it is not needed. | ПА | |
| | | JBMISSION 8: DELIVERY OF NORMAN ROAD EXTENSION NOT COST OCP) | ED | |
| | the wit | ne 'Mundijong Proposed Roads and Freight Network' figure within the DSP deperextension of Norman Road as 'future local distributor' and shows the intersect the Soldiers Road is to be 'grade separated'. Neither the extension or grassparation is reflected in the DCP (nor is the Doley Road extension). | ion | |
| | hiç mi No se inc se ex | atting aside the costs of road upgrades, the cost of a grade separated crossing ghly significant. The two other grade separated crossings within the DCP total sillion and \$19 million each (average of \$16.5 million). Assuming similar costs orman Road, and given the total DCP costs of \$219 million, this additional graph grades are paration alone could add in excess of 13% to the DCP. It is also noted the D cludes comment that engineering constraints require the two planned graph grades are parations to be constructed simultaneously. We assume similar constraints worked to the Norman Road grade separation. These complexities and costs demand appropriate level of planning and coordination. | for ade CP ade uld | |
| | gra ab wit | comment is provided with the DCP to explain why the Norman Road extension ade separated crossing, and Doley Road extension have been omitted. In exence of any explanation, we can only assume this is because they are associant that 'Development Investigation Area', and that the Shire is operating with a vibramending the framework to include these additional items once planning of | the ted ew | |

| Submitter | No | Submitter Comments | Officer Comment | Officer |
|-----------|---|--|---|----------------|
| | | | | Recommendation |
| | <u> </u> | | | · |
| | DC are Inc to s | ese cells has progressed. However, this contradicts the purpose of a DSP and CP to coordinate the delivery of such infrastructure. Either the roads/intersection in the coordinate the delivery of such infrastructure. Either the roads/intersection is necessary and should be planned for and included in the DCP, or they are recluding such items at some point in the future, noting there is no formal timefraction as a how long that may be, will significantly limit the capacity to fairly apportion accover costs for such infrastructure. Notwithstanding, consideration must also went to whether it is appropriate to include this infrastructure in a DCP at all | ons not. me and | |
| | gui ten mu and sup in sat Thi ass inc and but wh sho Ro | ate Planning Policy 3.6 (2009) and draft State Planning Policy 3.6 (2019) providance on planning for contributions for infrastructure. Need and nexus is the chant underpinning that policy framework. Put simply: the need for infrastructust be clearly demonstrated (need) and the connection between the developmed the demand created should be clearly established (nexus). The TIA prepared proport the DSP and inform the DCP does not include the Norman Road extension any of its modelling. It nonetheless concludes the road network will funct tisfactorily and has the capacity to accommodate the expected growth in traffic clearly demonstrates there is no 'need' for the Norman Road extension. A suming we are correct in that the Shire intends to amend the DCP in the future clude this additional item, the connection between the 'need' for this infrastruct did development then appears tenuous. They appear in [parts of] the same DS tif they are not needed to service the development from the outset, it is uncluded that nexus exists. Again, either it is needed and should be included, or it isn't an ouldn't. As it stands, the DSP and DCP provide a strong indication the Normal advention is not needed and therefore should not be included in either the D the DCP. | ore ure ent I to ion ion fic. nd, e to ure SP, ear d it ian | |

| Submitter N | No | Submitter Comments | Officer Comment | Officer Recommendation |
|-------------|--|---|---|---------------------------|
| | SHOROS SU INE Althrof t traf pro The industrial it was error Nei advinde Tor | Submission 8: The extension of Norman Road and grade separated cross buld be considered within the context of SPP3.6, noting the extension of Norman does not appear to meet the test for need and nexus. BMISSION 9: POSSIBLE USE OF NORMAN ROAD EXTENSION DUSTRIAL TRAFFIC (DSP) Inough no purpose for the Norman Road extension is stated in the DSP, Office the Shire have previously informally advised this may seek to divert indust fific (trucks) away from the Bishop Road and Soldiers Road intersection a wide an alternate route to Tonkin Highway. Be DSP should not seek to facilitate the use of urban roads as a thoroughfare ustrial traffic. Regardless of where that traffic is directed within the area, it we an undue negative impact on amenity and road safety. Advice received from the second conflict with the logical position of a primary school wice DIA2 and any local centre uses, as guided by the principles of Livea ighbourhoods (2009). We also understand that Main Roads Western Australia hised it is opposed to such an arrangement, and instead recommends to ustrial traffic use South Western Highway and higher order roads to according Highway – this appears to be a far more logical and desirable arrangements in inconsistent with the principles of proper and orderly planning that a district less inconsistent with the principles of proper and orderly planning that a district less contents and the principles of proper and orderly planning that a district less contents with the principles of proper and orderly planning that a district less contents are the proper and orderly planning that a district less contents are the proper and orderly planning that a district less contents are the proper and orderly planning that a district less contents are the proper and orderly planning that a district less contents are the proper and orderly planning that a district less contents are the proper and orderly planning that a district less contents are the proper and orderly planning that a district less contents are the proper and | ers rial and for will om ich to ble has hat ess ent. | Recommendation |
| | plai thro | nning framework would seek to facilitate the movement of industrial traffic/true ough the heart of a planned urban residential area. Submission 9: The extension of Norman Road may result in industrial travelling through the middle of a planned urban residential centre, including | ffic | |

| Submitter | No | Submitter Comments | Officer Comment | Officer Recommendation |
|-----------|--|--|--|---------------------------|
| | | | | Recommendation |
| | To The dup no and der ext it b exe | mary school and local centre uses. Industrial traffic should instead be routed nkin Highway via South Western Highway and higher order connecting roads. e proposed extension of Norman Road appears to be an illogical and inefficing plication of infrastructure that has no technical basis and for which there appeared. Additionally, its delivery is not appropriately planned for under the Dod no commentary is provided to clarify its intended purpose (noting the monstrates it is not necessary for the function of the movement network). The tension will negatively impact amenity for future urban uses within the site, who bisects, and will potentially undermine the integrity and viability of a plant emplary innovative housing model aimed at significantly improving sustainable daffordability in the construction and ongoing operation of residential buildings. | ent ars CP, TIA The iich ned | |
| | ted it sexi development we to be | e anomalous status of the Norman Road extension must be resolved. In chinical analysis used to inform the DSP and DCP demonstrates it is not need serves no positive purpose and does not improve or substantially change isting situation; and poses significant constraints to the efficient delivery of urbivelopment. We believe the only reasonable action is to delete the Norman Rottension from the DSP. The look forward to continuing to work with the Shire on these matters in the fut help achieve its vision to create a diverse, sustainable, and distinct urban cer Mundijong. | ed; the pan pad ure | |

| Submitter | No | transcore | 51 York Street Sublaco WA 6008 RO.Box 42 Sublaco WA 6904 Phone: +61 (08) 9382 4199 Fax: +61 (08) 9382 4177 Email: admin@transcore.net.au *********************************** | sicoloding | Comment | Officer Recommendation |
|-----------|----|--|---|----------------|----------------------|---------------------------|
| | | | 120 148-wv-0 1 a deax | | | |
| | | road link (westward extension of Norman Re | lundijong District Structure Plan d provide traffic engineering advice on a new oad) that is proposed in the Mundijong District | | | |
| | | Structure Plan (December 2018). The proposed Norman Road extension withrough the middle of the existing Lot 30 as | estward from Soldiers Road would cut right shown on Figure 1. | | | |
| E20/5999 | | MEDIUM - HIGH: R40-100 LOW (SUBURBAN): R20-35 LOW (TRANSITIONAL): R10-15 RURAL DIA DEVELOPMENT INVESTIGATION: Figure 1: Norman Road Exte | PRIMARY DISTRIBUTOR DISTRICT DISTRIBUTOR RAILWAY RESERVE HIGH FREQUENCY TRANSIT CORRIDOR ension in the Mundijong DSP | Ordinary Counc | il Meeting - 16 Nove | ember 2020 |

| Submitter | No | The Mundijong DSP report refers (at Table 2) to "the newly identified roads (Doley and | Off | icer Comment | Officer |
|-----------|----|---|-------------|-------------------------|------------------------|
| Submitter | No | The Mundijong DSP report refers (at Table 2) to "the newly identified roads (Doley and Norman road extensions) required by the sub-regional framework", which is a reference to the South Metropolitan Peel Sub-Regional Planning Framework (WAPC, March 2018). The SMPSRPF (page 46) indicates, "Byford—Cardup—Mundijong network: Additional linkages will be provided between road networks proposed in the existing Byford and Mundijong district structure plans and will include extension of Doley Road and realignment of the southern portion of Malarkey Road. Some refinement of east-west connections may be appropriate, including westward extension of Norman Road to connect to Bishop Road." The Doley Road extension is shown on the SMPSRPF plan but the Norman Road extension is not, as can be seen on Figure 2. Proposed Regional Roads Road Reserves Road Reserves | Off | icer Comment | Officer Recommendation |
| E20/5999 | | Figure 2: South Metropolitan Peel Sub-Regional Planning Framework The SMPSRPF discusses "westward extension of Norman Road to connect to Bishop Road" but the Mundijong DSP only proposes to extend Norman Road to Doley Road. The resultant Norman Rd – Doley Rd – Bishop Rd route is not an improvement compared to the existing Norman Rd – Soldiers Rd – Bishop Rd route. | Ordinary Co | uncil Meeting - 16 Nove | mber 2020 |

| Submitter | No | | C | Officer Comment | Officer |
|-----------|----|--|------------|------------------------|----------------|
| | | The Mundijong DSP has interpreted the SMPSRPF comment that "Some refinement of | | | Recommendation |
| | | east-west connections may be appropriate, including westward extension of Norman Road to connect to Bishop Road" as being "required by the sub-regional framework". Not only that, but the DSP has deleted the corresponding section of Bishop Road, which was actually shown as an arterial road in the SMPSRPF plan. Despite deletion of that section of Bishop Road as an arterial road, this deleted section of Bishop Road is still shown as a future high frequency transit corridor on the DSP plan (Figure 1). That is just one indication that the inclusion of the Norman Road extension was a late addition in the Mundijong DSP and its implications may not have not been adequately investigated. | | | |
| | | One of the appendices of the Mundijong DSP report is the Transport Impact Assessment Mundijong Structure Plan (Cardno, 5 December 2018). All of the traffic modelling in that TIA report does not include either the Doley Road extension or the Norman Road extension. Figure 5-4 (Intersection Sufficiency Map) of the TIA report summarises the results of the intersection evaluation undertaken and indicates "modified intersection sufficient" at the existing Norman Rd / Soldiers Rd T-intersection. Despite that, Figure 3-1 (Road Network Changes) of the TIA report shows those two road extensions as dashed lines with traffic lights required at the resulting Norman Rd / Soldiers Rd 4-way intersection. There is no evidence that any traffic modelling or analysis of these two road links and associated intersection requirements has been undertaken in the TIA report nor any assessments of impacts or benefits. The fact that the traffic modelling in the TIA did not include the Norman Road westward extension even suggests that the road network would operate satisfactorily without it and therefore this link is unnecessary and not warranted. | | | |
| | | The area north of Bishop Road between Soldiers Road and Tonkin Highway labelled DIA2 on the DSP plan (Figure 1) is identified as an Urban Expansion area on the SMPSRPF plan (Figure 2). Table 8 in section 3.2.1 of the DSP report indicates DIA2 will accommodate 2,220 dwellings and 7,311 residents out of the total 59,179 population capacity of this DSP area. The DSP report notes "It is important that precincts without existing LSPs endeavour to meet the targets identified in Table 8 to align not only with State planning expectations for infrastructure provision but also with the Mundijong Development Contribution Plan." | | | |
| | | It is also noted that the Shire prepared a revised <i>Mundijong Urban Development Contribution Plan</i> (DCP) dated 08/05/20 but that appears to only relate to the existing Mundijong LSP areas and does not include the Development Investigation Areas (DIA1, DIA2 and DIA3) identified in the draft Mundijong DSP. The DCP does not include the Norman Road extension or the Doley Road extension through DIA2, nor Doley Road extension south of Bishop Road. The DCP appears to show Bishop Road upgraded and extended eastwards across Soldiers Road and the railway line (see Figure 3), presumably involving another railway crossing. Therefore the DCP is not consistent with the draft DSP in this area, and cannot be interpreted as an accurate representation of the DCP requirements for this part of the DSP area. This just reinforces the conclusion that inclusion of the Norman Road extension in the draft DSP appears to be a late addition and has not been sufficiently evaluated and its impacts not understood to justify its inclusion in the | | | |
| E20/5999 | | DSP. | Ordinary C | ouncil Meeting - 16 No | vember 2020 |

| Submitter | No | _ | Off | icer Comment | Officer Recommendation |
|-----------|----|--|-------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| | | Adveral Tuylor Rissel Bokup Rissel Protestor Stave Tisso Confer Bokulate Next Stave Rissel Staylor Rissel Staylor Rissel Staylor Rissel Staylor Rissel Staylor Rissel Staylor Rissel Traper Assetse Staylor Rissel Traper Assetse Adveral Tuylor Rissel Staylor Rissel Traper Assetse Adveral Tuylor Rissel Staylor Rissel Traper Assetse Adveral Tuylor Rissel Traper Assetse Total Rissel Total Risse | | | |
| | | Figure 3: Roads to be Constructed or Upgraded in the DCP The extension of Norman Road westwards across Lot 30 would sever that future residential cell with significant negative impacts on residential amenity and road safety, particularly for vulnerable road users such as pedestrians and cyclists. If that is combined with a grade-separated rail crossing (a bridge over the railway line) as indicated in the DSP report, the Norman Road westward extension would also be elevated several metres above the future residential developments in this cell, increasing land take and further exacerbating the severance issues caused by this new road link. Even if the Norman Road rail crossing does need to be grade-separated in future (i.e. if passenger rail services are ultimately extended south to Mundijong as recommended in the DSP), the Soldiers Rd / Norman Rd intersection could remain as a 3-leg intersection to minimise the impacts on this future residential cell. It is understood that one reason behind the suggested westwards extension of Norman Road is to provide a route for traffic from the planned industrial area north of Norman Road (see Figure 2) through the DSP area and onto Tonkin Highway, It is understood that | | | |
| E20/5999 | | Main Roads WA has advised they don't support this, and would prefer industrial traffic to use South Western Highway and higher order roads to reach Tonkin Highway. We would strongly agree with MRWA because it is far more appropriate for industrial traffic to travel around the outside of the urban area of this DSP rather than being funnelled through the heart of this Urban Expansion area. | Ordinary Co | uncil Meeting - 16 Nove | mber 2020 |

| Submitter | No | Submitter Comments | Officer Comment | Officer Recommendation |
|------------------------------|----|--|--|---------------------------|
| | | Therefore, it should be concluded that the proposed westward extension of Norman Road has not been sufficiently evaluated and would have unsatisfactory negative impacts upon the Urban Expansion area north of Bishop Road that is identified in the South Metropolitan Peel Sub-Regional Planning Framework. Accordingly, it is recommended that the proposed westward extension of Norman Road should be deleted from the proposed Mundijong District Structure Plan. Yours sincerely, Behnam Bordbar Managing Director | | |
| Harley Dykstra IN20/16815 | | The Shire of Serpentine Jarrahdale has initiated the Mundijong District Structure Pland the associated Mundijong Urban Development Contribution Plan, which a documents that seeks to provide an overview of the land use planning are infrastructure needs for Mundijong Urban area, as identified in the Metropolita Region Scheme. In response to these documents, Harley Dykstra would like to make a submission behalf of our clients Mr. Barry Mort and Mrs. Nina Mort who are the landowner of Lot 10 (No. 310) Keirnan Street Mundijong (the subject site), that objects to the designation of the subject site as District Open Space. Our client urges the Shire Serpentine Jarrahdale to amend this designation to "Low (Suburban) R20-35" accordance with the land to the east and south of the subject site. This submission also seeks the removal of the item within the Mundijong Urban Development | the subject of discussions between the Shire and the Department of Education. To Consideration is being given to whether the current Department of Education owned in Secondary school site on Keirnan Street | and Amendment 209 |

