Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Applicant Comment	Officer Comment
DWER	A.	Lot 218 (No. 575) Abernethy Road, Oakford - Proposed Educational Establishment Thank you for providing the development application received with correspondence via email on 13 September 2023 for the Department of Water and Environmental Regulation (Department) to consider. The Department has reviewed the application and does not support the proposal in its current form. Key issues, recommendations and advice are provided below and these matters should be addressed. Issue Groundwater Advice The property is located within the Serpentine Groundwater Area (Byford 2 sub area) which is proclaimed under the Rights in Water and Irrigation Act 1914. Any groundwater abstraction would be subject to licensing by the Department. It should be noted that groundwater from the Leederville aquifer in this sub area is currently fully allocated resulting in no resource being available for new applications. Limited groundwater is currently available within the Superficial aquifer however due to the site's geology, it may be difficult to draw a reliable groundwater supply for large volumes from this aquifer. Please note, water availability is subject to change on a daily basis. Alternative sources of water may need to be sought to satisfy any nonpotable water requirements or the applicant can seek a water trade agreement from another groundwater user in the area. Further information on trades and transfers is available from https://www.wa.gov.au/service/building-utilities-and-essential-services/integrated-essential-services/integrated-essential-services/integrated-essential-services/water-entitlement-transfers-trades-and-agreements. The applicant is encouraged to contact the water licensing section on 9550 4222 as soon as possible to discuss water	The applicant advises that the current school campus at Armadale has two superficial groundwater licenses (L205182), and the Byford campus has a single license (L203296) which are proposed to be relocated to the subject site. The licenses total 28,650KL, approved for irrigation of ovals and playing fields on the current campuses.	DWER's submission has been addressed in the report.

Ordinary Council Moeting 18 March 2024

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Applicant Comment	Officer Comment
Submitter	No	availability and potential alternatives. A secure water source needs to be identified for the irrigation of up to 2.3ha of soccer fields, gardens and ovals prior to progression of the development application. Issue Industry Regulation Advice The Department regulates emissions and discharges from the construction and operation of prescribed premises through a works approval and licensing process, under Part V, Division 3 of the EP Act. The categories of prescribed premises are outlined in Schedule 1 of the Environmental Protection Regulations 1987. The EP Act requires a works approval to be obtained before constructing a prescribed premises and makes it an offence to cause an emission or discharge from an existing prescribed premises unless they are the holder of a works approval or licence (or registration) and the emission is in accordance with any conditions to which the licence or works approval is subject.	The client accepts the advice from DWER. A private sewer pressure main and pump station is capable of connecting the Campus to Byford as supported by the Department of Health and the Water Corporation.	Officer Comment
		The provided development referral request was reviewed in relation to works approval and licence requirements under Part V Division 3 of the EP Act. Based on the information provided, the proposed operations will cause the premises to be considered a prescribed premise as per Schedule 1 of the <i>Environmental Protection Regulations 1987</i> for the following category:		

Submitter	Submitter No		Submitter Comments		Applicant Comment	Officer Comment
		Category	Category description	Production or design capacity		
		85	Sewage facility: premises –	More than 20 but less than 100m₃ per day		
			(a) On which sewage is treated (excluding septic tanks); or			
			(b) From which treated sewage is discharged onto land or into waters			
		a prescribed premises	works approval to be obt	ained before constructing to cause an emission or operation) is held for the		
		licence for this premis	ses to date. As such, it i	n for a works approval or s recommended that the roval (or licence) with the		
		Regulation Guide to Lapprovals and licences	icensing or if they have	on and <i>Guideline: Industry</i> queries relating to works at info@dwer.wa.gov.au or a works approval.		
		60,750 L/day (60.75 m The available irrigation provided by the application	ns/day) for a population of n area is 19,874 m ₂ . Th ant do not indicate the max l maximum reactive phos	oughput is estimated to be 1,350 students and staff. he supporting documents kimum nutrient (maximum phorous) concentration in pated area for the activity		

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Applicant Comment	Officer Comment
		could not be calculated. The applicant will need to provide the Department further information regarding nutrient concentrations and loading rates with the works approval application.		
		The construction and installation of onsite effluent disposal systems requires approval from the Department of Health in accordance with the Health (Treatment of Sewage and Disposal of Effluent and Liquid Waste) Regulations 1974.		
		The application will also need to demonstrate compliance with the general provisions of the EP Act and all relevant regulations e.g. <i>Environmental Protection (Controlled Waste) Regulations 2004</i> and <i>Environmental Protection (Unauthorised Discharges) Regulations 2004</i> .		
		Please note that this advice is based on information provided. Should this information change, the works approval and/or licensing requirements may also change. Applicants are encouraged to contact the Department at the above contact details to clarify requirements, should there be changes to information.		
		Issue		
		Site and Soil Evaluation		
		Advice		
		The proposed wastewater treatment system is to comply with the Government Sewerage Policy (WAPC, 2019) and draft State Planning Policy 2.9 Planning for Water and the associated guidelines State Planning Policy 2.9 Planning for Water Guidelines. Further comments are included within Attachment 3.		
		It is recommended that the Site and Soil Evaluation is referred to the Department of Health for comment.		
		Issue		

The Department provides advice and recommends quidelines for		
development on floodplains with the object of minimising flood risk and damage. The Birrega and Oaklands Flood modelling and drainage study (2015) shows that the general area is affected by overland flooding with the 1 in 100 (1%) AEP flood level expected to vary from 16.5 m AHD to 19.0 m AHD (please refer to Attachment 1).	The Finished Floor levels set under the Oaklands Flood Modelling are accepted. It is requested that as a condition of development approval, set the FFL for nabitable buildings at 0.5m above the 1% AEP flood evels onsite.	

Submitter No	Submitter Comments	Applicant Comment	Officer Comment
	Native Vegetation Advice Under section 51C of the Environmental Protection Act 1986 (EP Act), clearing of native vegetation is an offence unless: It is undertaken under the authority of a clearing permit it is done after the person has received notice under Section 51DA(5) that a clearing permit is not required the clearing is subject to an exemption Exemptions for clearing that are a requirement of written law, or authorised under certain statutory processes, are contained in Schedule 6 of the EP Act. Exemptions for low impact routine land management practices outside of environmentally sensitive areas (ESAs) are contained in the Environmental Protection (Clearing of Native Vegetation) Regulations 2004 (the Clearing Regulations). Based on the information provided, should development approval be issued, clearing required for the construction of proposed buildings and structures is likely to be exempt from the requirement for a clearing permit under Regulation 5, Item 1 of the Clearing Regulations. This exemption is described in the Departments 'A Guide to the Exemptions and Regulations for Clearing Native Vegetation'. It is the applicant's responsibility to determine compliance with these exemptions and therefore whether a clearing permit is required. If there is uncertainty, then the precautionary principle should be applied, and it is recommended applicants apply for a clearing permit. Note that this exemption does not apply prior to development approval being issued.	The applicant accepts the advice received from DWER regarding potential clearing of native vegetation. The applicant through the landscaping design seeks to retain existing vegetation onsite wherever possible, however subject to detailed design, may require minor clearing to enable development. We request an advice note be included advising of the obligations under the Environmental Protection (Clearing of Native Vegetation) Regulations 2004 (the Clearing Regulations).	

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Applicant Comment	Officer Comment
		Please also note that that clearing for a building/structure, combined with other exempt clearing activities on the property, must not exceed five hectares in a financial year.		
		If the proposed clearing for the asset protection zone (APZ) is considered by the Shire to be appropriate, and clearing of native vegetation for this purpose is specified within the Development Approval, it is likely to be exempt under Regulation 5, Item 1.		
		If the proposed clearing for the APZ is in accordance with the Shire's Firebreak and Fuel Hazard Reduction Notice, it is likely to be exempt under Schedule 6, Clause 10 (clearing in accordance with section 33 of the <i>Bush Fires Act 1954</i>) after the buildings have been erected.		
		Please note that the guide to exemptions does not reflect the correct schedule location for the referenced <i>Bush Fires Act 1954</i> exemption, given the change was made recently as part of the EP Act amendments. Please refer to Schedule 6, Clause 10 of the EP Act for the details relating to this exemption.		
		Clearing required for purposes other than buildings or structures, including sporting fields and landscaping, is not likely to be exempt.		
		The Department has not received a clearing permit application for this proposal. Application forms are available from https://www.wa.gov.au/service/environment/environment-information-services/clearing-permit-forms.		
		Additional information on how to apply for a clearing permit is available from Clearing permit forms Western Australian Government (www.wa.gov.au).		
		Information regarding clearing permit fees can be found here: Clearing fees – frequently asked questions Western Australian Government (www.wa.gov.au)		

