

NEW SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS
PA20/939 – Lot 4, 829 South Western Highway, Byford - Proposed Apartments

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Officer Comment
Main Roads		<p>In response to your correspondence received on 16 October 2020, Main Roads has no objections subject to the following conditions being imposed:</p> <p>Conditions</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Prior to occupation of the development, an acoustic report by a qualified acoustic consultant consistent with the requirements of <i>State Planning Policy No 5.4 – Road and Rail Noise</i> is to be prepared and submitted to the satisfaction of the Shire of Serpentine-Jarrahdale in consultation with Main Roads. Any recommendations contained in the acoustic report shall be thereafter implemented and maintained for the duration of the development. 2. Prior to the occupation of the building, certification from a qualified acoustic consultant is to be submitted confirming that the recommendations of the acoustic report have been implemented to the satisfaction of the Shire of Serpentine-Jarrahdale. 3. A notification, pursuant to Section 70A of the Transfer of Land Act 1893 is to be placed on the Certificates of Title of the proposed development. The notification is to state: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>"The lots are situated in the vicinity of a transport corridor and are currently affected, or may in the future be affected by transport noise."</i> 4. No earth works shall encroach onto the South Western Highway Road Reserve. 5. No stormwater drainage is to be discharged onto the South Western Highway Road Reserve. 6. No waste collection is permitted from South Western Highway Road Reserve. Should the City disagree with or resolve not to include as part of its conditional approval any of the above conditions or advice, Main Roads requests an opportunity to meet and discuss the application further, prior to a final determination being made. 	<p>The development has been conditioned to require a Noise Management Plan which will address this requirement. The NMP will be required to be based on an acoustic assessment demonstrating how noise from the road and rail will be mitigated to ensure prescribed levels under the <i>Environmental Protection (Noise) Regulations 1997</i>. A notification may be required though this process.</p> <p>The development does not pose this and as such considered to comply with these conditions. Anyhow, the development will be required to comply with the existing urban water management plan for the site which includes the existing restaurant.</p>

NEW SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS
PA20/939 – Lot 4, 829 South Western Highway, Byford - Proposed Apartments

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Officer Comment
		<p>Main Roads advises that it offers a free of charge pre-lodgement consultation service. Main Roads encourages both the Local Government in liaising with applicants to promote and capitalise on this free advisory service offered by the road authority prior to lodgement of strategic or statutory planning proposals, especially where development plans involve land adjacent to or have the potential to impact on the State road network. Further information on the pre-lodgement consultation process can be found on Main Roads website at mainroads.wa.gov.au >Technical & Commercial> Planning & Development</p> <p>Main Roads requests a copy of the City's final determination on this proposal to be sent to planninginfo@mainroads.wa.gov.au quoting the file reference above.</p>	
DFES		<p>The Department of Fire & Emergency Services (DFES) provide the following comments with respect to State Planning Policy 3.7 Planning in Bushfire Prone Areas (SPP 3.7) and the Guidelines for Planning in Bushfire Prone Areas (Guidelines):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed development application is located within an area that has been designated as a 'bushfire prone area' by the Fire and Emergency Services Commissioner pursuant to the Fire and Emergency Services Act 1998. In accordance with the requirements SPP 3.7, a BMP is required to be submitted with the proposal as per policy measure 6.5 of SPP 3.7. DFES acknowledge that a BAL assessment has been provided, and that the Shire have requested a BMP and EEP from the proponent. <p>Given the proposed development has the potential to increase the threat of bushfire to people, property and infrastructure, it is considered that it should not be supported until such time that the bushfire risk and hazard reduction measures are established and understood. DFES recommends that this development application be deferred to allow the proponent to submit the required information in accordance with SPP 3.7 and the Guidelines</p>	<p>A condition requiring a Bushfire Management Plan has been recommended which will address DFESs requirements.</p>

NEW SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS
PA20/939 – Lot 4, 829 South Western Highway, Byford - Proposed Apartments

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Officer Comment
Department of Water		<p>The Department does not object to the proposal, however wishes to provide the following advice.</p> <p>Issue: Stormwater</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>The proponents application, specifically Section 3.2.1.3 Byford Town Centre Local Structure Plan deems urban water management issues are negated due to drainage practices and infrastructure already pre-existing to service the site in its current state as a carpark.</p> <p>The Department would consider the change in land use from a carpark to an apartment building will constitute a change in hydrology for design storm events. The preparation of an Urban Water Management Plan to support the development application is considered unnecessary, however it is recommended that the proponent demonstrate the design can manage peak flow rates within the limitations of existing drainage infrastructure and consistent with the Byford Town Centre Local Water Management Strategy.</p> <p>In the event there are modifications to the proposal that may have implications on aspects of environment and/or water management, the Department should be notified to enable the implications to be assessed.</p>	<p>The Department of Water Environment Regulations comments are noted.</p>
A402922 Christensen		<p>Why this is a bad idea</p> <p>It is already hard enough to get a parking spot at Genesis with the worst designed parking lot (whoever designed that should seriously be banned from future planning)</p> <p>If you cut off that car park its going to make the beautiful landscaping at Dome look crap and cause more parking and traffic congestion. Might I add that there is surely a better spot for it. Like maybe across from United. Maybe you could fill in the gravel track so that cars can get through to their home address without having to drive out of their way.</p>	<p>The development proposes onsite and offsite parking to meet their obligations under the planning framework as detailed within the report.</p> <p>The development will generate at full capacity an additional 28 movements within the local network (14 movements to the site and 14 leaving). This is only based on 100% occupancy of the building which it is not envisaged to operate at all times.</p>

NEW SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS
PA20/939 – Lot 4, 829 South Western Highway, Byford - Proposed Apartments

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Officer Comment
		<p>I already hate driving down George Street as it is, we don't need to have more blockages in the way. How about you acquire the land of those houses on South Western Highway which are clearly abandoned or look horrible. Then the developer could make the apartments a little bigger with a resort like feel to their complex.</p> <p>Why do we need to be like inner city burb like feel?</p>	<p>George Street has the capacity to handle the minor traffic associated with the development.</p>
<p>A399824 Lanigan</p>		<p>I would like to make a comment regarding the serviced apartments proposed for south west hwy.</p> <p>I have concerns about parking and this proposal. It is sixteen bays short of what is required for what it is and where it is. Whilst the proposal argues that this is okay as there are street bays available or they only need bays at night this doesn't hold true. It is a very big Dome to begin with. As the area grows it will get busier. People will then be taking its parking bays and then the street bays. The businesses nearby need those bays for people to come and go. If it gets too congested people will go elsewhere. Exactly this happened to my own business in a similar village style shopping precinct. Cafe customers took over all of the street parking. I had to move. If council allows business after business to ignore the parking bay requirements it just won't add up to enough for everyone.</p> <p>Sixteen bays short is a lot of cars. Yes, the apartments have parking bays underneath, but they will be used by people staying there. Where will the staff park? Where will any additional cafe staff park if they are busier once it opens? The reciprocal parking, what happens if the business mix in the area changes and there is more demand for parking at different times that negates what is being used now?</p> <p>I think the development is a great idea and we need more accommodation option in the area but it has to have enough parking. All developments should comply with the number required for what they want to build.</p>	<p>The development proposes onsite and offsite parking to meet their obligations under the planning framework as detailed within the report.</p>