| Submitter | No | Submitter Comments | Officer Comment | Officer Recommendation |
|-----------|---|--|---|---------------------------|
| | fie PL Th Sp Co pre for | ontribution Plan (DCP) that seeks contributions for the development of a play ld at this site. JBLIC OPEN SPACE DISTRIBUTION The Shire of Serpentine-Jarrahdale have planned the distribution of Public Operace and recreational facilities throughout its municipality on the basis of community Infrastructure and Public Open Space Strategy (the Strategy) that we peared in January 2017, attached at Appendix A. This document provides direct the public open space and recreational needs of a growing population, beyone year 2050, where the forecasts suggest that the population in the Shire | the space constraints we are starting to foresee for Mundijong. It is noted that the DSF includes provisions for the full build out to 2050, and as such the future provision of | |
| | Of WI po inc | ceed 100,000. particular relevance to this submission are the requirements for the Mundijong hitby townsites. The strategy forecasts the needs for various facilities as equilation grows to 50,000 persons. On the basis, the key findings of the strated dicate that, by 2050, the Mundijong-Whitby precinct will require: 3 District Open Space areas, of between 5 – 20 hectares; and • 4 Neighbour Open Space areas. | remain in the DSP, being addressed further in the DSP submission responses. | |
| | Sp It 5 r Op Th of ab all Dis | is also noted that the Strategy indicates these facilities must be within 2km Offiniute drive, and within 400m OR a 5 minute walk for District and Neighbourholden space areas, respectively. Therefore, on the basis of the above requirements it is apparent that the provist a District Open Space area at Lot 10 Keirnan Street is superfluous given a sundance of other open space options within the Mundijong-Whitby area, which is in close proximity to the subject site. In particular, we note the large 63-hect strict Open Space area that is depicted on the District Structure Plan at the control Keirnan Street and South Western Highway. This particular site, being | Infrastructure Open Space Strategy is currently being updated as a result of the latest population estimates and the revised DSP. It is confirmed that this infrastructure is | |

| own (on the basis they need to be between 5 – 20 hectares). It is within a 5 minute drive of most, if not all, of the Mundijong-Whitby locality. Furthermore, there are at 9 neighbourhood open space areas depicted within the same locality, which represents more than double the required neighbourhood spaces. All of this suggests that there is comfortably enough open space provided within the Mundijong-Whitby locality. | Officer Comment | Officer Recommendation |
|--|--|---------------------------|
| community infrastructure needs the Strategy subsequently sets out the implementation of these needs. Specifically, to the Mundijong-Whitby precinct, the Strategy indicates that District Open Space is required within Precinct A (with High School & Primary School) – 2 fields, and within Precinct C – Keirnan Street 3 fields. Given the subject site is located within Precinct G of the Mundijong-Whitby Precinct, as identified with Local Planning Policy No. 29 – Mundijong-Whitby Planning Framework, it is clear that the strategy does not identify the need for District Open Space at the location proposed by the District Structure Plan and the Mundijong Urban DCP. Therefore, it seems inconsistent that section 2.4.3 of the Mundijong Urban DCP claims that the "Community Infrastructure and Open Space Strategy identifies a District sports oval to be co-located with the planned High School in Precinct G". This is incorrect and as such we request an urgent review of this document to determine the basis for this assertion. Whilst it is acknowledged that the Strategy identifies a portion of Neighbourhood Open Space within Precinct G, it is noted that the District Structure Plan identifies another site for this purpose. Perhaps the only counter-argument is that a portion of District Open Space is | nute at 9 nich The Notwithstanding the above, as a result of the submissions and further discussions with developers in the area, officers recommend the following changes to the DCP and the amendment: The life of the DCP is recommended to be 14 years, rather than 20 years; Population estimates and build out progress have been extensively reviewed through consultation with developers, the | |

| Submitter | No | Submitter Comments | Officer Comment | Officer Recommendation |
|-----------|--|--|--|---------------------------|
| | ma a I cla alre pla De rec In rec spa • T We nee of cer tha Str ope RE In Mu | e WAPC's Development Control Policy 2.4 — School Sites only requires aximum "Secondary" School site of 10 hectares or of 6 hectares to accommod High School site, which includes its own recreational spaces in additional sorooms and other facilities. The site that is to accommodate the High School eady more than 10 hectares (11.76ha), so in our view, and additional space along fields and the need for a "Shared-use agreement' between the Shire and expartment of Education, as suggested in the Mundijong Urban DCP is simply quired or necessary. Summary, our Client's view that District and Neighbourhood Open Space quirements are more than adequately met without the need for a further opace site at Lot 10 Keirnan Street is firmly held on the basis that: The planned District Open Space Facility at the corner of Keirnan Street & So estern Highway, and other additional facilities are easily sufficient to service eds of the Mundijong-Whitby locality; • The High School Site, adjacent to the we Lot 10, is already between 1 and 5 hectares larger than required, so there ratinly no requirement for additional open space to facilitate the construction at school; and • The Shire's Community Infrastructure and Public Open Sparategy concurs with this view given it does not recommend the provision of pullen space or community infrastructure at the subject site. ECOMMENDATIONS response to the above, our recommendation, in respect of Lot 10 Keirnan Streandijong is that the following occur: Amend the District Structure Plan Map from "District Open Space" to "Luburban) R20 – 35"; • Remove any reference if/where it occurs within the Dist | review of Forecast ID estimates, in line with the new DCP end date of 2034. The anticipated increase in lots during this period is now anticipated to be 7,200; - The development areas occurring within this period are expected to be primarily Whitby and the western edge of the DCA3; - The revised anticipated population and growth areas, have substantially reduced the need ow | |

| Submitter | No | Submitter Comments | Officer Comment | Officer Recommendation |
|-----------|--|---|---|---------------------------|
| | the Disters of the CC The New Prints of the CC The Company of the CC The Company of the CC Th | ructure Plan Report to playing fields or district open space occurring; and • Ame e Mundijong Urban Development Contribution Plan to remove the developmen strict Open Space adjacent to the High School site as a contribution item a move section 2.4.3 from the associated DCP report. hese recommendations are made on the basis of the rationale provided above DNCLUSION his submission has identified that the planned provision of District a eighbourhood Open space is more than sufficient within the Mundijong-Whi peinct even without the designation of Lot 10 Keirnan Street Mundijong as District open Space. Furthermore, the Shire's own public open space and communifrastructure strategy does not identify the need for this open space. We suggest that the Shire of Serpentine-Jarrahdale review this submission as identify given the fact that no change to the proposed DSP and DCP will cause erillisation of the subject site and make it extremely difficult to sell or further devel of the dorequest a meeting with Shire officers to discuss this matter further a excordingly, it would be appreciated if you could contact the undersigned on 94 and 100 per Space Strategy / Appendix A Harley Dykstra bimission - Appen | upgrades, which are detailed within the Shire's submission at the end of this document, and addressed as appropriate within each submission. On the above basis officers agree that the provision of a DSS at this site, will not be required within the life. | |

| Submitter | No |) | Submitter Comments | Officer Comment | Officer Recommendation |
|--------------------------------------|-----|---------------------------------|--|---|------------------------|
| Dynamic | 15. | | e submission in its entirety is a large document consisting of 281 pages. In the same of simple registration of automorphisms of simple registration of supplementation of supplementation of supplementations | | |
| Planning IN20/18692 IN20/18767 | | rele from It is doored | erests of simple registration of our submission, attached with this email are to evant Shire submission forms duly executed, our cover letter and advice let m LK Advisory. It is respectfully requested that our submission received is the entire 281 page cument and we seek the Shire's confirmation that our submission has been believed in its entirety via the above download link. In the download by Mundijong, King, Leipold and Kargotich Roads | | |
| | | On De Mu Am PA | behalf of WPG Landholdings Pty Ltd (WPG), Dynamic Planning a velopments is pleased to provide this submission on the recently advertised: Draft Mundijong District Structure Plan (DSP) (Shire Ref: PA18/779); and, Draft District Structure Plan (DSP) | A covering letter; Appendix 1 – A completed submission form to | 9 |

| Submitter | No | Submitter Comments | Officer Comment | Officer Recommendation |
|-----------|--|--|--|---------------------------|
| | (Ref. 3. Plate 4. Add 5. Ass. 6. Appl 7. correct Food Appl All ass. Drate fata | The Shire's completed submission form to proposed Scheme Amendment 2 ef: PA/18/780) – Refer Appendix 1; The Shire's completed submission form to proposed Mundijong District Struct an (Ref: PA/18/779) – Refer Appendix 2; Separate advice letter on the Draft DSP and DCP from Mr. Len Kosova of visory dated 20 August 2020 – Refer Appendix 3; Agricultural land capability report dated 28 August 2020 prepared by Lassessment Pty Ltd – Refer Appendix 4; Mundijong West Landowners Group (MWLG) schedule of members – Respendix 5; A letter to the Shire dated 18 June 2020 from WPG Landholdings Pty Infirming all of the land owners between Mundijong, Gangemi, Leipold and Karads are members of the Mundijong West Landowners Group and support aeviously lodged LPS 3 submission proposing the West Mundijong Urban Precince Appendix 6; and, Our previously lodged submission dated 6 December 2019 on the Shire's Date Cal Planning Strategy (LPS) and Local Planning Scheme No. 3 (LPS 3) – Respendix 7; I components of this submission must therefore be considered in the Shiresesment of the Draft Mundijong DSP, Amendment No. 209 and the associated Urban DCP. Jundamentally, our position is that there are material shortcomings and potential flaws in the recently advertised proposals, which can and should be resolvantly or wholly) by expanding the Draft DSP and DCP areas to include the last the proposals of | completed submission form to proposed Mundijong District Structure Plan Appendix 3 Advice letter on the Draft DSP and DCP from Mr. Ler Kosova of Lk Advisory dated 20 August 2020 Appendix 4 Agricultural land capability report by Land Assessmen Pty Ltd Appendix 5 Mundijong Wes Landowners Group schedule o members Appendix 6 - A letter to the Shire from WPO Landholdings Pty | |

| Submitter | No | Submitter Comments | Officer Comment | Officer Recommendation |
|-----------|---|---|--|---------------------------|
| | to just lett As the of t LP afo var | as the proposed West Mundijong Urban Precinct (WMUP). Our comprehensitification for this position is set out in the documents attached to this submissiter. Is mentioned above, our previously lodged submission dated 6 December 2019 is Shire's Draft LPS and LPS 3 is attached and contained as Appendix 7. As put the proceedings in the Shire's consideration of this submission relating to the destand LPS 3, some pertinent and additional information elements arose post prementioned LPS and LPS 3 submission. In the interests of completeness of ricus planning mechanisms being considered, these are listed below and are attached for review as part of this submission to the DSP and DCP: Appendix 4 - Agricultural land capability report dated 28 August 20 prepared by Land Assessment Pty Ltd. This report was undertaken response to claims from the Shire that the proposed WMUP held hig productive values for agricultural land. The detailed examination undertal by Land Assessment Pty Ltd confirms that the proposed WMUP is neither key agricultural asset nor highly productive agricultural land; Appendix 5 - A Mundijong West Landowners Group (MWLG) has beformed. Appendix 5 contains a schedule confirming all members of the group. Appendix 6 - A letter to the Shire dated 18 June 2020 from W Landholdings Pty Ltd confirming all of the land owners between Mundijo Gangemi, Leipold and King Roads are members of the MWLG group a support the previously lodged LPS 3 submission proposing the WMUP. | between Mundijong, Gangemi, Leipold and King Roads are members of the Mundijong Wes Landowners Group and support the previously lodged LPS 3 submission proposing the Wes Mundijong Urbar Precinct Appendix 7 — A previously lodged submission on the Shire's Draft Loca Planning Strategy and Local Planning Scheme No. 3. | |

| Submitter | No | Submitter Comments | Officer Comment | Officer |
|-----------|----------------------------------|--|-----------------|----------------|
| | | | | Recommendation |
| | | | | |
| | | e look forward to the Shire's consideration of this submission in respect of the D undijong DSP, Amendment No. 209 and associated Draft Mundijong Urban DC | | |
| | De | eview of Draft Mundijong District Structure Plan & Draft Mundijong Urbevelopment Contribution Plan (Amendment No. 209 to Shire of Serpent rrahdale Town Planning Scheme No. 2) | | |
| | | Advisory has been engaged by WPG Landholdings Pty Ltd (WPG) to dependently review the: | | |
| | - | Draft Mundijong District Structure Plan (DSP) (Shire of Serpentine Jarrahdale Ref: PA18/779); and |) | |
| | - | Draft Mundijong Urban Development Contribution Plan (DCP) associated with Amendment No. 209 to the Shire's Town Planning Scheme No. 2 (Shire Ref: PA18/780). | | |
| | ext Kir sul (LF is I | the purpose of our review has been to determine the value and impact of stending the Draft DSP and DCP to incorporate the land bounded by Mundijonging, Leipold and Kargotich Roads, Oldbury, which was the subject of your bmission (dated 6 December 2019) on the Shire's Draft Local Planning Strateges) and Local Planning Scheme No. 3 (LPS 3). For ease of reference, this are later described in this advice as the proposed West Mundijong Urban Precinct (MUP). | gy a | |
| | | e acknowledge and accept that this advice will inform or accompany a bmission to the Shire on the Draft Mundijong DSP and DCP, on behalf of WPC | 3 . | |
| | | ur opinions and advice on the Draft Mundijong DSP and DCP are set out below your and the Shire's consideration: | ' | |

| Submitter | No | Submitter Comments | Officer Comment | Officer Recommendation |
|-----------|------------------------|--|-------------------|------------------------|
| | | | | |
| | 1. | Draft Mundijong DSP (Shire Ref: PA18/779) | | |
| | | The Draft Mundijong DSP has a lengthy and complicated history, which can be illustrated by the following timeline of events: | est | |
| | | 11 – WAPC approval of the Mundijong Whitby DSP, comprising the urban port the new Draft Mundijong DSP (i.e. east of the West Mundijong Industrial Area) | | |
| | (Ma | 13 – Draft West Mundijong Industrial Area DSP adopted for advertising by Couarch). This structure plan has remained in draft form and has never been finopted. | | |
| | 20 | 17 – MRS Amendment gazetted to rezone the West Mundijong Industrial Area | a. | |
| | | 18 - Town Planning Scheme Amendment and DCP gazetted for the Windijong Industrial Area ('DCA 2') (February). | est | |
| | De Str DS | 18 - Council (in May) endorsed for advertising the Draft Mundijong Lovelopment Strategy for the entire Mundijong locality. The Local Development entegy comprised a Draft Mundijong DSP incorporating the 2011 Mundijong White Pand the 2013 Draft West Mundijong Industrial Area DSP, together with matailed Concept and Precinct Plans. | ent itby | |
| | DS ass Co the | 18 – Council (on 17 December) adopted for advertising a revised Draft Mundijon, Amendment No. 209 to Town Planning Scheme No. 2 (TPS 2) and sociated Draft Mundijong Urban and West Mundijong Industrial Area Developm ntribution Plans. This is the Council decision which has been acted upon to initial erecent advertising of the Draft Mundijong DSP, Scheme Amendment No. 2 dight the related Urban and Industrial DCPs. | the ent ate | |
| | | In its recent advertising material regarding the Draft Mundijong DSP, the States that: | nire <u>1.2</u> | |