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Applicant Comment	Officer Comment
		If further clarification is required, please contact the Department's Native Vegetation Regulation section by email (admin.nvp@dwer.wa.gov.au) or by telephone (6364 7098).		
		Issue		
		Noise		
		Advice	An Amended Acoustic Report was provided to the	
		Please refer to Attachment 4 for the Department's technical review of the <i>Acoustic Review</i> prepared by Herring Storer Acoustics (June 2023) in accordance with the <i>Environmental Protection (Noise) Regulations</i> 1997.	Shire for assessment which incorporated ambient noise levels.	
		Issue		
		Acid Sulphate Soils	Acknowledged.	
		Advice		
		Acid Sulfate Soils (ASS) risk mapping indicates that the site is located within an area identified as representing a moderate to low risk of ASS occurring within 3 metres of the natural soil surface. The Department advises that neither a model ASS related condition nor an advice note is considered necessary in this instance, as there is no indication in the proposal to suggest that dewatering or ground disturbance is proposed.		
		Issue	As previously advised, the client requests a condition	
		Stormwater Management	of development requiring	
		Advice	the preparation of a detailed stormwater	
		Comprehensive details of the proposed stormwater management system is to be included within the Water Management Plan, including the locations of tree pits and grassed swales proposed to capture and treat stormwater from small events.	management plan. Matters for consideration listed by	

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Applicant Comment	Officer Comment
		A conceptual design and cross section of the living stream drainage swale is required inclusive of invert levels, maximum groundwater levels, depth of soil amendment, subsoil drainage, 1% AEP flood levels, maximum storage volumes and topography.		
		Where the Department has a statutory role, planning applications should be considered prior to the Department issuing any relevant permits, licences and/or approvals.		
		In the event that the applicant determines that a works approval or licence application is required under Part V of the EP Act, the advice provided in this communication does not prejudice and must not be considered to infer the outcome of the EP Act licence and works approval process.		
		If 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.	Advice received from DWER is accepted.	
		DWER Technical (Review) Report	It is noted that the report	
		Advice on the Acoustic Review for the proposed Educational Establishment at Lot 218, 575 Abernethy Road, Oakford, prepared for the Shire of Serpentine Jarrahdale	reviewed by DWER was superseded by the updated acoustic assessment prepared	
		Environmental Noise Branch (ENB) of the Department of Water and Environmental Regulation (DWER) has reviewed the Acoustic Review report prepared by Herring Storer Acoustics (HSA).	04/10/23, outlining the ambient noise levels of the locality.	
		The HSA report contains no technical information, such as predicted noise levels, on which to make comment, as the report considers that the noise emissions from the school (excluding any mechanical services) are affectively exempt under regulation 16 of the <i>Environmental Protection (Noise) Regulations 1997</i> . While ENB would agree that the bulk of the noise emissions from the proposed school are exempt under regulation 16, an indication of the impact that the new	No activities are proposed outside of the current school operating daytime and weekday hours.	

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Applicant Comment	Officer Comment
		school would have on the existing environment is of value to decision makers.		
		Mechanical noise sources such as air-conditioners, pumps, extraction and exhaust fans, and potentially, cyclones dust collectors do have to comply with the assigned levels, ENB agree that these should be assessed when designs become available and mitigation be designed, if required. Consideration should be given to the cumulative noise from these sources and the HSA recommendation that each block be designed to meet a base LA10 noise level of 37 dB(A) is reasonable if the facilities are to only be used during the daytime. Lower levels are appropriate if the facilities are to be used in the evening or at night.		
		ENB would agree that noise from the gym and the music block can be contained to an acceptable level, providing the buildings are used for the purpose for which they are designed. For example concerts type events in the gym are likely to lead to unacceptable noise level, particularly if occurring at night.		
		Additional areas that potentially may be noise sources during the evening, at night or on the weekend are: events in the future community purpose/auditorium building, events in the amphitheatre located in the secondary school area and sport played on the hard courts (should lighting be installed).		
		The proposed development site is adjacent to noise sensitive premises to the east with residential buildings being approximately 140 m away from the hard courts. At this distance basketball noise may not be an issue during the day but may be an issue during the evening or at night.		
		Consideration should be given to noise modelling to determine the impact of out-of-hours noise sources.		

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Applicant Comment	Officer Comment
Water Corporation	B.	Thank you for your letter dated 24 August. We offer the following comments regarding this proposal. The site is located outside any water and wastewater scheme boundaries and therefore Water Corporation doesn't have any planning to service this lot. Appendix K – Servicing Report accurately describes the infrastructure required to service the proposed development. an extension of the water network of approximately 2.5km will be required. A private pump station will be required to pump wastewater into our network, the nearest suitable connection point is 3.2km away, should it be determined that connection to the sewer network is necessary. The above assets are to be delivered at the proponents cost and in accordance with Water Corporation requirements. Infrastructure contributions will also be payable at building stage. The information provided above is subject to review and may change. If the proposal has not proceeded within the next 6 months, please contact us to confirm that this information is still valid. Please provide the above comments to the landowner, developer and/or their representative.	Referral Comments from Water Corporation are acknowledged. The applicant recommends a condition of development approval for a standard reticulated water connection.	Water Corporation's submission has been addressed in the report.
DFES	C.	I refer to your email dated 9 August 2023 regarding the submission of a Bushfire Management Plan (BMP) (Version 1), prepared by Bushfire Prone Planning and dated 3 July 2023, for the above development application. The BMP is accompanied by a FRSA Oakford School Campus report from Element dated July 2023 for the above development application (DA). This advice relates only to State Planning Policy 3.7: Planning in Bushfire Prone Areas (SPP 3.7) and the Guidelines for Planning in Bushfire Prone Areas (Guidelines). It is the responsibility of the proponent to ensure the proposal complies with relevant planning policies and building regulations	The applicant accepts the advice from DFES. The applicant recommends a condition of development approval for the submission of the BMP and BEEP to the Shire of Serpentine Jarrahdale at	DFES's submission has been addressed in the report.

from obta	cessary. This advice does not exempt the application	cant/proponent	each stage of	Г
under wri	ining approvals that apply to the proposal inclunealth or any other approvals required by a releaten laws.	ding planning,	development.	
Assessm	<u>ent</u>			
SPP 3 below	7, and the supporting Guidelines as outlined in o	•		
		Action		
BAL	The inputs (actual separation distances) have not been provided in the BMP to demonstrate the methodology applied to determine the BAL outputs within the Contour Map. This would generally be provided in a table. It is noted that this has not prevented the assessment from being undertaken, however should be provided in accordance with Appendix Three of the Guidelines.	Modification to the BMP is recommended for accuracy.		
2. Poli	y Measure 6.6.1 Vulnerable and High-Risk land uses			
Issue	Assessment	Action		
Emergen	The referral has included a 'Bushfire Emergency Evacuation Plan' for the purposes of addressing the policy requirements. Consideration should be given to the Guidelines Section 5.5.4 'Developing a Bushfire Emergency Evacuation Plan'. This contains detail regarding what should be included in a BEEP and will ensure the appropriate content is detailed when finalising the BEEP to the satisfaction of the Shire.	Comment only.		
	The didevelo Further SPP 3. below. I. Police Issue BAL Contour Map 2. Police Issue Bushfire Emergence Evacuation Plan	The decision maker has confirmed this to be interested development and the application of SPP 3.7 is triggered. Further clarification is required within the BMP of the research service of the supporting Guidelines as outlined in or below. Policy Measure 6.5 a) Preparation of a BAL contour map Saue	The decision maker has confirmed this to be intensification of development and the application of SPP 3.7 is triggered. Further clarification is required within the BMP of the requirements of SPP 3.7, and the supporting Guidelines as outlined in our assessment below. Policy Measure 6.5 a) Preparation of a BAL contour map Ssue	The decision maker has confirmed this to be intensification of development and the application of SPP 3.7 is triggered. Further clarification is required within the BMP of the requirements of SPP 3.7, and the supporting Guidelines as outlined in our assessment below. I_Policy Measure 6.5 a) Preparation of a BAL contour map Ssue

Ordinary Council Meeting - 18 March 2024
Page 12 of 70

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Applicant Comment	Officer Comment
		DFES Built Environment Branch Comments As the proposed buildings appear to be Class 9b, plans will need to be provided to DFES BEB for assessment, required by Regulation 18B of the Building Regulations 2012 (as amended). It is noted that there appears to be a number of buildings proposed that will exceed 500m2 total floor area and as such, these will need to be served by a fire hydrant system designed in accordance with AS2419.1-2005 and meet with the FES Commissioner's Operational Requirements. Furthermore, any such system must be for the protection of the structures which it is serving and any requirements for Bush Fire suppression must be considered over and above this demand. Recommendation – compliant proposal – no objection DFES advises the proponent has adequately identified issues arising from the bushfire risk assessment and considered how compliance with		
		the bushfire protection criteria can be achieved within the submitted BMP. Please be advised that the same letter has been sent to David Carter at the Department of Planning, Lands and Heritage.		
		As this planning decision is to be made by a Joint Development Assessment Panel please forward notification of the decision to DFES for our records.		
Main Roads WA	D.	Proposed Educational Establishment - Lot 218 (575) Abernethy Road, Oakford - Ref. PA23/588 - DAP/23/02545 In response to correspondence received on 9 August 2023 please be advised Main Roads has reviewed the supporting information and has no	The applicant acknowledges MRWA comments with no objection to the proposal.	
		objections to the above application. Main Roads requests a copy of the Shire's final determination on this proposal to be sent to planninginfo@mainroads.wa.gov.au.		