| Submitter | No | Submitter Comments | Officer Comment | Officer |
|-----------|------------|--|---|----------------|
| | | | | Recommendation |
| | Sh | Provision 1 of Development Area 1 and Provision 1 of Development Area 2 of ire's TPS 2 require a single DSP to be adopted to guide subdivision a velopment for the whole of Development Areas 1 and 2. | and submission on the draft DSP will be | |
| | of | The Draft DSP is not being prepared or determined under the 'deemed provision the Scheme. Rather, it is being considered in accordance with the spectavelopment Area provisions of TPS 2. | | |
| | exe | The Draft DSP is an informing, relevant and strategic document to guide ercise of discretion for Structure Plans and Local Development Plans which der the auspices of the 'deemed provisions' of the Scheme. | | |
| | 2 De | the first point above, while it is true that Provision 1 of Development Areas 1 arequires a single DSP to be prepared covering both areas, Provision 4 evelopment Area 1 (Mundijong) also requires a structure plan for the area to comb. Part 4, Regulation 16 of the 'deemed provisions'. | of | |
| | not the | egarding point b. above, it is unclear why the Shire would state the Draft DSI to being prepared or determined under the 'deemed provisions' because – first e Draft DSP was instigated by and is now being advertised in accordance voluncil's December 2018 resolution (OCM148/12/18), which explicitly refers to: | stly, | |
| | | Schedule 2, Part 4, Clause 17 of the Planning and Development (Local Plann hemes) Regulations 2015 (the 'deemed provisions'); | ing | |
| | • T | he Draft DSP's compliance with clause 16(1) of the 'deemed provisions'; and | | |
| | | Advertising of the Draft DSP in accordance with clause 18 of the 'deen ovisions'. | ned | |
| | | s clear from Council's enabling resolution that the Draft DSP was indeed intended be prepared and determined under the 'deemed provisions'. Therefore, if the SI | | |

| Submitter | No | Submitter Comments | Officer Comment | Officer Recommendation |
|-----------|--|--|---|--|
| | If the with the go ad In of the Co for The dw research | relying on that 17 December 2018 resolution as the basis for advertising the DSP then it can only do so in accordance with the 'deemed provisions', because the precisely what Council's resolution required. The Shire no longer intends to prepare or determine the Draft DSP in accordance that the 'deemed provisions' then it could only do so under a new Council resoluted to does not reference or require compliance with the 'deemed provisions'. From the vernance and compliance viewpoint, doing so may void the current Devertising process, thus requiring the DSP to be advertised de novo. The relation to point c. above, the Draft DSP will itself need to fall under the auspit the 'deemed provisions' if it is being advertised and determined in accordance to buncil's resolution from 17 December 2018. The Section 3.2.1 of the Draft Mundijong DSP identifies an estimated yield of 17, wellings for Residential Precincts A – G. By contrast, the Draft Mundijonal Infrastructure' DCP (incorporated in Amendment No. 209 to TPS recasts a lesser yield of (only) 16,746 dwellings for Precincts A – G; while the Dommunity Infrastructure' DCP (incorporated in Amendment No. 207 to TPS recasts an even lower yield again of 16,382 dwellings for those precincts. The estimated residential population resulting from these three different forecasting yields is 50,840; 48,395; and 47,343, respectively, based on the Draft DS sidential occupancy rate of 2.89 persons per household. The action of the Rural Small Holdings and Development Investigation Areas (DIAs does not be a province of the recast of the Rural Small Holdings) pulation yields for both are either nominal (for the Rural Small Holdings) pulation yields for both are either nominal (for the Rural Small Holdings) | hat nce ion n a SP ces with 592 ng 2) raft | Recommend DCP life, infrastructure inclusions and lot forecasts, be amended in line with the Shire submission at the end of this document. |

| Submitter | No | Submitter Comments | Officer Comment | Officer Recommendation |
|-----------|--|---|--|---------------------------|
| | det 1.4 cor on G v per the 1.5 des bet 'Co | emature to reliably calculate (in the case of DIAs 2 and 3) in the absence of tailed planning. The dwelling yield inconsistencies described in 1.3 above are magnified with mpared against the detailed constraints assessment contained in your submiss the Shire's Draft LPS and LPS 3. That assessment concluded that Precincts would (only) yield around 13,056 dwellings with a resultant population of 37, rsons – approximately 4,536 fewer lots and 13,109 fewer residents than states a Draft DSP. It is critical that the Shire reconciles the variance in estimated dwelling yield scribed in 1.3 and 1.4 above, as inconsistent or inaccurate dwelling yield estimativeen the Draft Mundijong DSP, Draft 'Traditional Infrastructure' DCP and Dommunity Infrastructure' DCP will distort the district population forecasts, Distribution amounts, DCP cost apportionment and DCP income calculations. | recommendations from the DPLH to reduce the CIDCP life to 15 years; - Population estimates and build out progress have been extensively reviewed through | |

| Submitter | No | Submitter Comments | Officer Comment | Officer Recommendation |
|-----------|----|--------------------|--|------------------------|
| | | | | Recommendation |
| | | | - The development areas occurring within this period are expected to be primarily Whitby and the western edge of the DCA3; - The revised anticipated population and growth areas, have substantially reduced the need for provision of DOS and the extent of road upgrades, which are detailed within the Shire's submission at the end of this document, and addressed as appropriate within each submission. | |

| Submitter No | | Submitter Comments | Officer Comment | Officer |
|--------------|-----------------------------|---|--|----------------|
| | | | | Recommendation |
| | ac ad 1.7 ad in | 6 If the proposed WMUP were incorporated in the Draft DSP as Precinct M, coordance with your submission on the Shire's Draft LPS and LPS 3, then it would capacity for up to 6,500 additional dwellings and 18,784 residents. 7 The planning arguments in support of Precinct M were comprehensively lidressed in your LPS/LPS 3 submission and therefore do not need to be repeat this advice. However, in the context of the Draft DSP and the related 'Traditions frastructure' and 'Community Infrastructure' DCPs, it is worth noting the following the first of including Precinct M as a residential expansion area in the Draft DSP: | forecasts/anticipated lots, will be accounted for in the DCP which is to be published within 90 days of gazettal of Amendment 207. | |

| Submitter | No | Submitter Comments | Officer Comment | Officer Recommendation |
|-----------|--|--|---|---------------------------|
| | inco b. 7 sho c. E to t cor urb d. F the or c • M urb • TI G, v e TI pre urb by dist bar stru • Si | The addition of Precinct M would assist in resolving the identified dwelling yiel onsistencies; The addition of Precinct M would address any anticipated dwelling or population of the addition of Precinct M would address any anticipated dwelling or population of the Shire, Precinct in the current Draft DSP and DCPs; Based on the comprehensive assessment included in your previous submission the Shire, Precinct M is more developable, serviceable, accessible, coordinate mercially viable, and less constrained than other DSP areas proposed for panisation. Precinct M would provide a much-needed contingency to achieve urbanisation agreater Mundijong area if development within Precincts A – G does not proceed does not proceed at the rate or density envisaged by the DSP or DCPs. Bour opinion and experience, this is a very real possibility, given the: Bultiple, disparate land ownership throughout the Precincts where most of the and development is proposed. The absence of any Local Structure Planning for Precincts B, C, D, part E, F are which comprise approximately 60% of the total land area of Precincts A – G are proximately 70% of the anticipated dwelling yield. The immense challenges, costs, time delays and complications associated with exparing and adopting Local Structure Plans for most of the DSP's proposed than area. The only way this could practically be achieved is through pre-funding the Shire and recovery of costs via local, Precinct-level DCPs, in addition to the trict and Shire-wide DCPs. This added cost burden would impose a further trice to development of that land, which in turn could jeopardise the urban uncture upon which the entire DSP is premised; and ubstantial environmental, servicing and infrastructure constraints affecting must the existing DSP area. | It is noted that the submitter in essence is requesting Counci to expand the Draft DSP and DCP areas to include the land bounded by Mundijong, King Leipold and Kargotich Roads, Oldbury. The Department of Planning, Lands & Heritage have advised that only the areas currently included in the "Urban Development" zone can be included in the District Structure Planting area to incorporate the area as requested. | |

| Submitter | No | Submitter Comments | Officer Comment | Officer Recommendation |
|-----------|----|---|--|--|
| | | I.8 We note the WMUP shares the same Rural zoning under the Metropolitan R Scheme and the Shire's TPS 2 as DIAs 2 and 3. On this basis, as an interinal alternative approach to including the WMUP in the Draft DSP as a new residerecinct M, the land could instead be designated as a new DIA 4 under the DSP. This would provide WPG with an opportunity and incentive to carry out detailed planning to prove-up the development potential of that area, we prejudicing the zoning or land use outcomes that could arise from that work. Writew, this represents an appropriate and balanced way forward for the Draft Discovery. | also pre-fund some items. It is the intermore thout nour that all items included within the lifetime of the DCP. The Shire | II e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e |
| | : | 2. Draft Mundijong Urban DCP & Amendment 209 to TPS2 (Shire PA18/780) 2.1 The Draft Mundijong Urban DCP proposed by Amendment No. 209 to TP a 'Traditional Infrastructure' DCP with a 20-year operating life. This DCP multiple and in conjunction with the 'Community Infrastructure' DCP proposed Amendment No. 207 to TPS 2, which Council adopted for final approval at its mean 18 May 2020 (OCM110/05/20). The combination of shared costs from both | submissions and further discussions with developers in the area, officers have revised the following | Recommend DCP life, infrastructure inclusions and lot forecasts, be amended in line with the Shire submission at the |

| Submitter | No | Submitter Comments | Officer Comment | Officer Recommendation |
|-----------|--|--|--|---------------------------|
| | Dri 2.2 \$2 the de of 2.3 \$1 op ap de the 2.4 Mu \$2 Sc Ex Co Ac lar | presents the true impact of development contributions on land within the Mundipaft DSP. 2 The 'Traditional Infrastructure' DCP proposed by Amendment No. 209 identions in the Second present of the S | DCP is recommended to be 15 years, rather than 20 years. This will align with the recommendations from the DPLH to reduce the CIDCP life to 15 years; - Population estimates and build out progress have been extensively reviewed through consultation with developers, the Department of Education and review of Forecast ID estimates, in line with the new | |

| Submitter No | ١ | Submitter Comments | Officer Comment | Officer Recommendation |
|--------------|--|--|--|------------------------|
| | Infra 2.6 land \$16 and pote area esti pre Fur for: • cc • re • de | uction, given the stated intent to still include these items in the 'Communication of the property of the above, the development contribution rate applicable divithin Precincts A – G of the Draft Mundijong DSP is expected to range from 5,507 per lot (dwelling) to \$18,257 per lot, depending on the future inclusion, of apportionment of community infrastructure items M03 and S02. This has ential to adversely affect the commercial viability of development within the Da, as the proposed contribution rate is likely to represent around 10% of imated average sale price for lots created in the Draft DSP area, based of vailing average lot price of approximately \$185,000 for a 450m2 lot in Whitby. Thermore, this contribution rate is presented in static terms, and does not account escalation and the value of money over time elays in the progress of development and payment of contributions sk of lot yields not being achieved within the life of the DCP | increase in lots during this period is now anticipated to be 7,200; The development areas occurring within this period are expected to be primarily Whitby | |

| document, and addressed as appropriate within each submission. The anticipated cost per lot for DCA3 is now anticipated to be \$9,576. This figure, including the potential CIDCP payment, aligns with values currently operating in Byford, where the rate of development is currently increasing. It is noted in respect of 2.5, that any future amendment would fall under the provisions of new draft SPP 3.6 which determines the provisions of new draft SPP 3.6 which determines the provisions of new draft SPP 3.6 | Submitter | No | Submitter Comments | Officer Comment | Officer Recommendation |
|--|-----------|----|--------------------|---|---|
| maximum DCP life of 10 years. Since the | | | | addressed as appropriate within each submission. The anticipated cost per lot for DCA3 is now anticipated to be \$9,576. This figure, including the potential CIDCP payment, aligns with values currently operating in Byford, where the rate of development is currently increasing. It is noted in respect of 2.5, that any future amendment would fa under the provisions of new draft SPP 3.1 which determines a maximum DCP life of | f e e l f e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e |

| Submitter N | No | Submitter Comments | Officer Comment | Officer Recommendation |
|-------------|----|--------------------|---|------------------------|
| | | | | Necommendation |
| | | | infrastructure noted is not planned until beyond 2040, such an amendment would not be implemented before that time. It is therefore incorrect to add these costs to the current DCP value(s). It is further noted that the Mundijong Urban DCP reimburses developers for land associated with POS and drainage, which would otherwise be ceded free of charge under Liveable Neighbourhoods. The value of this credit is \$2,569 per lot, and this amount should be deducted from any Contribution totals when assessing the actual cost impost of the contributions. | |

| Submitter | No | Submitter Comments | Officer Comment | Officer Recommendation |
|-----------|---|--|--|--|
| | the a. I De Am ide Se Stip of I nee tha | From our assessment and experience, we have identified the following critical issues two DCPs relating to the Draft Mundijong DSP – Neither the 'Traditional Infrastructure' DCP Report nor the text to be inserted velopment Contribution Area 10C in Appendix 10 of TPS 2 (pursuant nendment No. 209) specify the timing or priority of infrastructure items, other the trifying (in Section 4.1 of the DCP Report) the Town Centre Distributor and Graparation as the sole priority infrastructure item. pulation of infrastructure timing and priority is a mandatory essential requirem. Draft State Planning Policy No. 3.6 (SPP 3.6) – Infrastructure Contributions and eded to provide certainty and confidence to developers and future residents all at the infrastructure items ich contributions are being collected for will actually be delivered in a predictater and timing committed to by Council. | as to this Amendment is prepared, provides that a development contribution plan is to specify the priority and timing for the provision of infrastructure. It is not a requirement or recommendation that such priority be | provision - Officers recommend an Appendix be included in the final DCPs for West Mundijong Industrial and Mundijong Whitby Urban, to detail the agreed project timelines, once defined. |

| Submitter | No | Submitter Comments | Officer Comment | Officer Recommendation |
|-----------|--|--|--|--|
| | dw dw Dra Ba to v \$2' Th the 'Tr sho the Ho yie | As stated in 1.3 earlier in this advice, there are inconsistencies between relling yield and population forecasts stated in the Draft Mundijong DSP (17,5 rellings), Draft Mundijong 'Traditional Infrastructure' DCP (16,746 dwellings), aft 'Community Infrastructure' DCP (16,382 dwellings). Issed on a development contribution rate of \$16,507 per lot (dwelling) this equal varying development contribution incomes of \$290.39 million, \$276.42 million, a 70.41 million, respectively. It is is significant considering the combined value of infrastructure to be funded from the Draft Mundijong DSP (almost entirely from Precincts A – G) is \$286.12 million, and the properties of 16,746 dwellings contained in the Draft Mundijonal Infrastructure' DCP is likely to result in a substantial \$10 million fund ortfall. This shortfall increases to more than \$15 million if the estimated yield from the Draft 'Community Infrastructure' DCP is applied. In the properties of 13,056 dwellings included in your submission on the Shir aft LPS and LPS 3 is applied, resulting in a colossal \$70 million funding deficit. | reconciliation of population and lot forecasts have been addressed previously within this submission. Officers note that this reconciliation will be reflected within both the revised DCP and the revised DSP, noting that the draft DSP extends to full build out at 2050. Officers also note that | Recommend DCP life, infrastructure inclusions and lot forecasts, be amended in line with the Shire submission at the end of this document. |

| Submitter | No | Submitter Comments | Officer Comment | Officer |
|-----------|-----------------|--|---|----------------|
| | | | | Recommendation |
| | | | for populations outside the proposed DCA3. A recommendation has been made within the DSP submission response that the DSP only includes the areas currently included in the "Urban Development" zone. | |
| | | | The anticipated lot yield for the DCA is updated annually to reflect actual build and any changes or additions to included LSP areas, which the Shire believes is the most accurate approach. | |
| | or As wit | The Draft Mundijong 'Traditional Infrastructure' DCP does not include any income expenditure projections to demonstrate infrastructure project funding or cashflos a result, the DCP assumes that all required infrastructure items will be delivered thin the DCP's 20-year lifespan. To do so, any one or more of the following scenarios would need to occur — | W. expenditure | recommended, |

| Submitter | No | Submitter Comments | Officer Comment | Officer Recommendation |
|-----------|---|---|--|---------------------------|
| | end Scoope Scoyea For del Thi dev In 20° cat 5,5 2,7 pro dev alo pro be | enario 1: The Shire would need to pre-fund most of the infrastructure at ormous expense. enario 2: Some infrastructure items would need to be removed from the 20-ye erating period of the DCP for funding and delivery in a separate, subsequent DC enario 3: All development contributions would need to be collected within the 2 ar operating period. r Scenario 3 to occur, the DCP's forecast yield of 16,746 lots would need to livered at an average rate of 837 lots per annum for the next 20 years. is is rather unrealistic when considering the pattern and pace of histori velopment in the Shire, as outlined below. reviewing the Shire's Annual Budgets and Financial Reports from 2014/15 19/20, we note that the total number of rateable properties in all Residential Glategories (Improved, Vacant and Minimum) across the whole Shire increased from 1/22 properties, equating to an average annual increase of 542 rateable residential properties per annum. Hence, to match the DCP's ambitious average annual velopment rate, the production of residential lots within the Draft Mundijong Digner would need to be some 55% greater than the average annual residential objection across the whole Shire for the past five years — and this would need sustained over the next 20 consecutive years. overcome this growth rate challenge, several important and interdependences must be resolved, as follows: | included within the DCP report. The Shire's CEP will be updated to reflect the DCP items at the prevailing CEP revision, once accurate costings and inclusions are available in the 90 day period post gazettal of the amendment The Shire is anticipating that the forecast lots and infrastructure inclusions (as recommended within this response to submissions) will be delivered within the | |

| Submitter No. |) | Submitter Comments | Officer Comment | Officer Recommendation |
|---------------|--|---|--|---------------------------|
| | phy for C Dracor Throexpunt Timprodev Arto subt Timptwo Timp | The District and Neighbourhood Centres proposed in the Draft DSP need to visically created and visible to new buyers, as the amenities are essential attract buyers in a competitive local and district property market. Comprehensive local structure planning will need to be completed for most of aft DSP area, before subdivision or development can occur and before a ntribution will be paid from those areas. The inherent challenges posed by multiple and uncoordinated land owners oughout most of the Draft DCP area will need to be overcome, as history a perience have demonstrated that little or no development will occur in those are all and unless those challenges are successfully resolved; There must be early and coordinated delivery of critical district-level infrastruct a stimulus for accelerated supply of residential lots/dwellings in the great antipong area; There must be a marked increase in demand for the residential product of the posed by the Draft DSP/DCP and it must be commercially feasible for evelopment sector to supply new product to meet or exceed that demand; and diditional developable land must be made available in the greater Mundijong at compensate for the reduction in dwelling yield forecast in your LPS/LP permission; The overall land base from which contributions are collected must increase brove the feasibility of delivering on the infrastructure aspirations contained in a aforementioned DCPs; The additional contributing land referred to in the preceding point must ficiently large, de-constrained, accessible and appealing to the market, courage new development early in the DCPs life. This in turn will gener | other similar urbar areas such as Byford and Baldivis, we do no believe comparing historic data is ar effective forecasting tool. We also note ar additional boost from local governmen housing stimulus measures, and Stage Government projects such as the Tonkir Highway extension Metronet and Westport. The Shire does no underestimate the challenges inherent ir effectively managing such hyper-growth and agrees that many of the issues noted will need to be addressed to facilitate the | |

| Submitter No |) | Submitter Comments | Officer Comment | Officer Recommendation |
|--------------|-------------|---|--|---------------------------|
| | ear In d | yment of requisite development contributions which can then be directed to rely delivery of critical district-level infrastructure. Our opinion, inclusion of the proposed WMUP in the Draft DSP and DCPs we nificantly contribute to resolving the above issues, for the reasons already cove this advice and outlined in your earlier submission on the Shire's Draft LPS/LP | development. uld In order to meet the red forecast population | |

| Submitter | 1 | No | Submitter Comments | Officer Comment | Officer Recommendation |
|-----------|---|----|--------------------|--|---------------------------|
| | | | | represent an effectively planned community, the Shire needs to deliver infrastructure. It is our experience in Byford that, where hyper-growth commenced in 2004, but contribution sharing arrangements did not commence until 2016, we now have significant shortfalls of infrastructure and significant issues to address. This has both delayed the provision of critical facilities, and placed the cost burden of delivering such infrastructure on the ratepayer base, rather than on those who had created the need. It is therefore critical that | |

| Submitter | No | Submitter Comments | | | | | Officer Comment | Officer |
|-----------|------------|--|--------------------------------|-------------------|--------|--------|---|----------------|
| | | | | | | | | Recommendation |
| | | | | | | | we have contribution arrangements in place early, and for the appropriate lifespan, to avoid a repeat of these issues. | |
| | | | | | | | Grant funding and advocacy is an important part of our strategy to assist in reducing the cost within the DCP(s). Grant funding can only be sought for a confirmed project and as such, inclusion within the DCP is critical to the grant application and advocacy process. | |
| | foll DC | Appendix 4 of the Drowing expected popular A 4 in Amendment No | ation growth w 207 to TPS 2 | rithin the 2): | | | | |
| | | 1,979 3,680 6,398 | 12,380 20,961 | 28,007 | 37,421 | 50,000 | developers, the | with the Shire |

| Submitter | No | Submi | itter Con | nments | | | | | | | Officer Comment | Officer Recommendation |
|-----------|-------------------|--|---|---|-----------|---|---|--|-------------------------------------|------------------------------|---|---------------------------|
| | hor are Tab | ousehold rea: able 2 - Expe 2016 684 ncrease from previous period nis clearl OCCUT L | d, this tra ected Lot/Dv 2021 1,273 589 ly illustra until 205 | welling Growt 2026 2,213 940 ates that 51. Desp | to the fo | dijong DCP A 2036 7,252 2,969 l-out of the | ot/dwellir rea 2041 9,691 2,439 ne Draft N | 2046 12,948 3,257 Mundijon onal Infr | 2051 17,301 4,353 g DSP ai | 89 persons p the Draft DS | Education and review of Forecast ID estimates, in line with the new DCP end date of 2034. The anticipated increase in lots during this period is now anticipated to | |

| Submitter | No | | Submitter Comments | Officer Comment | Officer Recommendation |
|-----------|----|--|---|--|-------------------------------|
| | | or I pas cor dist cor the | If the proposed WMUP were incorporated in the Draft DSP as either Precinct DIA 4 then the 6,500 additional lots proposed in that Precinct could (subject saing all relevant need and nexus tests and in accordance with Draft SPP 3 htribute a notional \$2,500/lot for local infrastructure or up to \$3,500/lot where the trict infrastructure is also involved. This would generate additional development income ranging from \$16.25 million to \$22.75 million, thereby increase funding pool for delivery of traditional and community infrastructure items, whence the development contribution rate for all properties in the DSP. | to Planning, Lands &6) Heritage have advised that only the areasent currently included in the "Urban | No modifications recommended. |
| | | and | The absence of a detailed timing and priority schedule for traditional (in particular community infrastructure items under the Draft Mundijong DCPs will invariate rise to the same paradox afflicting most DCPs of this size, scale and 20+ years. | bly this submission it is | provision - Officers |

| Submitter | No | Submitter Comments | Officer Comment | Officer |
|-----------|--|---|---|--|
| | | | | Recommendation |
| | cor infr cre Add this cor G. cor | the horizon, whereby new lots first need to be created to generate development intributions that will eventually fund the new infrastructure, but the new restructure first needs to be delivered to incentivise and cater for the subsequential of new lots. In the proposed WMUP to the Draft Mundijong DSP area will assist in resolves dilemma, as your LPS/LPS 3 submission revealed the area is comparatively least rained and easier to develop than much of the land contained in Precincts and Therefore, the WMUP could serve as an important source of both development in the land rate revenue to assist in managing prefunded infrastructure ited DCP cashflow. | timing and priority within the official DCP produced within 90 days of gazettal of the Amendment. A - ent | included in the final DCPs for West Mundijong Industrial |
| | pla a \$1, \$1, b. 7 WM out c. 7 mill in it | 0 While it is acknowledged that future rates income is not a determining factor anning decisions, it deserves to be noted that — The Minimum Residential GRV rate adopted by Council in its 2020/21 Budge, 276 per rateable property, while the average Residential GRV rate equates 764 per rateable property. The estimated yield of 6,500 dwellings (i.e. rateable properties) from the proposed MUP translates into an estimated annual rates revenue for the Shire (at full but) ranging from \$8.29 million — \$11.46 million. This potential rate revenue from the proposed WMUP is (only) approximately lion less than the Shire's total forecast Residential rates revenue of \$13.52 million to 2020/21 Budget. The would urge the Shire to give detailed consideration to the matters raised in the vice if there is to be any prospect of achieving the infrastructure goals. | DCP are that those driving the growth, pay for the associated infrastructure required as a result of the growth. It is not appropriate that the ratepayer fund such infrastructure. | recommended. |

| Submitter | No | Submitter Comments | Officer Comment | Officer Recommendation |
|--|--|--|-----------------|---------------------------|
| | url I w Sh Plo yo Yo | evelopment aspirations and population targets proposed for the broader Mundijournation and the Shire as a whole. I would welcome the opportunity to discuss any aspect of this advice with you or nire. The ease do not hesitate to contact me on 0439 044 967 or len@lkadvisory.com.a but have any queries whatsoever regarding this matter. The pours sincerely, LEN KOSOVA | the | |
| Peter Webb & Associates IN20/18800 | The whole site so the site state of the site sta | e: Submission on the draft (revised) Mundijong Urban District Structure an and Amendment No. 209 on behalf of DJM Mundijong Pty Ltd nis is to advise that we act for DJM Mundijong Pty Ltd (DJMM), the Company nich owns Lots 11 to 14 Keirnan Street, Mundijong. These landholdings are truated at the north western corner of the intersection of Keirnan Street and oldiers Road, Mundijong. The subject landholdings are located within the bundaries defined as being subject to the draft District Structure Plan: Mundijon (DSP) and proposed Amendment No. 209 to Town Planning Scheme No. (PS 2) and the accompanying Development Contribution Plan (DCP). The DSF mendment No. 209 and the DCP are currently the subject of an extended divertising period, which is scheduled to close on 31 August 2020. nis submission is lodged on behalf of DJMM as part of this formal advertising ocess. ne Council of the Shire would be aware that DJMM had submitted a Local rructure Plan (LSP) on 12 July 2019 for Sub-Precinct G, following an extensive e-consultation process with Shire's Technical Officers on 12 June 2019. | 2 | |

| Submitter | No | Submitter Comments | Officer Comment | Officer Recommendation |
|-----------|--|---|-------------------------|---|
| | inc rev the DS be ou act In as De the sat | council resolved to approve a modified boundary for the land required to be cluded in the LSP. Following that resolution, DJMM has invested considerably vising all of the technical documentation to respond to the approved boundary e LSP and in accordance with the endorsed Mundijong-Whitby DSP and the dispersion of the LSP has now been resubmitted to the Shire and has recently the formally accepted, with the advertising process now underway. We extend a rappreciation to the Shire's Planning Department for its efficient response and the interest of the progressing the LSP to the formal advertising process. Independent of the draft DSP as we highlighting our concern over some of the infrastructure items listed in the evelopment Contribution Area 10C – Mundijong Urban in Amendment 209 and the accompanying DCP for DCA3, which is considered in many ways to not extisfactorily meet the fundamental principles of the WAPC SPP 3.6 – evelopment Contributions for Infrastructure and the seriously entertained draft vised SPP 3.6 (SPP 3.6). | for aft I rell | |
| | Th Mu Th str It is wh Th the | Draft District Structure Plan: Mundijong Urban ne land forms part of the area defined in the draft DSP as 'LSP Area G — undijong North'. ne recently submitted LSP for Sub-Precinct G2 is consistent with the broader rategic framework identified in the draft DSP. is however noted that the DSP Map at Figure 1 illustrates a road network layou nich is inconsistent with the road upgrade map included in the DCP for DCA3. nis includes inconsistencies with the District Distributor road network, noting the eDSP Map does not include the Skyline Boulevard and Tinspar Avenue annection. These inconsistencies will presumably result in the WAPC being | the Skyline/Bishop | Recommend that Skyline Boulevard be amended on DCP road map, costs and text within the Mundijong Whithy Urban DCP |

| Submitter | No | Submitter Comments | Officer Comment | Officer |
|-----------|-----|---|---|--|
| | | | | Recommendation |
| | for | Amendment 209 to the currently operative Town Planning Scheme No. 2 and the Development Contribution Plan – Mundijong Urban | n. in the relevant DSP and DCP documents, however it is noted that if recommendations made within the Shire submission are accepted, there is no need and nexus within the DCA, for the portion of Skyline currently identified north of the Town Centre Distributor Road. It is therefore recommended that the DCP costs reflect only the portion of Skyline between Tinspar Avenue and the Town Centre Distributor road. | Tinspar Avenue and the Town Centre Distributor road. |

| Submitter N | o | Submitter Comments | Officer Comment | Officer Recommendation |
|-------------|---|--|--|--|
| | - the base of the tree of the | ne lack of commitment to seeking alternative funding sources so as to relieve to rden of requiring these costs to be paid by the current active developers in this reation. DCP lifespan exceeds the recommendations of the current and draft SPF | Officers note the concern regarding the lifespan of this Mundijong Development Contribution Plar (DCP). As required under the transitional arrangements of draff SPP 3.6, this Amendment (being prepared prior to | life, infrastructure inclusions and lot forecasts, be amended in line with the Shire submission at the end of this document. |

| Submitter | No | Submitter Comments | Officer Comment | Officer Recommendation |
|-----------|----------------------|--|---|---------------------------|
| | per be to starear Th | d of 2020) to have a maximum lifespan of 10 years. Extensions to that time riod are only supported in limited circumstances, should reasonable justification demonstrated. There is no justification evident in the advertised documentation support such an extension of the lifespan of this DCP. The Amendment proposal and the current DCP therefore must be revised to clude only the infrastructure needed to support the demand generated by the pulation anticipated to be residing in this location within ten (10) years of the DCP being formally introduced. The specific proposal and the Current DCP therefore must be revised to clude only the infrastructure needed to support the demand generated by the pulation anticipated to be residing in this location within ten (10) years of the DCP being formally introduced. The proposal the Shire cannot commit to deliver within the ten (10) years of the DCP being accordance to the commit to the included in the DCP but rather introduced where at need is clearly demonstrated. The DCP is required to be reviewed annually and therefore infrastructure items of added in consultation with the major stakeholders as the Shire reaches the age of being able to commit to the delivery of that particular infrastructure withing asonable timeframe. The current proposed DCP therefore does not satisfactorily meet the principles of the delivery and certainty. | SPP 3.6 2009 does not mandate a lifespan of a DCP and makes provision for 5 yearly reviews to occur for any DCP with a life exceeding 10 years. Notwithstanding the above, officers note that, as a result of the submissions and further discussions with developers in the area, officers have revised the following | |

| Submitter | No | Submitter Comments | Officer Comment | Officer |
|-----------|----|--------------------|--|----------------|
| | | | | Recommendation |
| | | | recommendations from the DPLH to reduce the CIDCP life to 15 years; - Population estimates and build out progress have been extensively reviewed through consultation with developers, the Department of Education and review of Forecast ID estimates, in line with the new DCP end date of 2034. The anticipated increase in lots during this period is now anticipated to be 7,200; - The development areas occurring | |

| Submitter | No | Submitter Comments | Officer Comment | Officer |
|-----------|----|--------------------|--|----------------|
| | | | | Recommendation |
| | | | within this period are expected to be primarily Whitby and the western edge of the DCA3; The revised anticipated population and growth areas, have substantially reduced the need for provision of DOS and the extent of road upgrades, which are detailed within the Shire's submission at the end of this document, and addressed as appropriate within each submission. It is noted that Infrastructure items | |