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Applicant Comment	Officer Comment	
Department of Health	E.	Thank you for your letter of 9 August 2023, requesting comments from the Department of Health (DoH) on the above proposal. The DoH provides the following comment:	The advice received from the Department of Health is acknowledged.	DoH's submission has been addressed in the report.	
		1. Water supply and Wastewater Management Wastewater Management	The DoH support for a private sewer connection is		
		The submitted proposal reports do not appear to have demonstrated a suitable area for the land application area and disposal of effluent. The DoH suggest that connection to deep sewerage and mains scheme	acknowledged and identified as a potential servicing option for the development.		
		water are considered as a viable option for this proposal. However, if this this is not economically viable, subject to the Department of Water and Environmental Regulation (DWER) confirming that the proposal complies with State Planning Policy 2.7; the proposal is required to comply with the requirements of the Health (Treatment of Sewage and Disposal of Effluent and Liquid Waste) Regulations, 1974 (the Regulations).	Following development approval, should the relevant government agencies (DoH and DWER) support an alternative effluent disposal system onsite to facilitated staged works		
			Further information is required for this option, prior to DoH supporting the proposal. In particular:	onsite, further information is to be provided to the	
		1. Site and Soil Evaluations (SSE) were undertaken in late November and early April. These are not represented as the wettest time of the year as per AS/NZS 1547:2012 requirements. A site-specific site and soil evaluation SSE will need to be undertaken by a qualified consultant during the wettest seasonal time of the year (mid-July/early-Sept) as	Shire for determination via an amended DA process. DoH recommendation for a reticulated water		
			per AS/NZS 1547:2012.	connection is acknowledged, as	
		2. The land application area needs to be located where the land is not subject to inundation in a 10 per cent annual exceedance probability rainfall event as per Government Sewerage Policy, 2019, requirements.	supported by the Water Corporation.		

Ordinary Council Meeting - 18 March 2024
Page 14 of 70

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Applicant Comment	Officer Comment
		3. In addition to point 1, the proposal is located within a sewerage sensitive area and the proposed land application area will need to be raised nearly two meters in height to meet the minimum setbacks from high water tables or perched water.		
		4. The wastewater treatment system proposed must be a system approved or certified for use by the DoH. The system and land application area will require ongoing maintenance programs that includes details of how the land application area will be managed without damaging the drains and preventing events with light infrastructure, i.e., tents from being placed onto it, vehicles driving on it or other risk factors.		
		5. The permeability and infiltration rates do not appear to represent the soil type of similar soil categories as per AS/NZS 1547:2012. The soil type has been classified as a Category 6 soil and there are insufficient details of how the permeability will be increased, managed and therefore the land application sized as claimed.	The proposed development is to be connected to the reticulated water network in Byford as supported by Water Corporation.	
		6. There is little detail of drainage and stormwater management that refers to existing infrastructure but does not appear to manage stormwater off site.		
		7. Detailed plans showing the proposed building envelopes, the proposed onsite wastewater system and land application area including setback distances, exclusion zones and measurements.		
		Once the above have been determined and demonstrated, an 'Application to Construct or Install an Apparatus for the Treatment of Sewage' is required to be submitted to the Local Government for each wastewater treatment system that will be required to be forwarded to the DoH for assessment and approval.		
ı				

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Applicant Comment	Officer Comment
		Drinking Water Management All drinking water provided on site must meet the health-related requirements and risk management framework set out in version 3.7 of the Australian Drinking Water Quality Guidelines 2011. These are highlighted in principle in the following link: https://www.health.wa.gov.au/Articles/N R/Reticulated-drinking-water-scheme-providers	Non-potable drinking water is to be clearly marked onsite for irrigation purposes only.	
		Any non-drinking water (i.e., water that is not intended or suitable for drinking) must be managed to ensure it cannot be confused with or contaminate the drinking water supply. This requires satisfactory labelling of non-drinking water taps and, depending on system configuration, suitable backflow prevention arrangements.		
		2. Medical Entomology The risk of mosquitoes and mosquito-borne diseases such as Ross River and Barmah Forest virus disease is largely unknown for this region. There may be seasonal freshwater mosquito breeding habitat within close proximity to the subject land. Additionally, there is the potential for mosquitoes to breed in on-site infrastructure and constructed water bodies if they are poorly designed.	A Mosquito Management Plan is requested to be a condition of development approval.	
		It is the recommendation of the DoH that the proponent ensures proposed infrastructure and site works do not create additional mosquito breeding habitat as follows: • Changes to topography resulting from earthworks (e.g., the installation of pipelines, footpaths, roads etc) must prevent run-off from creating surface ponding as it may become mosquito breeding habitat.		

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Applicant Comment	Officer Comment
		Water tanks and other water-holding containers must be sealed or screened to prevent mosquito access and breeding. Regular monitoring for mosquito larvae and treatment with larvicide may also be required.		
		Waste items (tyres, drums and other water holding receptacles) should be filled with sand/soil; kept undercover or punctured to reduce the chances of these items holding water and becoming mosquito breeding habitat.		
		Constructed water bodies (drainage infrastructure, infiltration basins and swales, settling ponds, wetlands, etc) must be located, designed, and maintained so they do not create or contribute to mosquito breeding.		
		Constructed water bodies (drainage infrastructure, infiltration basins and swales, settling ponds, wetlands, etc) may require regular monitoring and application of herbicides and/or removal of invasive vegetation to prevent the harbourage of mosquito larvae.		
		The Chironomid midge and mosquito risk assessment guide for constructed water bodies (Midge Research Group, 2011) should be referred to during the early stages of planning to ensure that the potential for on-site mosquito breeding is minimised. This document is available at:		
		https://www.health.wa.gov.au/%7E/media/Files/Corporate/general-documents/Mosquitoes/PDF/Chironomid-midge.pdf		
		3. Chemical Hazards		
		The site has not been classified as a C-RR, CRU, RRU as recorded on DWER's Contaminated Sites database (CS Act 2003). Whilst this site does not appear on DWER's public access database, it may be subject to other important classifications not recorded on the database. The		

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Applicant Comment	Officer Comment
		proponent should obtain a Basic Summary of Records relating to the land and its surroundings to complete their assessment of the site's suitability for a rezoning to a more sensitive land use with: https://www.wa.gov.au/system/files/2023-06/form-2-request-for-a-summary-of-records-in-respect-of-land.pdf If the proposed development includes the demolition and clearance of the existing farmhouse this building should be subject to a hazardous materials inspection and any asbestos, fuel oils, or agricultural chemicals should be removed prior to any demolition.	The applicant notes the existing shed onsite is outside of the development envelope and is to be retained.	
A202417	1	We support the proposal. We believe the project will do good to nearby and surrounding area.	Support of the development proposal is acknowledged.	Thank you for your submission.
A402884	2	We DO NOT want this proposed school to go ahead. The intersection crossovers at Orton and Kargotich, Abernethy and Kargotich are already extremely dangerous and many accidents and deaths unfortunately happen almost weekly on Kargotich Road. The possibility of much more traffic moving thru this area petrifies me. We have young children who attend Court Grammar. We do not require another school in that close proximity to us, nor are we religious and do	Refer below to detailed discussion on traffic.	Thank you for your submission. The matters you have raised have been addressed in the report.
		not wish to attend church to attend this school. This school is suited to a suburban area like Byford. Also to add to that there is no housing/cavallo estate right on the doorstep of Court Grammar therefore why should we accept a school so close to our home here? We built in Oakford and have invested \$1.3 million dollars into our house. We built a big rural country home as our home fits the area therefore we DO NOT want or require a k-12 school a stone throw away.		