| Submitter | No | Submitter Comments | Officer Comment | Officer Recommendation |
|-----------|--------------------|---|--|---|
| | | | can only be added or amended through a Major Amendment to the town planning scheme. They cannot be implemented through the Annua Review process. | |
| | 1 | Infrastructure Items, Land and Other Items Road Network Upgrades DCP Map | The Traffic Impact | inclusions and lot forecasts, be amended in line with the Shire submission at the end of this |
| | Th im | e inclusion of road upgrades in the DCP must be based on justification that the provements are required as a direct result of the increased demand generated the anticipated population using the identified road network. | traffic volumes only up | |
| | tha the | could these roads be forecast to accommodate low volumes significantly less can what typically defines the function and characteristics of the identified route, can the inclusion of the required upgrades is questionable in terms of satisfying a principle of need and the nexus. | projects these volumes to 2040 (the completion of the DCP). | |
| | the and in s | e DCP states that it includes a number of local roads requiring upgrades, as ese roads are described as 'local roads playing a district function'. However, the ticipated traffic volumes included in the accompanying traffic modelling does not some instances reflect the function that this road is identified as performing. erefore, the need for the upgrade is not clearly established. | Further to the Shire submission to reduce the DCP infrastructure in line with a 15 year DCP and revised | |
| | As | r example, there are a number of roads identified in the Traffic Impact sessment (TIA) prepared by Cardno (June 2020) with a recommended road erarchy function characteristic of 'Integrator B'. These roads are defined in | population projections many of the road network items are | |

| Submitter | No | Submitter Comments | Officer Comment | Officer Recommendation |
|-----------|--|--|---|----------------------------------|
| | 7,0 TIA fun The | reable Neighbourhoods as having an indicative traffic volume ranging between 200 and 15,000 vehicles per day (vpd). The estimated capacity identified in the A is far less than what is typically considered as a road performing this district action. e current proposed DCP therefore does not satisfactorily meet the principle of ed and the nexus. | | |
| | At properties of the propertie | 2020 TIA: Table 3-1 summary and recommended road reservation widths. Table 3-1 of the updated TIA, the forecast daily traffic volumes on the roads oposed to be modified are identified. We provide the following comments in gard to the recommended road reservation widths identified in the TIA and the rastructure items included in the DCP report. e following comments also refer to the independent review of the itemised stings included in the DCP undertaken by Cossill & Webley (C&W). A copy of the itemised costing spreadsheet is attached to this submission. | | |
| | So 203 | Soldiers Road: Idiers Road is identified as carrying an estimated traffic volume of 9082 vpd in 31 in the TIA. The recommended road hierarchy classification is identified as eighbourhood Connector A'. | As noted above, the TIA extends to 2031 and volumes have been forecasted beyond that point. | recommend removal of Paterson |

| Submitter | No | Submitter Comments | Officer Comment | Officer Recommendation |
|-----------|---|---|--|---|
| | roared bey TIA Par giv mo Sh ach with envious The wie | e recommended road reserve width is 20m, which is the current width of the ad reserve. The DCP item listed for Paterson/Soldiers Road states that land is quired to achieve a 30m wide road reserve. This requirement for widening yond the existing 20m is not substantiated through the accompanying current A. terson/Soldiers Road therefore does not appear to be required to be widened en the supporting technical TIA does not provide evidence to support such addifications as being needed to accommodate the forecasted population at the int when 'built-out' of the area has been achieved. Notwithstanding this, the intervolution of the significant restriction of physically being capable of hieving any such widening of this carriageway due to the vegetation contained hin the reservation on both sides of the roadway. This vegetation has significat vironmental value, being protected within Bush Forever Site 365 and described a 'Flora Road' by the Shire. e costs associated with road widening should therefore be removed. addition to the inability and lack of substantiated need for the road to be dened, the review undertaken by C&W confirms that the costs identified be Shire in the DCP for the upgrades proposed to this road reserve are bestantially inflated by approximately \$1.59M. | must be provided in support of a newly gazetted Amendment, within 90 days of the gazettal. | Amendment and Mundijong Whitby Urban DCP costs, map and text. |

| Submitter | No | Submitter Comments | Officer Comment | Officer Recommendation |
|-----------|---|--|--|--|
| | Th Th an the Bi te In an | Bishop Road (East): ne DCP states that this road is to be widened to a minimum of 35.6m. ne TIA states that the recommended width for this road in order to accommodate estimated 7983 vpd in 2031 is 30m. The inconsistency between the DCP and the supporting TIA is a major concern. Presumably, the costs for the upgrading shop Road (east) should reflect the recommended width listed in the supporting chnical documentation. addition, the review by C&W has identified that the costings included in the DC e significantly higher than the current rates. This has resulted in the DCP cost e Bishop Road upgrade being substantially inflated, by \$555,648.00. | been forecasted beyond that point. Officers note that Bishop Road will require a reserve of | Bishop Road – recommend removal of Bett Road to Soldiers Road portion of the upgrade and road reserve identified at 30m within the Amendment and Mundijong Whitby Urban DCP costs, map and text. |

| Submitter | No | Submitter Comments | Officer Comment | Officer Recommendation |
|-----------|----|--------------------|---|---------------------------|
| | | | Mundijong Urban DCP funded portion of this project, extend from the Tonkin Highway reserve to Bett Road only. | |
| | | | In respect of costs identified, SPP 3.6 provides that a DCP must be provided in support of a newly gazetted Amendment, within 90 days of the gazettal. Infrastructure items or inclusions still require detailed design and costing, which will be completed during the 90 day window. | |
| | | | The Shire is of the opinion that it is an inefficient use of developer funds to undertake this level of detail for projects which may not | |

| Submitter | No | Submitter Comments | Officer Comment | Officer Recommendation |
|-----------|---|---|---|--|
| | The receive the second | Taylor Road/Adams Street The road width identified for Adams Street is 30m which is consistent with the TI commendation. The need for a 30m wide road reserve is however questioned, noting in particular is forecast traffic volumes identified in the TIA and also the fact that a local centro to be developed at the intersection with Keirnan Street. The noted that Adams Street is identified as performing an 'Integrator B' road inction, notwithstanding that this road is forecast to only carry approximately 3,6 and by 2031. Similarly, Taylor Road is identified as carrying approximately 5,96 and by 2031 and is also identified as performing an 'Integrator B' road function. I could therefore appear that the function of Taylor Road/Adams Street is actually tended to perform a Neighbourhood Connector A and/or B role in the road setwork. The local centre is no interesting the intersection with Kiernan Street. The local centre is no inger identified as being required at the intersection of Taylor Road and Kiernar reet. It has been shifted further north to the intersection of Taylor Road with the local centre Distributor Road. The urge the Shire to review the costs associated with the upgrading of Taylor and recommended road reserve width. | and volumes have been forecasted beyond that piont. Officers note that Taylor Road / Adams Street will require a consistent reserve of 30m now that the local centre has been relocated. Further to the Shire submission to reduce the DCP infrastructure in line with a 15 year DCP and revised population projections, it has been recommended that the Mundijong Urban DCP | Taylor Road / Adams Street — recommend removal of Adams Street upgrade and references to the local centre, and that the road reserve be identified at 30m within the Amendment and Mundijong Whitby Urban DCP costs, map and text. |

| Submitter | No | Submitter Comments | Officer Comment | Officer Recommendation |
|-----------|----|--|---|---------------------------|
| | | addition, the cost review undertaken by C&W has identified a discrepancy of 43,425.00. | of this project, be removed. In respect of costs identified, SPP 3.6 provides that a DCP must be provided in support of a newly gazetted Amendment, within 90 days of the gazettal. Infrastructure items or inclusions still require detailed design and costing, which will be completed during the 90 day window. The Shire is of the opinion that it is an inefficient use of developer funds to undertake this level of detail for projects which may not ultimately be approved and included. | |

| Submitter | No | Submitter Comments | Officer Comment | Officer Recommendation |
|-----------|------------------|---|---|--|
| | The roa The to 3 | Mundijong East/Watkins Road e required road width for Mundijong Road is inconsistent with the recommended at width identified in the TIA. The road width is recommended at 30m in the Tie DCP report states that the road width will typically be 25m wide and expanded 35m in width between Kargotich Road and Paterson Street. e inconsistencies between the TIA and the DCP items creates uncertainty and list be resolved prior to the Amendment and DCP being adopted and forwarded the WAPC with a supportive recommendation. e also note that the C&W review has identified a cost discrepancy in the order 65,394.00. | A. and volumes have been forecasted beyond that point. Officers note that Mundijong Road East/Watkins Road will require a consistent | recommend removal of this project from the Amendment and Mundijong Whitby Urban DCP costs, map and text. |
| | g) [.] | Town Centre Distributor Road (New Whitby Road) | As noted above, the TIA extends to 2031 and volumes have | Distributor Road – |

| Submitter | No | Submitter Comments | Officer Comment | Officer Recommendation |
|-----------|----------|---|-----------------|--|
| | Th be | ne road width requirements are again inconsistent in the TIA and the DCP reported level of uncertainty created by these inconsistencies is concerning and must enaddressed. The enable is a cost discrepancy of \$1.59M. The enable is a cost discrepancy of \$1.59M. | | identified at 30m within the Amendment and Mundijong Whitby Urban DCP costs, map and text. |

| Submitter | No | Submitter Comments | Officer Comment | Officer Recommendation |
|-----------|----|--|---|---|
| | | North-South Road e C&W cost review has identified a discrepancy of \$916,916.00. | which may not ultimately be approved and included. Officers note that North-South Road will require a consistent reserve of 30m. Further to the Shire submission to reduce the DCP infrastructure in line with a 15 year DCP and revised population projections, it has been recommended that this project be amended to include only the section between Watkins Road and Galvin Road. In respect of costs identified, SPP 3.6 provides that a DCP must be provided in support of a newly gazetted Amendment, | North South Spine Road – recommend removal of the upgrade portion north of Galvin Road, and that the road reserve be identified at 30m within the Amendment and Mundijong Whitby Urban DCP costs, map and text. |

| Submitter | No | Submitter Comments | Officer Comment | Officer Recommendation |
|-----------|--------------------|---|--|---|
| | | | within 90 days of the gazettal. Infrastructure items or inclusions still require detailed design and costing, which will be completed during the 90 day window. | |
| | | | The Shire is of the opinion that it is an inefficient use of developer funds to undertake this level of detail for projects which may not ultimately be approved and included. | |
| | E tr 'I T | Galvin Road New (Evelyn Street/Galvin Road/Kiernan Street) Evelyn Street and Galvin Road are both identified in the TIA with relatively low raffic volume forecasts, being well below the identified function of these roads as ntegrator B'. This leads to question as to whether the extent of upgrades proposed are based demand generated by the population intended to reside in this location. We also note that the C&W review has identified a discrepancy of \$1.05M. | been forecasted | recommend removal of this project from within the Amendment and Mundijong Whitby Urban DCP costs, map and text. |

| Submitter | No | Submitter Comments | Officer Comment | Officer Recommendation |
|-----------|-------------------------------|---|---|---|
| | Th the Th wid inv | Skyline Boulevard The recommended width identified in the TIA and the proposed width included in the DCP are inconsistent. The TIA recommends a width of 25m. The DCP report states that the minimum of this road is to be 30m. There is no connection between the technical vestigation and the DCP. The C&W cost review has identified a discrepancy of \$458,748. | DCP and revised population projections, it has been recommended that this project be removed from the DCP and the Amendment. Officers note that this Road will require a consistent reserve of 25m. Further to the Shire submission to reduce the DCP infrastructure in line with a 15 year DCP and revised population projections, it has been recommended that this project be amended to include only the section between Tinspar Avenue and Town Centre Distributor Road. | Skyline Boulevard – recommend removal of the upgrade portion north of Town Centre Distributor Road, and that the road reserve be identified at 25m within the Amendment and Mundijong Whitby Urban DCP costs, map and text. |

| Submitter | 1 | No | Submitter Comments | Officer Comment | Officer Recommendation |
|-----------|---|-----|---|---|---------------------------|
| | | | | In respect of costs identified, SPP 3.6 provides that a DCP must be provided in support of a newly gazetted Amendment, within 90 days of the gazettal. Infrastructure items or inclusions still require detailed design and costing, which will be completed during the 90 day window. | |
| | | | | The Shire is of the opinion that it is an inefficient use of developer funds to undertake this level of detail for projects which may not ultimately be approved and included. | |
| | | Aga | Finspar Avenue ain, the discrepancy between the TIA and the DCP report in regard to the ommended road width creates uncertainty. | As noted above, the TIA extends to 2031 and volumes have | recommend that the |

| Submitter | No | Submitter Comments | Officer Comment | Officer Recommendation |
|-----------|----------------------------------|---|--|---|
| | 203 Co The It is inc | e TIA states that Tinspar Avenue is likely to have a forecast traffic volume in 31 of 12,771 vpd and that it will perform the function of a Neighbourhood innect A. The recommended width of this road is 25m. e DCP states that the minimum width for this road is to be 30m. s unclear as to why there is such a significant variation which results in an creased cost for the DCP. e C&W cost review has identified a discrepancy of \$1.6M. | been forecasted beyond that point. Officers note that this Road will require a consistent reserve of 25m. In respect of costs identified, SPP 3.6 provides that a DCP must be provided in support of a newly gazetted Amendment, within 90 days of the gazettal. Infrastructure items or inclusions still require detailed design and costing, which will be completed during the 90 day window. The Shire is of the opinion that it is an inefficient use of developer funds to undertake this level of detail for projects | within the Amendment and Mundijong Whitby Urban DCP costs, map and text |

| Submitter | No | Submitter Comments | Officer Comment | Officer Recommendation |
|-----------|------------------------------------|--|---|------------------------------|
| | Th su Pr Ro re as | Intersection Treatments – South West Highway ne proposed intersection treatments with South West Highway are considered ab-regional infrastructure items. This is because the South West Highway is a rimary Regional Road, which is a major road under the care and control of Main bads WA. Alternative funding sources for all intersection treatments with the gional road network therefore must be sought and a contribution amount assigned to MRWA in the DCP. The current proposed DCP therefore does not attisfactorily meet the principle of equity. | which may not ultimately be approved and included. The cost of new road intersections into an existing MRWA road are at the cost of the developer. MRWA will only fund intersections from adjoining roads where the Primary Regional Road is being newly built and required to connect at that time. | No modifications recommended |
| | Th fre ful go Th as | ne inclusion of the grade separated crossings (which are road crossings over a height and regional transport rail line) should not be included in the DCP. The inding for these works falls under the responsibility of the state, not the local overnment and/or the developers of land contained within DCA3. The requirement for developers within the DCA3 to bear the burden of the costs associated with constructing this significant regional infrastructure is unjustified. This argument is particularly pertinent on review of the most recent updated TIA. The TIA states that the mesoscopic model identifies that all of the existing | Officers agree that grade separated crossings should not be included in the DCP. | Recommend |

| Submitter | No | Submitter Comments | Officer Comment | Officer |
|-----------|------------------|--|---|----------------|
| | | | | Recommendation |
| | Th | ersections will operate at an acceptable level of service for the 2031 scenario. e TIA further assesses the proposed intersection forms and confirms that the ersections will also be sufficient to accommodate future growth. | | |
| | as exi sur | e updated TIA therefore confirms that the proposed development of Mundijon an urban area will not generate the demand for grade-separated crossings. Is sting at-grade crossings are operational and are confirmed as being capable opporting the demand generated by the additional traffic volumes attributed to the creased population residing in this location. | he of | |
| | Alt | y need for these crossings is therefore a sub-regional infrastructure item. ernative funding sources by the state government is therefore required to be ught for these particular items. | | |
| | | e therefore request that the infrastructure item and the costs associated with the de-separated crossings are removed from the DCP. | ne | |
| | | e current proposed DCP therefore does not satisfactorily meet the principles of and the nexus and equity. | of | |
| | 3. | Land for Road Reserves | Officers agree. Deta | il |
| | inc | noted above, the required upgrades for the road reserves listed under the DC clude widths above 20m, which additional widths do not correlate with the commended road widths included at Table 3-1 of the recently prepared TIA. | P and recommendation relating to this included in the abov | s s e |
| | and pos Sh | e recommended widths identified in the TIA are presumably the most current d therefore the DCP report should be adjusted accordingly. This will have a sitive reductive impact on the costs included in the DCP, which will assist the ire in ensuring urban development becomes a viable option for those downers eager to progress land development. | points an summarised in th table of road width which is included in th Shire submission a | e s e |