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Applicant Comment	Officer Comment
		It would be seriously disappointing if this proposal went ahead as it would look like an eyesore and out of place in what once was a peaceful rural lifestyle and swamp and bush lands. WE SAY NO! Thank you for taking your time to read.		
A401997	3	For nearly 30 consecutive years immediately prior to moving to Oakford, I lived either on the same road as a school, or within 200m of one. I know exactly what it is like to live near a school, and one of the major reasons I decided to live here was to get away from that. My parents deliberately bought a house in close proximity to a planned school in the early 1980s, several years before it was built. It was a known thing, formed the central focal point of a very well-planned development, and residents were able to make informed decisions about living next to a school, prior to it being built.	Refer below to discussion on current planning framework.	Thank you for your submission. The matters you have raised have been addressed in the report.
		That is in stark contrast to this proposal. Had I known that there was going to be a school on the corner of Kargotich and Abernethy Roads, I wouldn't have moved here.		
		Residents, like me, who have made significant financial and investment decisions to achieve a certain lifestyle, risk having that completely undone. We have made sacrifices, such as not having connections to mains water and sewerage and living further away from key services than others, with the trade-off being that we can aim for the lifestyle that we want. We knew about those constraints, and the cost and inconvenience associated with those was well worth it. However, this proposal threatens that.		
		I am not naive enough to think that Oakford won't get developed further, and I am not automatically opposed to all development. I understand that the Shire has a need to grow, but it needs to be "consistent with the orderly and proper planning of the locality and the preservation of the amenity of the locality." This proposal does not meet those criteria, as per 5.1.1(a) of		

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Applicant Comment	Officer Comment
		the Town Planning Scheme No. 2, and I will discuss some reasons for this position below.		
		The proponent relies heavily on the SJ Shire Local Planning Strategy (LPS) to support its proposal. However, they have failed to consider, or deliberately ignored, several pertinent sections. Perhaps most striking is a direct reference to Private Schools. On pages 120-121 of the LPS, the Shire states:		
		"It is critical that the landscape, environmental and indeed economic values of rural land be recognised and protected. Unless there is a clear message that further encroachment of urban development and further fragmentation of land zoned Rural for non-productive purposes will not be contemplated, there is likely to be speculation and pressure for further rezoning."		
		It goes on to list several examples of this pressure, and among them is this:		
		"Pressure for non-rural activities to locate on rural zoned land (eg: private schools) due to unavailability of suitable and/or affordable land in urban locations" (P 121 of the LPS)		
		It is almost as if this particular example was listed for this particular situation.		
		The Shire demonstrates their willingness in the LPS to resist pressures, such as private schools wanting to locate on rural land, and that proposals that result in the further fragmentation of rural zoned land will not be contemplated. Had the proponent read this part of the LPS, they would have reconsidered the proposed location. The Shire has an opportunity now to send that clear message that they are seeking, otherwise:		
		"The highly valued rural character of the Shire will be severely compromised if not destroyed if urban development is permitted to continually sprawl outwards." (P 120 of the LPS).		

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Applicant Comment	Officer Comment
		In the same document, the Shire outlines how schools will form part of the long-term planning of the areas:		
		"Given the population projections for Byford and Mundijong, it is important that an adequate number of primary and secondary schools be planned for at the structure plan stage and land set aside for this purpose to ensure education requirements will be met in the future." (P 66 of LPS)		
		This proposal isn't part of any structure plan that I am aware of, and the LPS does not include Oakford as a potential site for any school.		
		Reading this proposal in the context of the LPS, and the inconsistencies I've discussed above, this proposal clearly does not meet the requirements of 5.1.1(a) of the Town Planning Scheme No.2. It is not consistent with what the Shire plans for this locality, and it has the potential to completely destroy the amenity of the area that is enjoyed not just by those close by, but the entire Shire.		
		Since I received the letter notifying me of this proposal on Friday August 25, 2023, I have spent considerable time reading through the proposal documents in order to make an informed submission on this proposal. I am fortunate that I can somewhat read and understand these documents, but for someone not used to these kinds of reports, at 628 pages, it is enough to scare off all but the most determined people. I am familiar with the phrase "baffle them with bull****", and this appears to be a prime example. The proponent may be attempting to bog the Shire officers, and those whose opinions have been sought, down with the sheer volume and bulk of it, in the hope that it just gets waived through without proper scrutiny. It could be argued that the proponent is setting up an expectation that because of the years of work they have already done on the proposal, and the expense that they have occurred, it would be unfair to them for Council not to allow this proposal to progress. It would not surprise me if Shire officers and Councillors feel intimidated when dealing with certain developers.		

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Applicant Comment	Officer Comment
		In addition to that, the residents mostly effected by this proposal have only had a short time to consider their position. Had the inhabitants of the locality been consulted properly, prior to this proposal being submitted, the proponent may have gained a better understanding of the area, and the strong feelings that this now galvanised community has. Since expressing my concerns publicly, I have discovered that I am not alone in my strong opposition to this proposal.		
		Personally, I find it quite staggering that the proponent, and certain individual members of the Free Reformed Church, are of the belief that they can blindside the inhabitants of this locality with such a huge development, and not receive some criticism, or push back. It is the height of arrogance and shows complete disdain for those whom this development will severely adversely effect. Section 5.1.1(b) of the Town Planning Scheme No. 2 states that a non-complying development "will not have any adverse effect upon the inhabitants of the locality" in order for it to be approved. I will list below just some of the identified 'adverse effects' I think are relevant in this case.		
		Traffic The proponent has estimated that there will be an extra 1,000 traffic movements in both the morning and afternoon peaks. Using Main Roads traffic data, this will triple the traffic volumes at both 7am and 4pm, from approximately 500 to 1500. It will also increase the average daily traffic volume by almost 50%. To suggest that this won't have an adverse effect on the inhabitants is just delusional. Because of the congestion that this will cause at those key pick up and drop off times, the local roads, including those of Oakford Green, will be used as additional pick up and drop off zones, or as staging areas for waiting cars who will then move to the designated zones when called up, like what happens at Perth Airport.	Refer to detailed discussion on traffic considerations.	
		It is also worth noting that the Traffic Impact Assessment report may have been compiled using incorrect or misleading information provided by the client. The report states:		

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Applicant Comment	Officer Comment
		"The Site primarily functions as an education institution, primarily serving the residential developments surrounding it. Anticipated major attractors/generators in the vicinity of the site include the residential developments located within the Oakford radius." (P145 of proposal)		
		As I will discuss later, the catchment area for this school would not primarily be Oakford, or even the Shire, but surrounding areas as far as Mandurah.		
		<u>Fire</u>		
		On page 242 of the proposal, a post-development BAL Contour Map is shown. It shows that parts of the residential lots backing onto Kargotich Rd, have possibly had sections of the property recategorised as BAL-FZ due to their proximity to the proposed school. If this is the case, the consequences for those property owners are very significant. It may severely impact on the owner's ability to do things on their property that they would otherwise be able to do, and it may require a caveat or restrictive covenant being placed on the title. This could be a massive adverse effect, and significantly increase the	The BMP and BEEP prepared in support of the development proposal does not impact upon the BAL ratings of lots outside of the subject site. This appears to be a	
		chance of fire to those specific properties, and even the others within the Oakford Green estate.	misunderstanding of the policy framework, with any vegetation not within the	
		Water	proponents ownership or	
		This proposal is estimated to take up 35% (14 million litres per year) of the remaining available allocation of ground water. Our ground water systems are already under incredible stress. This will have an immediate adverse effect on the inhabitants of the locality in that the quality, and the amount, of groundwater available will be reduced. As our rainfall continues to trend downwards, aquifer recharge is reduced, and there will be less available for genuine rural activities, and for household water use by many local inhabitants.	control considered BAL-FZ as it cannot be managed by the proponents. Each landowner has their own obligations for bushfire management relating to their individual landholding.	
		The proposed site is not in Water Corp's forward planning for potable water or mains sewerage. A sewer line of 3.2km in length would need to be built by the developer and will run directly adjacent to the Bush Forever site on	Servicing via reticulated water and private pressure main, will require further	

Ordinary Council Meeting - 18 March 2024 Page 23 of 70

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Applicant Comment	Officer Comment
		Abernethy Rd. (P502 of the proposal). A potable water line of 2.5km in length will need to be constructed, also running adjacent to the Bush Forever site on Abernethy Rd. (P503 of the proposal). Damage to that protected site would be a devastating loss to the inhabitants of the locality, and also goes against "the preservation of the amenity of the locality" criteria, as per 5.1.1(a) of the TPS.	consideration of environmental impacts following determination.	
		In addition to the environmental concerns raised above, the proposal only pays little regard to the inherent value of a rural landscape as it is, with open grasslands and scattered trees. The proposal admits that some of these trees are used as forage for the endangered black cockatoos but says that they are not worth keeping. I have also witnessed black cockatoos roosting in the mature trees that line Kargotich Rd. Even though they are not native, they are being used by endangered species here as their preferred roosting sites have been destroyed by developments similar to this. This proposal also makes no mention of the 'Cathedral of Trees' on Abernethy Rd, that is listed on the Significant Trees register of the Shire. That significant stand of trees is already under pressure, and suffering damage from the traffic that is taking that route to avoid the roadworks on Thomas Rd, and the associated congestion at other intersections. It doesn't take a vivid imagination to see what might happen if the school proposal is approved, and the increased traffic takes its toll on one of the locality's only tourist attractions.	The application specifically retains the "Cathedral" of trees along Kargotich Road and Abernethy Road through the landscape design with development setback from the street frontages. The intent is to retain all significant vegetation onsite as outlined within the landscaping masterplan.	
		Telecommunications The locality is only served by an already oversubscribed 'Fixed Wireless' connection. NBN Co has no intention of rolling out underground cable to our area, so allowing for a school of 1200 to be placed in an area that is already struggling with the current numbers, is a significant adverse effect to the inhabitants of the locality.	The proposed development will require the installation of a transformer onsite. There is existing capacity within	