| Submitter | No | Submitter Comments | Officer Comment | Officer Recommendation |
|-----------|--------------------|--|--|---------------------------|
| | of t ina nev | ate and Federal funding, reserve funds and grants. The current DCP expects a the infrastructure to be funded through the DCP. This approach is considered appropriate and not in the best interests of encouraging the development of this w urban community in Mundijong. The current proposed DCP therefore does not satisfactorily meet the principle of uity. | that the provision of DOS be reduced within the DCP. | |

| Submitter | No | Submitter Comments | Officer Comment | Officer Recommendation |
|-----------|----|--------------------|--|---------------------------|
| | | | The capital costs included in the DCP for Shared Use DOS include for one oval, and the land costs being shared between the SUA parties. | |
| | | | This approach reflects some saving in the DCP for the SUA, but importantly, balances the risk that an SUA may not be achieved. | |
| | | | Any future cost savings from a SUA agreement, will be reflected in the Annual DCP update. | |
| | | | Grant funding and advocacy is an important part of our strategy to assist in reducing the cost within the DCP(s). Grant funding can only be sought for a | |

| Submitter | No | Submitter Comments | Officer Comment | Officer Recommendation |
|-----------|--|--|---|-------------------------------|
| | The received three implications and the second terms of the second | Water Quality Management The justification for the inclusion of this administrative item is stated as being equired to be funded by the developers rather than by the local government rough other avenues does not directly relate to the preparation and plementation of the DCP. The DCP report states that the water monitoring dertaken is a requirement of the Mundijong-Whitby District Water Management an. The direct linkage to the undertaking of this monitoring as part of the andard infrastructure items included in the DCP is not established. Other fundirechanisms must be explored and adopted for this post development water conitoring program. The developers in Mundijong are required to undertake dependent pre and post water monitoring investigations as part of the more stailed local structure planning and subdivision approval processes for their own adholdings. The current proposed DCP therefore does not satisfactorily meet the principle of juity and accountability. | Water Monitoring is required because, without it, we are unable to support development of the | No modifications recommended. |
| | _ | Administration Costs and DSP revision determination under deemed ovisions | The preparation of the scheme and the management thereof | recommended. |

| Submitter | No | Submitter Comments | Officer Comment | Officer |
|-----------|--|--|--|----------------|
| | | | | Recommendation |
| | of the First Plant Me essential the local area (a) draw from the cost of the c | e question the appropriateness of attributing the costs of the review and update the Mundijong District Structure Plan as an item included in the DCP. stly, we note that the Shire is required to prepare and update District Structure and for areas identified for urban and/or industrial development in the South etropolitan Peel Sub Regional Framework (WAPC). A DSP forms part of the sential overarching planning framework for a local government area. The DS is higher-level strategic plan which informs the preparation of the more detailed at structure plans (LSPs) over landholdings within the DSP area, which LSPs is undertaken by individual landowners and/or developers. The costs of viewing the endorsed DSP is therefore the administrative responsibility of the all government and not a cost included in the DCP. Section 2.7 – Administration Items of the DCP report, it is stated that the pended and future costs involved with planning studies including (but not limit the Mundijong District Structure Plan and amendments, traffic studies and ainage studies are included in the DCP. These costs are associated with the exparation of the DSP and are therefore outside of the scope of the administrations able to be included in a DCP, as specified at Schedule 4 of the draft SPP is included in the DCP. esee costs are described at Schedule 4 of SPP 3.6 (draft) as being those whice ectly relate to the preparation and implementation of the DCP, including: Costs to prepare and review DCP cost estimates; costs to prepare and review DCP cost estimates; costs for undertaking valuations for DCP; | the planning process and therefore need to be included in the scheme costs Municipal funds should not be used to subsidise specific development and new residents. ed ion 3.6. | |

| Submitter | No | Submitter Comments | Officer Comment | Officer |
|-----------|------------------|--|-----------------|----------------|
| | | | | Recommendation |
| | | ees for professional services directly linked to the preparation and plementation of the DCP (e.g. legal and accounting fees); | | |
| | | costs for computer software and/or hardware upgrades necessary to enable Deparation; | CP | |
| | - P | roportion of staff salaries directly related to DCP administration; | | |
| | _ | inancial institution fees and charges associated with the administration of DCI | | |
| | | nterest charged on loans taken out to pre-fund items included in the DCP stablished based on lending rates at the time DCP is prepared). | | |
| | adı pre | e therefore object in the strongest possible terms to the inclusion of ministration costs of the Shire which are noted in the DCP report as including eparation and revisions to the DSP and which date back to 2011 (i.e. costs what to back to almost a decade ago). | | |
| | ind sta by | condly, at Section 1.1 – Background of the DCP Report, the Shire appears to licating the following justification as a means for attributing the costs of the andard required review of the 2011 endorsed Whitby-Mundijong DSP, to the D stating that the DSP is prepared in accordance with Provision 1 of Development 1 and Development Area 2 of the Shire's Town Planning Scheme No. 2. | CP | |
| | De | a District Structure Plan, it is not being prepared or determined under the emed Provisions of the Scheme. Rather, it is being considered in accordance that the specific Development Area provisions. | ; | |
| | | e proposed 2020 Council Approved Mundijong District Structure Plan (CAMDS an informing, relevant and strategic document that enables the consideration a | | е |

| Submitter | No | Submitter Comments | Officer Comment | Officer |
|-----------|--|--|--|----------------|
| | | | | Recommendation |
| | fall Thi De Re We Pla Pla rev acc the Mir rev and the inte pla pro ope is in | ercising of discretion for Structure Plans and Local Development Plans, which I under the auspices of the deemed provision.' is is an incorrect interpretation of the Schedule 2, Part 4 - Structure Plans of the semed Provisions of Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) ingulations 2015. The are concerned over the statement in the DCP report that a District Structure are in so not a document prepared or determined under the deemed provisions of anning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015. The view of the DSP is considered a 'structure plan' and is required to be prepared coordance with the deemed provisions. This has previously been recognised be Shire in formal Council Minutes. In particular, we refer to the previous Council and 17 December 2018) which clearly states that the DSP view has been drafted in accordance with the deemed provisions of the Planning Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015. As such, follow a adoption of the DSP by the Council of the Shire, the revised DSP is presume ended to be sent to the WAPC for endorsement, in accordance with proper anning process. Should the revised DSP not be endorsed by the WAPC, poposed Amendment No. 209 which seeks to introduce DCA 3 to the currently erative TPS 2 is also presumably unable to be supported in its current form, an inconsistent with the endorsed Mundijong-Whitby DSP. The ecurrent proposed DCP therefore does not satisfactorily meet the principles of the dand the nexus, equity, transparency and accountability. | will be addressed within the DSP submission responses. the in y sill mg ng lbly | |
| | The | Independent Review of Costings e independent review of the infrastructure costings undertaken by C&W has timated that the costs are inflated by a staggering \$8 million. The DCP is | This statement in regards to provision of costings required to be | recommended. |

| Submitter | No | Submitter Comments | Officer Comment | Officer Recommendation |
|-----------|-------------------------------|--|---------------------------------------|---------------------------|
| | sch up als acc Th | quired to be submitted to the WAPC with an accurate and up to date cost hedule. We therefore request that the Shire adjust the costings to reflect the dated information provided and in addition to that reduction in cost of \$8 millio so remove the infrastructure items not able to be justified as being required in accordance with the fundamental principles of SPP 3.6. The current proposed DCP therefore does not satisfactorily meet the principles of guity and accountability. | included within the Scheme Amendment. | |

| Submitter | No | Submitter Comments | Officer Comment | Officer Recommendation |
|-----------|----|--------------------|---|------------------------|
| | | | It is noted that the submitter has queried some cost inclusions of infrastructure throughout its submission (intersections with MRWA roads, road reserve widths and land associated with road reserves). It is therefore difficult to assess whether the costings are like-forlike in respect of inclusions and contingencies, to be able to provide further comment. | |
| | | | Officers would welcome the submitter providing copies of the costings undertaken. It is possible, if more detailed than current DCP costings, that these can be used to | |

| Submitter | No | Submitter Comments | Officer Comment | Officer Recommendation |
|-----------|--|--|--|-------------------------------|
| | It is DC necessary and cost info to the cost and the co | The lack of apportionment is stated in the draft SPP 3.6 Guidelines that 'costs that cannot be included in the CP (existing demand and future development beyond the lifespan of the DCP) ared to be funded from alternative sources such as local government rates, Stated Federal Funding, reserve funds and grants.' order to ensure the principles of need and the nexus and equity are upheld, the sts must be apportioned by all those that generate the need for each item of trastructure. This includes the existing community and any users outside of the CA area. The request that the Shire undertake the necessary review to determine the external which the infrastructure is required to be apportioned, as it is inequitable to sign the total cost to the future residential population of Mundijong Urban (DCA). The current proposed DCP therefore does not satisfactorily meet the principles of the current proposed DCP therefore does not satisfactorily meet the principles of the current proposed DCP therefore does not satisfactorily meet the principles of the current proposed DCP therefore does not satisfactorily meet the principles of the current proposed DCP therefore does not satisfactorily meet the principles of the current proposed DCP therefore does not satisfactorily meet the principles of the current proposed DCP therefore does not satisfactorily meet the principles of the current proposed DCP therefore does not satisfactorily meet the principles of the current proposed DCP therefore does not satisfactorily meet the principles of the current proposed DCP therefore does not satisfactorily meet the principles of the current proposed DCP therefore does not satisfactorily meet the principles of the current proposed DCP therefore does not satisfactorily meet the principles of the current proposed DCP therefore does not satisfactorily meet the principles of the current proposed DCP therefore does not satisfactorily meet the DCP and D | required as a direct result of growth within the DCA. There is therefore no requirement to apportion such infrastructure. Officers recognise that such an apportionment occurred within the CIDCP, however that was in recognition that | No modifications recommended. |

| Submitter | No | Submitter Comments | Officer Comment | Officer Recommendation |
|-----------|---|--|--|--|
| | A relation | Priority Infrastructure requirement of the SPP 3.6 is that it is important to determine and specify in the anning Scheme and the DCP the priority and estimated timing of delivery for ich infrastructure item. The text of the proposed amendment to the current Planning Scheme states under the heading of 'priority and timing of infrastructure provision': 'refer development intribution plan report (as revised from time to time)'. The DCP does not indicate a time period for any of the infrastructure required to be a priority infrastructure is stated that the infrastructure will be delivered on an 'as seeds' basis. The priority infrastructure is then identified in the DCP report as being the 'Town entre Distributor' and the 'Grade Separation'. The reasons for these two particulars being priorities is questionable and not explained in the DCP report. The absence of the timeframes on the delivery of each infrastructure item does not instructure item to see the SPP 3.6 principles of need and the nexus, certainty and incountability. | DCP/Amendment is gazetted, a DCP report must be produced within 90 days. At this time, when the DCP infrastructure inclusions are known the Shire will work with the Byford Industry Reference group to inform a submission to Council as to the order and timing of | Timeline of provision - Officers recommend an Appendix be included in the final DCPs for West Mundijong Industrial and Mundijong Whitby Urban, to detail the agreed project timelines, once defined. |

| Submitter | No | Submitter Comments | Officer Comment | Officer Recommendation |
|-----------|------------|--|--|------------------------|
| | Th C8 infi | b. The estimated per lot contribution is \$13,057.00. It is cost is not reflective of the current rates, as demonstrated in the attached as worstings review of the current market rates associated with each rastructure item. It is local government perception (in general) seems to be that these contribution sts are not significant in terms of profit margins for developers. This is not an curate assumption. The current per lot contribution will have a dire impact on the illity for developers to invest in this location as urban development and the cost sociated with construction of the subdivision will become an unviable option in eleting the objective of 'housing affordability'. IMM is eager to progress development in Mundijong. A Local Structure Plan for ab-Precinct G2 has just recently been formally accepted by the Shire for sessment and is now proceeding through the advertising process. The inclusion of the costs as proposed are currently unreasonable and will impact thousing affordability in this area. Should the costs not be refined to satisfy the inciples of SPP 3.6, it will have a significant impact on the ability for DJMM to be alled to progress to the construction of the intended urban development of its indholdings. The current proposed DCP therefore does not satisfactorily meet the principles of unity and certainty. | C&W without the ability to review the cost inclusions. That said, it is accepted that the costs currently provided are high level, and subject to more detailed costing within the 90 day from gazettal period. Officers would like to review the C&W costs in this regard, if they can be provided. | |

| Submitter | No | Submitter Comments | Officer Comment | Officer Recommendation |
|-----------|----|--------------------|---|---------------------------|
| | | | within this submission be accepted, will be reduced to c\$9,576. It is further noted that the Mundijong Urbar DCP reimburses developers for land associated with POS and drainage, which would otherwise be ceded free of charge under Liveable Neighbourhoods. The value of this credit is (assuming all recommendations are accepted) is \$2,569 per lot, and this | |
| | | | amount should be deducted from any Contribution totals when assessing the actual cost impost of the contributions. The submitter stated that the DCP does not deducted from any Contribution totals. | |

| Submitter | N | O | Submitter Comments | Officer Comment | Officer Recommendation |
|----------------------------|-----|-------------|--|--|---------------------------|
| | | | | provide certainty, need and nexus or equity. Officers contend that to enable the delivery of the infrastructure and progress the local structure plan the DCP needs to be approved. Without such, there is no certainty that the needs of the new residents will be satisfied, and require residential rates to be increased unfairly to provide this infrastructure, as happened in Byford. Officers therefore do not agree with this contention. | |
| Peet Limited IN20/18835 | 17. | 209 This | JNDIJONG URBAN DEVELOPMENT CONTRIBUTION PLAN (AMENDMENT 9) is submission has been made on behalf of the landowners within the andijong/Whitby urban cell, specifically the following landowners: | The submission has been considered and the contents noted. Officers note that the Shire has been | , |

| Submitter No | Submitter Comments | Officer Comment | Officer Recommendation |
|--------------|--|--|--|
| | Gold Fusion Pty Ltd • Peet Mundijong Syndicate Limited • Qube Mundevelopment Ltd • Kerrboyle Pty Ltd Qube Adams St Mundijong • Mundella Farms Pty Ltd • Wellstrand Pty Mundijong Pty Ltd Together, these landowners represent approximately 67% of land with Mundijong-Whitby district cell. We provide this submission into relation Serpentine-Jarrahdale's (the Shire) draft Mundijong Urban Developme Contribution Plan and the proposed inclusion of an additional item to the West Mundijong DCP, which are advertised alongside proposed Amendo the Shire's Town Planning Scheme No 2 that is currently being adversed by the Shire. We appreciate the opportunity to provide a submission in relation to the land have reviewed the document against other Development Contributional are operational within the Perth Metropolitan Area, and also against ecently advertised Draft State Planning Policy 3.6 – Infrastructure Cortain is important that the Shire progresses these frameworks and policies deretainty to the development outcomes that can be achieved and provide lelivery of affordable land to the Perth metropolitan area. Without this and affordability, development of the Mundijong/Whitby cell will be ster lirect result of the policy development. The landowners advise that the current policy development, and propoles not provide certainty to the development of the urban cell and will levelopers being unable to deliver the affordable land that is required from mence development in the cell. | developers and to Department Planning, Lands Heritage since 20 regarding to Development Contributions Pl with little success resolution of the maissues. The curre DSP and DCP th were advertised at the recess announcements infrastructure by to State government have significant progressed many the issues a provides a roadmap the provision infrastructure. Office do not believe th deferring the DCP or provide resolution the matters raised | an or ain ent ent ent ent ent ent ent ent ent en |