Ordinary Council Meeting - 18 March 2024
Page 24 of 70

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Applicant Comment	Officer Comment
		Power I read in the proposal documents (P505 of the proposal), that the closest substation, Byford, has less than 5MVA capacity available. It could be much less as that is the smallest increment on Western Power's scale. Western Power doesn't have any intention of upgrading that facility as yet, even though this locality is the subject of frequent blackouts due to damage to existing infrastructure from storms, trees and car accidents, and the lack of capacity in the network.	the network to support the proposed development as advised by Western Power (refer to servicing report).	
		Placing an additional load of 850KVA will further degrade the service provision to the inhabitants of the locality and would simply be irresponsible of the Shire to allow this proposal to proceed.		
		Additional Matters		
		The proponent has put up some very thin arguments in support of their proposal. They say that:		
		"This development supports the LPS by increasing the number of education facilities within the region." P42 of proposal		
		In actual fact, they are proposing to close at least two schools (one inside the Shire) and consolidate them onto one campus. So, at best, it keeps education facilities the same, and if they close more than two, then it reduces the overall number of educational facilities.		
		The proponent also claims:		
		"The Strategy also suggests that the key to resolving one of the local challenges is to encourage economic and business development within the Shire to strengthen local employment and the local economy. This development supports this aim by increasing employment opportunities within the local area." P42 of proposal		
		Once again, this is not true, as the Free Reformed Church of Australia only allows practising members of the Church to be enrolled in, or work at their schools. The number of practising members of the Free Reformed Church		

Ordinary Council Meeting - 18 March 2024 Page 25 of 70

Submitter No	Submitter Comments	Applicant Comment	Officer Comment
	of Australia is so small that it doesn't have its own category when it comes to census data. It is classed together with Presbyterian and Other Reformed Churches, so the true number in the Shire is hard to determine. However, it wouldn't be any more than 947, as per the 2021 census, and is much likely considerably less than that total. Further analysis of that census data suggest that the Free Reformed Church makes up only 0.5% of the total numbers in the 'Presbyterian and Other Reformed Churches' category across Australia. Although not precise, it can be extrapolated to give a reasonable estimate of the numbers with the Shire, and how small the educational and employment benefit would be to the Shire. Most of any educational or economic benefit that this proposal might have, will scatter throughout the adjacent Local Government Areas, and our Shire will be left to pick up the tab. That brings me to another point, the proposed plans include a 2.4m high security fence around the entire complex. This is completely out of character with the locality as most properties have post and rail, or post and wire fences, as per Shire requirements. This security fence implies that the facilities, in particular the outdoor playing surfaces, won't be available to the wider community, and will be restricted to just the members of this particular Church. Another aspect of this proposal which is not in keeping with the character of the locality is the two-storey administration building: "The proposed development is generally single storey in nature (with the exception of the secondary school administration building and gymnasium). The secondary administration building is proposed to be two storey in height (9.35m); and provides an identifiable address and orientation for the school." (P 48 of the proposal). So this is suggesting that this building will be visible from quite a distance, and will stick out like a sore thumb.	The proposed development seeks approval for only an Educational Establishment as per the Development Application.	

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Applicant Comment	Officer Comment
		Although not explicitly proposed, the proposal documents mention 'Chapel' many times, including this:		
		"The primary and secondary schools are linked by a planted and shaded pedestrian avenue running east west and may connect to a future chapel building." P40 of the proposal.		
		It would be fair to assume that if the proposed school development is approved, then a Church would soon follow, further adversely impacting the inhabitants, and taking away respite on the weekends from the activity of the school.		
		It is also my understanding that religious organisations are exempt from paying taxes and rates, and with the additional stress on the Shire's infrastructure that a development like this will cause, it will become a financial burden as the Shire will have to pay to maintain, and potentially upgrade, the existing infrastructure out of step with forward planning. This will of course flow onto the rate payers of the Shire, of which, very few will be able to use these facilities as mentioned above.		
		Finally, it would also be remiss of me not to mention that there are several examples of conflicts of interest in this proposal. Firstly, both of the Executive Directors of the surveyor for this proposal, Harley Dykstra, are members of the Free Reformed Church of Australia, with one of them even being the Chairman of the Free Reformed Schools Association, which is the client for this proposal.		
		I am also of the understanding that the 'Senior Planning Consultant' for 'element' is also a member of the Church and is in fact on the board of 'Seek Wisdom", which is the Free Reformed Church's study centre.		
		There are most likely more connections, and more blurring of the lines, but these conflicts of interest cut to the heart of our society, as Shire officers and Councillors rely on accurate and truthful information in order to make informed decisions. Any hint of real or perceived bias should be enough on its own to prevent this proposal from progressing.	No real or perceived conflict of interest exist with the assessment and	

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Applicant Comment	Officer Comment
		Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback on this proposal, I urge the SJ Shire Council to recommend to MODAP that this proposal not be approved in the strongest possible terms. If you require any more information from me, or the group on whose behalf that I am speaking, please don't hesitate to get in touch with me.	determination of this application by the Shire of Serpentine Jarrahdale and the Metro Outer Joint Development Assessment Panel.	
A401988 The same submission was submitted twice by separate landowners.	4 and 5	I oppose the development application for the proposed education establishment at Lot 218, 575 Abernethy Road, Oakford. This development would have an enormously negative impact on myself, my family, all residents living in the estate that is East of the proposed site, local residents, and other SJ residents. The development will not support my family, families of the Oakford Green estate or many Oakford residents at all as access to the school is limited to those who are members of the Church. My property backs onto Kargotich Rd and is directly East of the proposed site. We bought this land and built here on land that is zoned as rural living. When we bought the land we were told that surrounding farmland may be developed in the future however as it is zoned as rural and rural living it would be for other larger residential rural living lots. Not an incredibly large, exclusive educational facility. My main reasons for opposing this proposal are: 1. Increase in traffic (on already busy roads) 2. Increase in noise 3. Future expansion plans of FRSA 4. Loss of privacy 5. NBN & power outages	Refer to detailed discussion below re. Traffic and Noise.	Thank you for your submission. The matters you have raised have been addressed in the report.

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Applicant Comment	Officer Comment
Submitter	No	7. Destruction of vegetation for forest red-tail black cockatoos 8. Lack of real employment opportunities 9. Undeclared conflict of interest of Harley Dykstra I oppose the proposal due to the increase in traffic this proposal will cause. The traffic report only takes into consideration the large increase in traffic Monday-Friday between 0745-0845hrs and 1500-1600hrs. No information for traffic movement external to these hours for extracurricular activities and/or further expansion has been reported on. The increase in traffic between the above hours will see an additional 1,000 traffic movements occur during each of the two timeframes per day. This in addition to the already large number of traffic movements along these routes each day. It will have a negative impact upon all people within the Oakford Green estate and other users of the roads. Increased traffic will directly impact my family and other members of the estate as the time of commuting to commitments such as work and school will be significantly increased in the morning and afternoon periods. It is also a reasonable concern that Stadamy Street will be used as a through road by residents and nonresidents of the SJ shire to bypass the increasingly busy intersection of Kargotich and Abernethy roads. Despite the upgrades that will be made to Kargotich Rd and the intersection, the proposal would mean a large increase in traffic will still occur thus impacting SJ residents both locally and widely. The proposed education facility would also create a lot more noise which would have a negative impact on my family and many other local residents. Noise will be largely increased due to initial and ongoing construction of the facility, increased traffic movement directly behind our property, and activities undertaken at the facility. The proposal also includes the performing arts centre to be built close to Kargotich Road directly behind our properties. We chose to buy a rural living lot for the quietness that is not available in urban areas. This will no lo	Applicant Comment	Officer Comment