| Submitter | No | Submitter Comments | Officer Comment | Officer Recommendation |
|-----------|------------------------------|--|--|---|
| | me res de de Pla | the landowners implore the Shire to defer consideration of the DCP and undertage aningful engagement with the landowner group in order to utilise the collective sources to collaborate and develop a DCP framework that will enable the evelopment objectives of the Shire to be achieved, in a manner which emonstrates compliance with all of the overarching principles of the State anning Policy 3.6 (SPP 3.6). The primary concerns that are highlighted by the landowners are as follows: | | |
| | a) i. l | Planning Framework: The DCP has been prepared on the basis of a draft DSP that: s inconsistent with the regional road and rail planning that is currently underwathe region. Until such time as these studies are complete and the outcomes own by the Shire and affected landowners, it is considered premature for the | The DSP which is being advertised concurrently with this Amendment, considers and reflects | rail crossings - Recommend removal of Grade |

| Submitter | No | Submitter Comments | Officer Comment | Officer Recommendation |
|-----------|---|---|--|---|
| | roa tim ii. I pro with has | aft DSP (and associated DCP) to identify proposed alignments for key district ads and propose a form/composition that cannot be substantiated at this point ne. It includes significant infrastructure items such as grade separated crossings apposed these be fully funded by landowners in the DCP area. This is inconsist the principles of State Planning Policy 3.6 (SPP 3.6) and sufficient justifications not been provided for the inclusion of these items in the context of SPP 3.6, cluding establishment of the need and nexus. | as understood at this time. Whilst we accept that there is an element of uncertainty | Mundijong Urban DCP and Amendment 209 |

| Submitter N | No | Submitter Comments | Officer Comment | Officer Recommendation |
|-------------|----|--------------------|--|------------------------|
| | | | commenced in 2004, but contribution sharing arrangements did not commence until 2016, we now have significant shortfalls of infrastructure and significant issues to address. This has both delayed the provision of critical facilities, and placed the cost burden of delivering such infrastructure on the ratepayer base, rather than on those who had created the need. It is therefore critical that we have contribution arrangements in place early, and for the appropriate lifespan, to avoid a repeat of these issues. Any changes to requirements | |

| Subi | mitter | ſ | No | Submitter Comments | Officer Comment | Officer Recommendation |
|------|--------|---|---------------------------|---|--------------------------------|---------------------------|
| | | | The are into dee (Lo is r | Has not been supported by the Western Australian Planning Commission. Be Shire fails to acknowledge that the Deemed Provisions of the LPS Regulation applicable to all local planning scheme, whether or not they are incorporated to the local planning scheme text and where there is any inconsistency, the emed provision prevails. It is a requirement of the Planning and Development local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015 (Deemed Provisions) that a decision required by the Commission with respect to any structure plan received by the cal Government. | to the DSP. Procedurally these | |

| Submitter | No | Submitter Comments | Officer Comment | Officer Recommendation |
|-----------|----|--------------------|---|------------------------|
| | | | head of power provided by the Deemed Provisions, or under the head of power provided by TPS2. Officers discussed this issue with the Department of Planning Lands and Heritage, and it was pointed out that the Deemed Provisions reference Structure Plans, which typically are the step just before subdivision and development takes place. In respect of this proposal however, it is a District Structure Plan, and still requires a following process of a Structure Plan to be prepared, before subdivision and development occurs. | |

| Submitter | No | Submitter Comments | Officer Comment | Officer Recommendation |
|-----------|----|--------------------|---|---------------------------|
| | | | Officers therefore recommend that Council continue with the head of power used in the 2011 Mundijong Whitby DSP, which is provided under Provision 1 of Development Area's 1 and 2 of Shire of Serpentine Jarrahdale Town Planning Scheme No. 2. This states: | |
| | | | "A single District Structure Plan is to be adopted to guide subdivision and development and will cover the areas of Development Areas No. 1 and 2. Any Loca Structure Plans subsequently adopted within the area of the District Structure Plans | |

| Submitter | No | Submitter Comments | Officer Comment | Officer Recommendation |
|-----------|--|---|---|---|
| | | | shall be subject to the provisions of the District Structure Plan." | • |
| | franthe i. the i. the inv To bee to ii. t will bee Un Sh ass a fe The ade this | The quantum of infrastructure works associated with the road and rail planning mework is material in terms of the DCP. The landowners remain concerned the DCP is progressing ahead of the resolution of these matters, noting: that Shire has been advised that Main Roads WA (MRWA) has completed vestigative work to facilitate the realignment of the freight rail in conjunction with rinkin Highway extension works. It is understood that recommendations have en made to the State Government and that a Business Case may be presented Cabinet in the final quarter of 2020; and the final stage of regional road planning studies by DPLH are underway, which I advise of forecast traffic volumes, alignments and road cross-sections have nen made available. Intil such time as these studies are complete and the outcomes known by the sire and affected landowners, it is considered premature for the draft DCP (and sociated DSP) to identify proposed alignments for key district roads and proposorm/composition that cannot be substantiated at this point in time. The landowners note that a Traffic Impact Assessment dated 29 June 2020 was ded to the Shire's website in recent weeks, without explicit communication that is was now available. The landowners have been unable to determine whether is Traffic Assessment is consistent with and supported by DPLH. The Traffic pact Assessment also appears to be inconsistent with the DCP as advertised, | that progressing these matters is premature and are of the opinion that the certainty that this brings is beneficial to all stakeholders and will proactively avoid many of the issues for Mundijong, that are being faced currently in Byford by not having a DCP at the onset of development. A significant amount of road planning has been undertaken and it is noted that the TIA | Recommend that road widths in the DCPs and Amendment be aligned with those noted in the TIA, as per the table included in the Shir submission at the end of this document. Grade separated rail crossings - Recommend removal of Grade Separated Crossings from the Mundiiong Whithy |

| Submitter | No | Submitter Comments | Officer Comment | Officer Recommendation |
|-----------|------------------------------|---|--|---------------------------|
| | i. E the be up ap ii. DC ass | nich highlights the degree of uncertainty that is present within the advertised ocument. The Traffic Impact Assessment notes that full build out of the DCP area is not hieved within the 2031 horizon, and as such the assessment has developed a genario at the point when build-out of the Shire's development planning is hieved. Detailed analysis of the Assessment needs to be undertaken as it identifies the are appears to be an acceptable level of service at build out, and that there may only localised capacity constraints at that time. Based on this, any such grades are unlikely to be justified as a result of development and should be portioned. There are significant inconsistencies between the road widths costed within the CP, and the widths that are recommended as part of the traffic impact sessment. The Assessment should be amended to demonstrate the needs at the end of CP timeframe, not build-out, and as a result the costs of grade separation should be borne by the development of the region and should be excluded from the CP. | with developers in the area, officers have revised the following aspects of both the DCP and the DSP: - The life of the DCP is recommended to | Amendment 209 |

| Submitter | No | Submitter Comments | Officer Comment | Officer |
|-----------|----|--------------------|---|----------------|
| | | | | Recommendation |
| | | | build out progress have been extensively reviewed through consultation with developers, the Department of Education and review of Forecast ID estimates, in line with the new DCP end date of 2034. The anticipated increase in lots during this period is now anticipated to be 7,200; The development areas occurring within this period are expected to be primarily Whitby and the western edge of the DCA3; | |

| Submitter | No | Submitter Comments | Officer Comment | Officer Recommendation |
|-----------|----|--------------------|--|------------------------|
| | | | | Recommendation |
| | | | - The revised anticipated population and growth areas, have substantially reduced the need for provision of DOS and the extent of road upgrades, which are detailed within the Shire's submission at the end of this document, and addressed as appropriate within each submission. Officers agree that the DCP and Amendment should be updated with the latest road widths, as advised in the TIA. | |

| Submitter | No | Submitter Comments | Officer Comment | Officer Recommendation |
|-----------|-----------------------------|--|---|------------------------------|
| | The Sh Sta | Alignment to SPP3.6: e landowners strongly object to the basis of preparation of the DCP and urge to review the draft in light of the seriously entertained and advertised Draft ate Planning Policy 3.6 – Infrastructure Contributions and against the generally cepted guiding principles that relate to Developer Contributions Plans. e landowners note that Council was made aware of the need for this DCP to be | SPP 3.6, this Amendment (being prepared prior to | No recommended modifications |
| | cor The pos In res | nsistent with Draft SPP 3.6 at its Ordinary Council Meeting on 19 August 2019 ere has been no subsequent justification that validates the change in this sition by the Shire. response to recent landowner queries regarding the proposed DCP, Shire offices sponses have quoted directly from Draft SPP3.6. The Landowners reiterate the | being prepared under the provisions of SPF 3.6 2009. This Amendment and DCP therefore aligns | |
| | Wh foll The rev | e Draft SPP should form the basis for the preparation of the proposed DCP. In the above matters raise the principle concerns of the landowners, the lowing provides a more comprehensive review of the DCP: 1. Review of Costs e landowner group engaged Cossill & Webley consulting engineers to conductive of the cost estimates associated with road creation and upgrades, as povided within the DCP. | | t |

| Submitter | No | Submitter Comments | Officer Comment | Officer Recommendation |
|-----------|-----------------------------|---|--|-------------------------|
| | Th be Th Sp pro | his review highlighted the opportunity to reduce costs by \$6m. A copy of this can found in Annexure A. The landowner group reviewed costs assumptions that make up the 'District Operace – Improvements' component and believe that costs within the numbers ovided by RBB are already conservative and contain contingency. Therefore, opposed DCP number in Annexure A excludes a further allowance for intingency. | high level comparison of totals has been provided. It is therefore impossible to ascertain if the inclusions and exclusions are comparable without further detail. That said, it is accepted that the costs currently provided are high level, and subject to more detailed costing within the 90 day from gazettal period Officers would like to review the C&W costings in this regard if they can be | |
| | Th | Need and Nexus ne guiding principle of Need and Nexus requires that the need for the rastructure in a development contribution plan must be clearly demonstrated | As required under the transitional arrangements of draf SPP 3.6, this | t |

| Submitter | No | Submitter Comments | Officer Comment | Officer Recommendation |
|-----------|---|--|--|---------------------------|
| | Sho Wir The ince 10- ins A wa set sug tim Fu DC occ It is arr dw fact of t | deed) and the connection between the development and the demand created could be clearly established (nexus). Ithin the DCP the Shire has advised that the region is forecasting "hyper growth the DCP Lifespan of 32 years has been established, which is materially consistent with the draft State Planning Policy 3.6 requirement of a maximum of the support in the supporting justification for the increased timeframe is sufficient to support the increased timeframe. Itimeframe of 20 years is inconsistent with the draft Local Planning Strategy the secently advertised which provides for the vision for Serpentine Jarrahdale at so out the 10-year planning and development framework for the Shire. This gagests that there is considerable uncertainty that exists in regard to the 20-year eframe for implementation. In the support that whilst the DCP has adopted a 20-year timeframe the CP incorporates the ultimate infrastructure requirements for the cell, which will cur over a significantly longer timeframe. It is important to acknowledge that the imposition of a Developer Contribution rangement introduces a cost that is directly borne by the purchaser of the relling. Where these costs are introduced to facilitate the provision of communication of the set of Need and Nexus, placing an inappropriate burden of whomeowner. It is position fails the test of Need and Nexus, placing an inappropriate burden of whomeowners in the Mundijong locality. It would be more appropriate to consider the level population growth forecast within the next 10 years, and seek to deliver the rastructure to a scale that is commensurate to a population of that size, as | the provisions of SPF 3.6 2009. This Amendment and DCP therefore aligns with the principles of draft SPP 3.6 2009 which does not mandate a maximum lifespan of 10 years. The Shire notes that the hyper-growth forecast for the Mundijong Urban area is the justification for the recommended 14 year lifespan, noting that many of the original inclusions subject to recommendations | |

| Submitter | No | Submitter Comments | Officer Comment | Officer Recommendation |
|-----------|----------------------|---|---|---------------------------|
| | | oposed to deferring the delivery of infrastructure that is scaled to an ultimate opulation of 50,000 people in 32 years-time. | The items included within the DCP are intended to be delivered within the life of the DCP and are not based upon the ultimate build out at 2050 for 50,000 residents. | |
| | | | Officers note that it is at the will of the developer as to whether costs associated with contributions are directly passed on to the homebuyer. | |
| | Th D0 en es | Accountability ne process to be followed for annual reviews should be greater defined within the CP. Specific points for inclusion are: - For suitably qualified professionals to be agaged for no more than 2 consecutive years for the purpose of reviewing cost estimates; and - Any amendments to the scope or specification of CIDCP Items to clearly articulated in a document that is advertised for public comment, prior to sing endorsed/adopted. | No changes to scope or infrastructure | modifications |

| Submitter | No | Submitter Comments | Officer Comment | Officer Recommendation |
|-----------|---|---|---|---------------------------|
| | to I The Med Alk fun - M - A - T inc The and Imp | e proposed DCP allows for indexation of costs, scope changes and cost revieuse implemented without the need for advertising. The landowners request that the Shire establish an 'Advisory Committee' echanism within the DCP. The City of Wanneroo has effectively implemented kimos Eglinton DCP Advisory Committee in 2015 with great effect. The aims a actions of this committee are to: Monitor the progress of the DCP fund; Assist Council in reviewing and refining a range of elements of the DCP; and to assist Council on the planning and development of infrastructure items bluded in the DCP. The aims and the planning and development of infrastructure items bluded in the DCP. The aims and the planning are planning a range of elements of the DCP; and the planning and development of infrastructure items bluded in the DCP. The aims and the planning are planning a range of elements of the DCP; and the planning and development of infrastructure items bluded in the DCP. The planning are planning and development of infrastructure items bluded in the DCP. The planning are planning and development of infrastructure items bluded in the DCP. | amendment process. The Shire currently engages with ar | |
| | Dra a E do iter Th | DCP Administration Costs aft State Planning Policy 3.6 notes that administration costs may be included a DCP item; however, they must relate directly to the work local government must to prepare and implement the DCP. All administration costs shall be individual mised within the DCP. The proposed DCP is inconsistent with this requirement, noting the following tracts from the advertised document: | management thereo | modifications f |

| Submitter | No | Submitter Comments | Officer Comment | Officer Recommendation |
|-----------|---|--|---|------------------------|
| | 1 | | | Recommendation |
| | De • "] Mu rev Re adi The • T for | SPP 3.6 explicitly allows all costs associated with the administration of a evelopment Contribution Plan to be recouped" The Shire has expended \$563,398 since 2011 towards the preparation of the undijong Urban Development Contribution Plan including District Structure Planvisions and associated Traffic Studies as discussed with the Mundijong industrations are group. This value has been added to the total anticipated ministration expenditure. The Landowners do not support the inclusion of the Shire's historical costs, noting the inclusion of costs as early as 2011 is unreasonable; The costs associated with District Structure Plan revisions are not relevant cost incorporation within the DCP; The traffic studies have been inconsistent with state planning requirements, and we created additional complexities and uncertainties for development of the gion. It is not reasonable for such costs to be borne by the DCP. | The Shire has only one full time resource in relation to the administration of DCPs (DCP Coordinator), whose cost is split across the 4 DCPs, in ratios | |
| | ado Fac of t ado cos Fuc | s also noted that the administration of the DCP appears to have been included dition to costs associated with the West Mundijong DCP and the Community cilities DCP. The landowners request some transparency around the itemisat the administration costs that are proposed by the Shire across its recently vertised DCP's, and a reconciliation against industry benchmarks of c. 2.5% osts. rther, the DCP administration cost should be further defined cognisant of the ticipated development activity, noting that the utilisation of a full-time resource e early years is likely to be an inappropriate cost burden to the DCP. | supporting personnel for the DCP is also allocated (such as Finance Officer, Infrastructure Engineer, etc.) | |