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Applicant Comment	Officer Comment
		I have concerns that should the proposal be accepted then further expansion of the school may occur with the likelihood of an increase in cohort size, a church, and a multipurpose hub. All of these factors would create more traffic and subsequent noise. An increase in traffic movement during both the identified peak period and also Sundays (church) and weeknights (multipurpose hub). These have been listed as part of the '2040 Vision: Campus Configuration and Infrastructure' discussion paper written by Free Reformed School Association Board Chairman Henry Dykstra (and Executive Director of Harley Dykstra). (Available at https://www.frsa.asn.au/wpfd_file/2040-campus-planning-vision-document-final/). The mention of a future chapel is also noted in the building application proposal — with both the Byford and Mundijong churches opening for a minimum of two services (9.30AM & 3.30PM every Sunday). Bible studies are also held on Tuesday mornings and evenings with a youth meeting occurring on another weeknight. The large surplus of park bays is also indicative of plans for expansion and/or use of the facility for non-teaching events. Other frequent events at the Byford FRC are held on Thursday evenings and Saturday afternoons. The subsequent increase in traffic and noise from these events has not been accounted for in the proposal. This will have a profound impact on local residents every day of the week and at multiple times during each day. NBN fixed wireless is indicated as available at the site for telecommunications in the report. Should the school only utilise the fixed wireless NBN and not extend the NBN fibre network then NBN wireless access will be significantly reduced for local residents due to the large requirements of the proposed facility. This would have a negative impact on all local residents who require internet access (e.g. for work).	The proposed development seeks approval for the K-12 school campus as proposed. No additional expansion is proposed by the development. Refer to discussion above. Refer to advice re. power above.	
		The Oakford Green estate has a high number of power outages each year. The report shows that the availability of the power as per Western Power is minimal. It is a concern that should the development occur, the power availability will be reduced for local residents and an increase in power outages may occur. This would have a profoundly negative impact on local		

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Applicant Comment	Officer Comment
		residents who require reliable power to access water, run aerobic treatment units for waste water management and for the everyday needs of households. Scheme water and mains sewer is not available as determined by the estate, electricity is required to operate water and septic pumps. Power outages due to overloading from the proposed facility have the potential to be dangerous for local residents should water be required in the event of a fire.		
		Privacy is also of great concern. The black 2.4m high garrison fencing is not in keeping with the rural style or requirements. It will not provide screening or privacy for residents of Stadamy St. The large number of slowly moving vehicles directly behind my property, and other properties within the estate will greatly reduce our privacy. As part of our rural living building requirements, residents had to build their properties with a 20m set back from the front of Stadamy St and as such, our alfresco/back garden areas are visible from Kargotich Road. Therefore, a large amount of slow-moving vehicles will be able to see directly into our alfresco/back garden areas that we enjoy as part of our rural living lifestyle. This will result in a loss of privacy and the issue will be further compounded by the development of a ring-road, access road and car park located directly behind the properties that back onto Kargotich Road. Many residents enjoy their outdoor areas and also have young children - this is a big breach of our privacy and negates the benefits of purchasing a rural living lot.	The proposed powder-coated fencing is required onsite to ensure student safety. The fencing style was chosen as this reflect the fencing used by Court Grammar School, Salvado Catholic School and Byford Senior High School. The school fencing chosen is typical for a school campus. Landscaping proposed will seek to soften any perceived visual impacts.	
		The proposal for development includes the plan to use groundwater for the establishment and ongoing irrigation of garden and oval areas. Many residents within the adjacent estate utilise groundwater for the irrigation of the properties to maintain green grass to reduce fire load. Many residents also utilise groundwater as part of their plans for a fire management strategy. We are concerned that should the facility access and use a large amount of groundwater, that this could have a detrimental effect on the access to groundwater for irrigation and fire protection for our properties. We often have black cockatoos within the vicinity of the Oakford Green estate and on the proposed lot. As keen bird watchers we see the Forest	Groundwater for irrigation purposes is subject to licencing approval from DWER.	

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Applicant Comment	Officer Comment
		Red-tailed Black Cockatoos regularly landing in and feeding on the sheoaks that are on the proposed property and that line Kargotich Rd. We have a deep concern that the development of the land will have a negative impact on the wellbeing of these birds that are already recognised as vulnerable.		
		The development proposal mentions that the facility will provide employment opportunities to local residents. To work for the FRSA you must be a Free Reformed church member therefore it does not offer employment opportunities for all local residents as the proposal suggests.	provide for increased employment within the Shire for members of the	
		Lastly, I believe that there is an undeclared conflict of interest with the surveyor company Harley Dykstra being co-directed by the Free Reformed School Association board chairman Henry Dykstra. The other Executive Director/Licensed Surveyor is also a recognised member of the Free Reformed Church of Australia (Sebastian Bolhuis). This is concerning due to the potential of the provision of biased information to support the proposed building application.	Refer to commentary on actual and perceived conflict of interest above.	
A402005	6	We live here for lifestyle – away from hustle, bustle etc. This is meant to be farming land (not school with 546 x car park bays) which will bring undue traffic congestion traffic to our quiet rural street which will become a thoroughfare, crime will increase, increased traffic to an already treacherous intersection road. Increased traffic to our street will pose safety issues for our kids / families, security to our properties will become vulnerable, increase of noise (sirens, pa systems, traffic, carnivals, bells etc) will take away our semi 'quiet' rural lifestyle, meaning this was not in any fore planning we were priveed to prior to purchasing property – as if was we would have re-considered. This seems to have been under the carpet proposed development and has only allowed for minimal properties / people to be priveed to alone which is not only 'unjust' but to not be giving the people (as a whole) of the Shire of	Refer to traffic advice below.	Thank you for your submission. The matters you have raised have been addressed in the report.

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Applicant Comment	Officer Comment
		on such a development which is not at all in favour of a big % is morally wrong.		
		The school will only cater for a select handful (if many) within the local community and is of no benefit to our young children or families that hold a minority of the Shire.		
		The development is also not at all within nor comply with the Serpentine town planning in that it will not be consistent with the orderly and proper planning of the locality and the preservation of the amenity of the locality (being rural!) and will have an adverse effect upon the inhabitants of the locality.	Refer above.	
		This also seems to have controversy with Executive Directors with one being the chairman of the proposed reformed school which is a		

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Applicant Comment	Officer Comment
		worrying about our children with busy roads and break-ins we moved to an area that is supposed to be semi-rural where we felt safer. Not only do we want this area to remain semi-rural we have genuine concerns about the proposed school.		
		The roads are the one of the largest concerns, firstly due the rapid growth within Byford the roads are already extremely busy and only getting busier which has led to many accidents - yes due to driver error, but adding to the congestion will only make matters worse.		
		The roads also cannot really handle more traffic, they can't handle the traffic that it currently has. Part of Orton Road, Warrington Rd, Nicholson Rd and Turner Rd only have enough room for one vehicle to remain on the road, the gravel road beside is not level and full of pot holes. Many other roads only just allow for 2 vehicles, when larger vehicles and trucks pass 1 vehicle often ends up swerving, which also endangers pedestrians.	Refer to traffic discussion below. The existing Campus provides for a surplus of car parking bays onsite to	
		The state of most roads within the area in general are poor, full of pot holes, large dips and dangerous intersections that due to the build up of traffic people take stupid risks and pull out or get impatient and don't follow the rules. Traffic banks up causing traffic to stop elsewhere, Salvado Catholic College is a perfect example of this at the corner of Abernethy and Warrington Rd, parents trying to get in to the school that want to use kiss and drop rather than parking up so they sit waiting to turn in to the school, people can't get past, you can't get to the day care and others can't get in to their own streets because traffic isn't even flowing through the roundabout because it's a stand still.	ensure no parking of vehicles offsite. Particularly, the internal road network ensures no cars are parked on surrounding local road networks.	
		While the traffic generally keeps flowing through Byford Secondary area near the shops, it is still incredibly slow and dangerous.		
		We pull out of our estate now and it is 90km - that will be reduced to 40km and we will face the above situation. Once established and the school starts growing there won't be enough parking - it happens at every school and we will then have everyone parking in our front yards.		

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Applicant Comment	Officer Comment
		We are literally seeing an accident EVERY WEEK at either Hopkinson and Abernathy or Hopkinson and Orton. Thomas Rd is already heavily congested and we have already been seeing Kargotich, Nicholson, Orton and other roads used as an alternative to Thomas.	Refer to servicing	
		Water- we are all on tank water, how are they going to provide sufficient water? Or will mains come and then we are all expected to do the same?	comments above.	
		Environment - When we built every tree we removed had to be replace with 8 trees, will they be doing the same? It is an extremely large amount of area that is being ripped up.		
		Cost - increase in expenses will see a cost in our rates go up and a majority of the people attending this school and church don't even live in the shire - so what contribution are they making to the shire at all to our area?	The proposed development will see an	
		It's supposed to be a semi-rural area how is this build up keeping the area semi-rural?? Please keep our area semi-rural and peaceful.	increased investment in the Shire by the client and members.	
		Thank you for your time.		
Resident	8	I wish to put in my objection to the school proposed.	Refer to traffic summary	Thank you for your
		I think there is enough traffic in the area without a school with extra traffic. The roads need to be improved drastically before this happens. Not to mention the ground water being taken for sporting fields.	below.	submission. The matters you have raised have been addressed in the
		I love our rural lifestyle and it is slowly being taken away from us. Please reconsider.		report.
A398397	9	Traffic Congestion: The addition of a school on Kargotich Road is likely to exacerbate traffic congestion in the area, especially during peak hours. This can pose safety risks for both students and residents. A comprehensive traffic impact study should be conducted to assess the potential gridlock and as the Oakford Equestrian Centre hire their indoor arena to the public on a regular basis for clinics and general use, this could also create further issues with horse floats added to the mix of busses and	Refer to traffic summary below.	Thank you for your submission. The matters you have raised have been addressed in the report.

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Applicant Comment	Officer Comment
		additional cars on that already busy intersection. I moved to this area for solitude and a quiet lifestyle, suburbia is encroaching at a rapid rate and by allowing these large infrastructures to be approved is just encouraging a fast paced city lifestyle instead of a quite rural one, which was my main goal for living in this area.		
		Infrastructure: The current infrastructure on Kargotich Road may not be sufficient to support the demands of a school. This includes roads, sidewalks, parking facilities, and public transportation options. The proposal should outline how these infrastructure issues will be addressed.	Refer to environmental	
		Environmental Impact: Building a school in Oakford may have adverse effects on the local environment, including habitat disruption, increased pollution, and possible harm to nearby wildlife. A detailed environmental impact assessment should be carried out to identify and mitigate these concerns.	considerations listed above.	
		Noise Pollution: The school's activities, including outdoor sports and events, could lead to increased noise levels, which may disrupt the peace and quiet of the neighbourhood. Noise reduction measures should be incorporated into the design and operation of the school.	Refer to noise summary below.	
		Property Values: Concerns about property values should be addressed, as the presence of a school can sometimes negatively affect nearby property values. A study on the potential impact on property values in the area should be conducted.	Not a valid planning consideration.	
		Zoning and Land Use: Verify that the proposal aligns with local zoning regulations and land use policies. If the school is not in compliance with these regulations, it could set a problematic precedent for future developments in the area.		
		Safety and Security: Assess the proposal's plans for ensuring the safety and security of both students and the surrounding community. Adequate measures should be in place to prevent accidents, vandalism, and unauthorized access to the school premises.		

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Applicant Comment	Officer Comment
		Community Input: Ensure that the community has had sufficient opportunities to provide input on the proposal. Public meetings and consultations should be conducted to gather feedback and address concerns from local residents.	Accepted.	
		Alternative Locations: Explore the possibility of alternative locations for the school that may have fewer negative impacts on the neighborhood. A thorough site selection process should be undertaken to evaluate other suitable options.		
		Preservation of Green Spaces: If the proposed location involves the destruction of green spaces or natural areas, consider advocating for the preservation of these areas or the creation of alternative green spaces within the school grounds.	The development proposal has sought to incorporate extensive green open spaces through the landscaping master plan design.	
A173801	10	No objection to proposed Educational establishment at Lot 218, 575 Abernethy Road Oakford	N/A	Thank you for your submission.
		This will be good for the future development around the surrounding areas.		
A401999	11	I am against building the school at corner of Abernethy Rd. and Kargotich Rd. due to the following:		Thank you for your submission. The
		Extra vehicles at school drop off and pick up times. The intersections around here aren't the best and struggle with the flow of traffic we already get, with a lot of accidents that seem to be almost on a weekly event. We have been patiently waiting for the Tonkin Highway extension to ease traffic flow, and now are in danger of creating more traffic. Our intersection we use is not the best for visibility, and now we could have cued traffic blocking us in.	Refer to traffic summary below.	matters you have raised have been addressed in the report.

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Applicant Comment	Officer Comment
		We chose the semi-rural lifestyle so we are not close to the rat race, but now may have to look at a large school with all the fencing etc like a prison. Sound travels out here, so guessing will be hearing PA announcements and probably kids yelling and screaming when playing on school ovels. School will probably be lit up at night for security, so that also will impact the neighbours that live opposite Kargotich Rd.	Refer to noise impact summary below. The applicant	
		Not to mention the impact of trucks and detours during construction. We are already living through an inconvenient detour from the closing of Kargotich at Thomas.	recommends a Construction Management Plan be prepared to the	
		So I am strongly against the construction of a school at Kargotich and Abernethy Rds.	satisfaction of the Shire.	
Website	12	This is supposed to be a semi rural suburb not development. The traffic issues will be a nightmare.	Refer to traffic summary below.	Thank you for your submission. The matters you have raised have been addressed in the report.
Website	13	Positively impacted we need more family oriented churches like reformed church.	Support for the development is acknowledged.	Thank you for your submission.
Website	14	I strongly agree with the proposal.	Support for the development is acknowledged.	Thank you for your submission.
Website	15	Supports the growing community.	Support for the development is acknowledged.	Thank you for your submission.

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Applicant Comment	Officer Comment
Website	16	This development will be a great way to bring people together in the local community and also provide further opportunities for employment in this area. The Shire will need to carefully consider upgrades to the roads in the area to ensure the safety of children.	Support for the development is acknowledged.	Thank you for your submission.
Website	17	We want the Christian school.	Support for the development is acknowledged.	Thank you for your submission.
Website	18	I support this initiative.	Support for the development is acknowledged.	Thank you for your submission.
Website	19	I support this initiative.	Support for the development is acknowledged.	Thank you for your submission.
Website	20	No way impacted rather benefited having a school around.	Support for the development is acknowledged.	Thank you for your submission.
Website	21	Significant increase in traffic on a section of road that is already high impact and problematic. Significant changes to the rural nature of the environment and surrounding properties Increased foot traffic and personnel accessing bridal trails via bikes, scooters and other.		Thank you for your submission. The matters you have raised have been addressed in the report.
Website	22	Its good to have a school around the area we live.	Support for the development is acknowledged.	Thank you for your submission.

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Applicant Comment	Officer Comment
Website	23	This project will benefit many Byford/ Serpentine Jarrahdale residents that currently bring their children to Armadale.	Support for the development is acknowledged.	Thank you for your submission.
Website	24	We will be severely impacted as the proposal is going to impact both roads in and out of our estate.	Refer to traffic summary below.	Thank you for your submission. The matters you have
		We bought this property and built our long term family home here 10 years ago so that we were out of a compacted and busy residential location. We specifically chose to be on the outskirts of Byford in an area that was zoned large residential blocks and farms only. Kargotich Road is a main arterial road of Byford and the surrounding suburbs and placing a school zone in the middle of a 90km hr stretch of SINGLE LANE road will be dangerous.		raised have been addressed in the report.
		A 100% private school only open to a very select religion does not align with the SJ Community values and planning. Our community is based around multiculturalism and inclusion - not division and unacceptance of others. There is no drainage, street lighting, scheme water, underground gas etc in this location, no kerbs or footpaths or road crossings etc and our land rates and taxes should NOT be used to fund anything that is not open to everyone in our shire. The majority of children attending this campus will not be from the Byford area, but will be bused in from locations across the Perth Metro and South West including, Armadale, Kelmscott, Melville, Mandurah, Baldivis, Rockingham etc. It is all outlined in the John Calvin Christian College 2040 Vision Campus Configuration and Infrastructure – Post Consultation Version2 as provided on their website in October 2021.		
		There is also farming land and Equestrian centres in this region with lots of horses, livestock and bridal trails. This all sees lots of trucks, trailers, horse floats etc - which reduce vision on side roads and road verges significantly causing another concern for safety. We all purchased in this area for the lifestyle and space, not to be inundated with traffic and hundreds of people daily. The next 5years of 40km hr roads and road blockages due to construction will cause MAJOR disruption to our lives.		