| Submitter | No | Submitter Comments | Officer Comment | Officer Recommendation |
|-----------|-------------------------|--|---|--|
| | | e CIDCP should be amended to appropriately incorporate a reasonable and insparent forecast of administration charges. | incurred (wages plus consultants costs, legal fees etc), plus forecasts based on the year ahead. The Shire will not publish the individual salaries of its employees, but will publish yearly the total amount spent under each category of wages, legal fees, consultants fees, etc. This information is audited yearly to ensure accurate representation of costs. | |
| | Th inc Fu this | Timeframes for Delivery of Infrastructure le timeframes and prioritisation of the proposed infrastructure items has not be cluded within the advertised DCP. In ther, section 6.9.5 provides for a developer who prefunds infrastructure to use a credit to offset future DCP liabilities. The clause prevents the payment of an accoupment to developers until they have completed the subdivision of all land he | prepared, provides that a development y contribution plan is to | recommend an Appendix be included in the final DCPs for West |

| Submitter | No | Submitter Comments | Officer Comment | Officer Recommendation |
|-----------|--------------------------------|---|-----------------|---|
| | and hol As sig ead | th the DCP area. This places unreasonable financial burdens on a developer d will constrain the development of the region as developers will be unable to ld the cost of large infrastructure items for the duration of their development. such, this clause will place the likelihood of Council being required to deliver a initicant portion of the infrastructure within the region. Consistent with SPP 3.6 ch item contained within the DCP should be noted within the Shire's capital brks program as a result of this position. | | Whitby Urban, to detail the agreed project timelines, once defined. |

| Submitter | No | Submitter Comments | Officer Comment | Officer Recommendation |
|-----------|--------------------------|--|---|--|
| | wit • "- thr wa | ne landowners require the following clause be inserted within the DCP, consiste th the seriously entertained version of SPP 3.6: The reimbursement of pre-funded works, and early ceding of land for acquisitio rough the DCP should be given priority according to timing that the infrastructur as delivered, as soon as adequate funds have been collected in the DCP having gard to the priority and timing of DCP works" | not applicable to this Amendment of DCP, as both are subject to | Recommend that the following wording replace the current clause in the |

| Submitter | No | Submitter Comments | Officer Comment | Officer Recommendation |
|-----------|----|--------------------|---|---|
| | | | developer until payments into the DCP are received from subsequent developers to cover the credited amount. The credit is then reimbursed to the developer as soon as circumstances permit. d) Where the DCP fund is in credit from developer contributions already received, the credit should be reimbursed as soon as the circumstances permit on completion of the works/ceding of land and having regard to the priority and timing of DCP works. The common question in respect of 6.7.2.12c) is what "as | includes the date at which the credit was realised, the status of current priority infrastructure and any new priority infrastructure." |

| Submitter | No | Submitter Comments | Officer Comment | Officer Recommendation |
|-----------|----|--------------------|---|---------------------------|
| | | | soon as circumstances permit" practically means. Compared to 6.7.2.12d), the Shire has current priority infrastructure identified under DCA1 as Abernethy Road and Thomas Road. Amendment 208 seeks to identify new priority infrastructure of San Simeon Boulevard and Indigo Parkway, and de- emphasise Thomas Road as priority infrastructure. It is considered reasonable that new priority infrastructure needs to be considered alongside pre-existing credits, and would not | |

| Submitter | No | Submitter Comments | Officer Comment | Officer Recommendation |
|-----------|----|--------------------|--|------------------------|
| | | | automatically overtake pre-existing credits - rather, the circumstances of the DCP would need to be considered and balanced in respect of credit timing vs infrastructure need. Officers would also seek to align decision making, reflective of the prevailing State Planning Policy 3.6 framework. Reflecting the SPP is what Departmental officers suggest also, given this underpins the overall governance framework for developer contributions. | |

| Submitter | No | Submitter Comments | Officer Comment | Officer Recommendation |
|-----------|--|---|--|---|
| | Th with with the with the wind the with the with the with the wind the with the wind the with the wind | Inconsistencies and omissions e landowners note that there are a number of inconsistencies and omissions thin the document that need to be clarified or reviewed: The land required to permit embankment batters for bridge infrastructure has not en included. Such embankments are a cost of the bridge, and as such should to be excluded; The Department of Education will be required to contribute to the cost of shared anying fields. Where co-location is proposed, and a reduction in land area for the joining school is reduced as a result of this co-location, a contribution needs to allowed for within the DCP; Section 2.2.10.1 notes that the estimate includes compensation costs associated that the shutdown of the rail due to disruption from works. This does not appear appropriately and transparently quantified within the cost estimates appended as DCP; More detailed breakdowns of the cost estimates are a range of items need to be ovided for the purpose of transparency, particularly in relation to the cost of ovathe district open space; The exclusion of the land acquisition of embankment batters should be reviewe the event that the grade separations are retained within the DCP | and batters, be removed from the DCP. In respect of the DoE portion for DOS being delivered via a Shared Use Agreement operational and maintenance costs of infrastructure cannot be included in a DCP only the original capital construction costs. The capital costs | Recommend removal of Grade Separated Crossings from the Mundijong Urban DCP and Amendment 209 |

| Submitter | No | Submitter Comments | Officer Comment | Officer Recommendation |
|-----------|----|--------------------|---|---------------------------|
| | | | This approach reflects some saving in the DCP for the SUA, but importantly, balances the risk that an SUA may not be achieved. Any future cost savings from a SUA agreement, will be reflected in the Annua DCP update. In respect of costs identified for infrastructure projects. SPP 3.6 provides that a DCP must be provided in support of a newly gazetted Amendment, within 90 days of the gazettal. Infrastructure items or inclusions still require detailed design and costing, which will be completed during the 90 day window. | |

| Submitter | No | Submitter Comments | Officer Comment | Officer Recommendation |
|-----------|--|--|---|-------------------------------|
| | The re Present de re The wind de Ginn or on the control of the con | he DCP should be amended prior to adoption to adjust for the impact following to except announcement of State Government Funding for the Kiernan Street Sportion recinct. This funding source should be identified as one of the key sources to eliver proposed Kiernan Street Sporting Precinct in its preliminary form, and as a sault should reduce the cost borne by the DCP, in accordance with Draft SPP 3.0 the landowners encourage the Shire to amend the document to ensure it complied ith industry best practice and to improvement the consistency and alignment of the DCP with its strategic planning documents to promote further urban evelopment within the Shire. Silven the above, the Landowners request a deferral of the endorsement of the CP, with a series of independently facilitated workshops to be commenced in order to collaborate and resolve the fundamental concerns that the landowners urrently hold. | Keirnan Park Recreational Precinct are included for within the DCP. | No modifications recommended. |

| Submitter | | No | Submitter Comments | Officer Comment | Officer Recommendation |
|---|---|-----|---|--|---|
| | | | decision by Council to proceed with this proposed DCP will sterilise developme the Mundijong urban cell. | specific recommendation. It is noted that, where funding is achieved for infrastructure which is a shared costs between the Shire and the DCP (such as the Keirnan Park grant), Council will determine the allocation of those funds. | |
| Shire of Serpentine Jarrahdale Strategic Planning Department | 1 | | a result of the submissions and further discussions with developers in the arcicers recommend a number of changes to the DCP and the amendment. | еа, | |
| | | ali | ne life of the DCP is recommended to be 15 years, rather than 20 years. This we gn with the recommendations from the DPLH to reduce the CIDCP life to 15 ars; | ill | Period of operation: Recommend the Amendment 209 and Mundijong Urban DCP be |

| Submitter | No | Submitter Comments | Officer Comment | Officer Recommendation |
|-----------|----------------------------|--|-----------------|---|
| | | opulation estimates and build out progress have been extensively reviewed rough consultation with developers, the Department of Education and review o | | amended to reflect a completion date of 2034. Population estimates: |
| | Fo inc are | precast ID estimates, in line with the new DCP end date of 2034. The anticipated crease in lots during this period is now anticipated to be 7,200. The developme eas occurring within this period are expected to be primarily Whitby and the estern edge of the DCA3; | ed | Recommend the lots included in the Mundijong Urban DCP be set at 7,200. |
| | | ne revised anticipated population and growth areas, have substantially reduced e need for provision of DOS and the extent of road upgrades. | | Infrastructure: Recommend that |
| | | nese changes, which relate to the Mundijong Urban DCP area (DCA3) only, are follows: | ; | the following projects be removed from the |
| | - - - - - - | DSS: Mundijong High School Precinct G to be removed; NOS: Whitby North Primary to be removed; NOS: Adam St/Cockram St Precinct E1 to be removed; Paterson St/Soldiers Road: Paterson St section to be removed; Bishop Road (East): section east of Bett Rd to be removed; Taylor Road/Adams St: Adams St section to be removed; Mundijong Road (East)/Watkins Rd: to be removed; North South Spine Road: Removal of section north of Galvin Road; Galvin Road: to be removed; Skyline Boulevard: removal of section north of Town Centre Road; | | Amendment and Mundijong Urban DCP: - DSS Mundijong High School; - NOS Whitby North Primary School - NOS Adam St/Cockram St; |

| Submitter | No | Submitter Comments | Officer Comment | Officer Recommendation |
|-----------|----|--------------------|-----------------|--|
| Submitter | No | Submitter Comments | Officer Comment | - Mundijong Rd East/Watkins Rd; - Galvin Rd. Infrastructure: Recommend that the following projects be amended within the Amendment and Mundijong Urban DCP: - Paterson St/Soldiers Rd upgrade: removal of Paterson St section; - Bishop Rd East: removal of |
| | | | | portion to east of Bett Rd; - Taylor Rd/Adams St: Adams St portion to be removed; |

| Submitter | No | Submitter Comments | Officer Comment | Officer Recommendation |
|-----------|-------------------------|--|-----------------|---|
| | | | | North South Road: removal of section north of Galvin Road; Skyline Blvd: removal of section north of Town Centre Rd. |
| | | ficers believe that the categorisation of DCP roads should align with terminologed in Liveable Neighbourhoods, in order to give better clarity. | pgy | Road categorisation: |
| | Into Th the Ne | or example; Instead of "X Road – Local Distributor", this would be "X Road egrator B" is would also remove the requirement to detail the specific road treatment with example; and enable the DCP to align with any changes to the Livea eighbourhoods standards without the need for a scheme amendment, which not use delays and additional cost to developers. | hin ble | Recommend removal of specific road build scope from the DCPs and Amendment 209. |
| | car de Int | r example: Instead of "Complete road construction based on a single lane striageway with central median, including intersection treatments and traffic convices as required", this would be "Complete road construction to achieve egrator B road standard, in accordance with Liveable Neighbourhoods, includersection treatments and traffic control devices as required". | trol an | categorisation: Recommend DCP roads be identified as follows within the Amendment and DCPs: |
| | | etail on the classifications for the proposed DCP roads is included in the tallow. | ble | - Bishop Road: Integrator B |

| Submitter | No | Submitter Comments | Officer Comment | Officer Recommendation |
|-----------|----|---|-----------------|---|
| | | | | Industrial North South Spine: Industrial Road; Kargotich Road: Integrator B; Mundijong Road (West): Integrator B; Bishop Road (East): Integrator B; North South Road: Integrator B; Skyline Blvd: Neighbourhood Connector A; Soldiers Rd: Neighbourhood Connector A; Taylor Road: Integrator B; Tinspar Ave: Neighbourhood Connector A. |
| | | number of road width changes (from the previous DCP revisions) have occurrate a result of the latest TIA modelling and forecasting to 2034. The associate | | Road reserves: Recommend DCP |

| Submitter | No | Submitter Comments | | | Officer Comment | Officer |
|-----------|--|--------------------|--|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | Recommendation |
| | in I Re Bi In Ka M Bi N Sk Sc Ta | | ire adjusting within the Amend This detail is included within a Classification Integrator B Industrial Road Integrator B Integrator B Integrator B Neighbourhood Connector A Neighbourhood Connector A Integrator B Neighbourhood Connector A Integrator B | Road Reserve 30m all areas 30m all areas 30m all areas 30m all areas 30m to Bett Rd 30m all areas 25m all areas 20m all areas | DCA DCA2 DCA2 DCA2 DCA2 DCA3 DCA3 DCA3 DCA3 DCA3 DCA3 DCA3 DCA3 | road reserves be amended as follow within the Amendment and DCPs: - Bishop Road: 30m - Industrial North South Spine: 30m; - Kargotich Road: 30m; - Mundijong Roa (West): 30m; - Bishop Road (East): 30m; - North South Road: 30m; - North South Road: 30m; - Soldiers Rd: 20m; - Taylor Road: 30m; - Tinspar Ave: 25m. |

| Submitter | No | Submitter Comments | Officer Comment | Officer |
|---------------------|--|--|---|--|
| | | | | Recommendation |
| | Mu rec an the the for wh in ad DC Th the inc by | fficers recommend that the annual review of the West Mundijong Industrial a undijong Urban DCPs, which enables review of costings, indexing of costs a conciliation of yields and funds (though no scope amendments are allowed with amendment), be formalised within the DCP to be carried out in consultation we Mundijong Industry Reference Group. This will provide visibility and certainty e development community, and also serve as an opportunity to review the timel or provision of infrastructure within the DCP, with those who have knowledge nere the development for the year ahead, is most likely to occur. It is noted the respect of any updates to the infrastructure provision timeline, approval adoption by Council will be required, before any amendments are reflected in ECP. There are a number of recommendations made within the submission responses the Mundijong DSP. The Amendment report references information within the DSC cluding Maps. Where recommendations for amendments to the DSP are approved to Council, officers recommend that the relevant text and maps in the Amendment port, be aligned with the revised information. | for SP, red | That wording be inserted into the DCP in respect of the requirement to review the Annual DCP reviews in collaboration with the relevant Industry Reference Group(s). DSP amendments: Recommend that any amendments approved by Council to the DSP, be reflected in the relevant text and maps, within the Amendment 209 |
| Landowners/Resident | s | | | and the DCP report. |
| A Khan | | nank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft district structure plan and sociated development contribution plan for Mundijong. | Officers thank the submitter for the time | |

| Submitter | No | Submitter Comments | Officer Comment | Officer Recommendation |
|------------|--|---|--|---------------------------|
| IN20/17477 | My affer fini Impuse Mu lots of received with a devented with a case the To ena froi | Indijong district structure plan I land interests relate to 10 Butcher Road. We have held a long term objective ect a development outcome which sees the continuation of Wallace Street, to ish off the R5 precinct of 2000sqm lots. portantly, part of the character for Mundijong is a sympathetic graduation of lar e and development that reinforces landscape character of the town. For undijong, the townsite has enjoyed a rural feel, in part by the availability of large is that in combination with retention of trees and gardens, creates the perception rural living on a town locale. It is important that opportunities for this form of velopment are maintained so as to reinforce a distinct series of neighbourhood at can still be enjoyed throughout. That is, not everywhere should be suburbant velopment of 300sqm lots. Thereas the peripheral parts of the Mundijong district will characterise suburbant ms of development, there is the opportunity to create a sense of unique urbanithin the governance and civic precinct, that is surrounded with a landscape that nections as a quasi-low density green belt to help maintain a distinctively rural arridscape town character. Whereas people often push for higher densities, in this see we seek to respond to character and complete what is a critical element for a town's future that has different neighbours on offer. I affect this outcome, I would like to recommend an R5 precinct be allocated to able completion of the Wallace Street precinct. Akin to the Byford by the Brook on the properties of the suburban estates that will otherwise develop at its respectful and different to the suburban estates that will otherwise develop | The previous District structure plans show this area for low/medium density residential development. The current DSP shows the area for Medium-High density (R40-R100) development due to its proximity to the town centre of Mundijong which will require a significant increase in densities to be viable and to comply with the population targets ser in the State planning framework and more specifically Perth & Peel @3.5 million. | |

| Submitter | No | Submitter Comments | Officer Comment | Officer Recommendation |
|-----------|-----------|--|--|---------------------------|
| | wi | tached is the image I seek to promote for this outcome. This can be achieved thout reticulate sewer, and this in itself can help ensure character is respected rough scaled density. | supportive of a flexible approach to infrastructure provision for low density housing. | |
| | De pro | evelopment contributions evelopment contributions based on ensuring a flexible spectrum of infrastructure ovision should ensure that shared infrastructure responds respectively to earacter. Through the town centre, and surrounding peripheral landscape set to earacter, should be flexible to respond to these different transects as they exist. | wn | |