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Applicant Comment	Officer Comment
		Earthworks will be noisy and vibration will cause damage to our homes and will fill our homes, sheds, vehicles with dust and debris as well as rubbish being airborne in the Summer Easterly winds. Once operational, the families and traffic attending the school multiple times a day and again all weekend and outside of school hours for church services and will mean our lifestyles will cease. We are ABSOLUTELY OPPOSED to this development.		
Website	25	Increased traffic, noise pollution, environmental pollution with increased population density. This is already an extremely dangerous road, increasing the traffic will endanger locals.	Refer to traffic summary below.	Thank you for your submission. The matters you have raised have been addressed in the report.
Website	26	I came to this address because I wanted a rural lifestyle and I am a horse rider. My lifestyle is slowly but surely being eroded and the area has become so busy with traffic speeding around the streets and has become so dangerous and you want to allow more. It has become so bad it is dangerous to walk your dog let alone ride a horse and you want to add to the turmoil by contemplating this proposal and Abernethy Road will become a death trap. The whole planning of the Byford, Oakford has been so badly planned and for the life of me I don't know how it was ever passed. Very disgusted rate payer.	Refer to traffic summary.	Thank you for your submission. The matters you have raised have been addressed in the report.
Website	27	I think it would be great. I literally could just walk to the school when my kids go to school. The roads would need updating and changing the speed limit. Other schools around the area are at capacity and I can't get my kids in. Oakford doesn't have a school.	Support for the development is acknowledged.	Thank you for your submission.
Website	28	The proposal does not comply with Section 5.1.1 of the Serpentine Jarrahdale Town Planning Scheme No.2, in that it WILL NOT be consistent with the orderly and proper planning of the locality, and the preservation of	Refer to planning summary below.	Thank you for your submission. The matters you have

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Applicant Comment	Officer Comment
		the amenity of the locality and WILL HAVE an adverse effect upon the inhabitants of the locality AND upon the likely future development of the locality.	The application is to be assessed against the objectives of the Rural zone under LPS 3.	raised have been addressed in the report.
Website	29	The proposal does not comply with Section 5.1.1 of the Serpentine Jarrahdale Town Planning Scheme No.2, in that it WILL NOT be consistent with the orderly and proper planning of the locality, and the preservation of the amenity of the locality and WILL HAVE an adverse effect upon the inhabitants of the locality AND upon the likely future development of the locality.	Refer to planning summary below. The application is to be assessed against the objectives of the Rural zone under LPS 3.	Thank you for your submission. The matters you have raised have been addressed in the report.
Website	30	The proposal does not comply with Section 5.1.1 of the Serpentine Jarrahdale Town Planning Scheme No.2, in that it WILL NOT be consistent with the orderly and proper planning of the locality, and the preservation of the amenity of the locality and WILL HAVE an adverse effect upon the inhabitants of the locality AND upon the likely future development of the locality.	Refer to planning summary below. The application is to be assessed against the objectives of the Rural zone under LPS 3.	Thank you for your submission. The matters you have raised have been addressed in the report.
Website	31	We are already seeing a huge increase in traffic in our area. The new residents in a new residential area close by speed past pedestrians, horse riders, children on bikes etc. There were so many near misses with construction workers driving through the area during the land development for this site and this will likely occur again should the school site go ahead. This school will attract unwanted traffic at peak hours on already strained roads and junctions. Noise pollution from added traffic, school activities and not to mention coaches and school transport.	Refer to traffic summary below.	Thank you for your submission. The matters you have raised have been addressed in the report.
Website	32	The additional traffic using Kargotich and Abernathy Road as well as the intersection. The road is not suitable for additional traffic. Furthermore, putting a school of this size at this location takes away from the rural feel of the area and it's starts to become suburbia.	Refer to traffic summary below.	Thank you for your submission. The matters you have raised have been

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Applicant Comment	Officer Comment
				addressed in the report.
Website	33	I am strongly opposed to the development of this school on the grounds that the increased traffic, noise pollution and higher risks to the surrounding residents. The increased fire risk and the destruction of the native vegetation that endangered species inhabit. The lack of information provided in regard to what is going to be used for sewerage and supply of water (potable supply) let alone the usage of already impacted ground water supplies. This development will not blend in with the existing estates that are adjacent on the eastern side of Kargotich Rd.	Refer to traffic and noise summaries below.	Thank you for your submission. The matters you have raised have been addressed in the report.
Website	34	This proposal affects the lifestyle I have sort by buying and living in a rural area. I didn't buy acreage to be close to an educational hub with 500 plus car parks to cater for what can only be assumed 1,000 plus students and the traffic that will bring to the area. Under section 5.1.1 of the Town Planning Scheme No2 it states that the proposal must not have any adverse affect upon the inhabitants of the locality and amp; the proposal must preserve the amenity of the locality, clearly this proposal contravenes this subsection.	Refer to planning summary below. The application is to be assessed against the objectives of the Rural zone under LPS 3.	Thank you for your submission. The matters you have raised have been addressed in the report.
Website	35	Please accept this as my definite opposition to the approval of this development Ref: PA/588 The proposal doesn't comply with Section 5.1.1 of the Town Planning Scheme. This development is not consistent with the proper planning of the locality, and will not preserve the amenity of the locality give examples of how you see this school being the thin edge of the wedge, with further higher density housing, increased traffic, and the loss of the rural surroundings that we all bought into. This development will have adverse effects on the inhabitants (us) of the locality. Give examples of how this school will negatively impact us and our family include things like the expected 1,000 traffic movements at drop off and pick up times (in addition to normal traffic); how the streets in our estate will become additional drop off and pick up points in order to avoid queuing; include	Refer to the traffic, noise and planning summary below. The application is to be assessed against the objectives of the Rural zone under LPS 3.	Thank you for your submission. The matters you have raised have been addressed in the report.

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Applicant Comment	Officer Comment
		how the current infrastructure and planned roundabouts about is barely enough to cater for usage now, let alone with 1,200 students plus staff; and how every other FRC School has a Church attached to it, meaning that there is not even respite on the weekends; the 400million + litres of ground water that they propose to use to water ovals and gardens when we are receiving letters requesting that we give back some of our bore licences so that others can be issued some ground water approvals for their homes. These are only a few things of how we expect that this development would impact our property against our wishes.	groundwater license	
Website	36	Please accept this as my definite opposition to the approval of this development Ref: PA/588 The proposal doesn't comply with Section 5.1.1 of the Town Planning Scheme. This development is not consistent with the proper planning of the locality, and will not preserve the amenity of the locality give examples of how you see this school being the thin edge of the wedge, with further higher density housing, increased traffic, and the loss of the rural surroundings that we all bought into. This development will have adverse effects on the inhabitants (us) of the locality. Give examples of how this school will negatively impact us and our family include things like the expected 1000 traffic movements at drop off and pick up times (in addition to normal traffic); how the streets in our estate will become additional drop off and pick up points in order to avoid queuing; include how the current infrastructure and planned roundabouts about is barely enough to cater for usage now, let alone with 1200 students plus staff; and how every other FRC School has a Church attached to it, meaning that there is not even respite on the weekends; the 400million + litres of ground water that they propose to use to water ovals and gardens when we are receiving letters requesting that we give back some of our bore licences so that others can be issued some ground water approvals for their homes. These are just a few of the impacts this development will have one our home and lifestyle that are against our wishes.	Refer above. Appears to be the same submission.	Thank you for your submission. The matters you have raised have been addressed in the report.

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Applicant Comment	Officer Comment
Website	37	All Oakford residents have chosen to invest and live in a rural area with significant financial outlay to achieve this. Having a development of this size thrust upon us after the fact, and in such close proximity, directly threatens this lifestyle choice when it is not in keeping with the Town Planning Scheme or the SJ Shire Local Planning Strategy. Specifically, the proposal is not in keeping with Section 5.1.1 of the Town Planning Scheme i.e. the orderly and proper planning of the locality and the preservation of the amenity of the locality. Furthermore: - There is no benefit to the Shire or the wider community with access to facilities restricted by a 2.4m fence that isn't in keeping with the rural feel of Oakford and attendance for the school reserved for church members only The Shire and local residents will be negatively impacted by having to pay for additional services, infrastructure and road maintenance. This would be at the detriment of already planned for and agreed projects with rates already becoming exorbitant. There has been a biased and unethical presentation of data by the surveyors and element with executive directors being members of the church creating an inexcusable conflict of interest. Other reasons I have for opposition: - Personal safety will be impacted by increased traffic on already busy roads not designed or rated for the current level of traffic. Increasing this to an extra 1,000 vehicle movements morning afternoon will significantly increase the risk of accidents and severely impact movement around the suburb Parents will attempt to avoid the Abernathy / Kargotich intersection and use side roads as pick up / drop off points and other road users will create "rat runs" through side streets to avoid the congestion. This will impact the safety and security of all residents in nearby estates The noise and vibration of construction will directly affect the health and wellbeing of nearby residents due to the heightened and sustained stress response that will last years while con		Thank you for your submission. The matters you have raised have been addressed in the report.

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Applicant Comment	Officer Comment
		moving equipment during construction Given every other FRC Schools have churches attached, it is likely this will be the case here meaning no respite on weekends from the noise or the traffic either I am against the environmental impact that the school will have on the habitat of the Black Cockatoos that rely on the trees on the proposed site for development. This will push an endangered species closer to extinction Also, the predicted use of 14 Million litres of ground water per year for sports fields and landscaping means the wider community cannot use or have access to this resource. This is a blatant disregard for both the environment and the local residents by using a precious resource that was not allocated to them or planned for with no thought or consideration for the long term impact this will have on a finite resource Impact to already deficient internet access as NBN is not upgrading the network anytime soon. Already we have poor mobile reception and internet access. An extra 1000+ people draining that every day will affect everyone in the community in their ability to communicate with loved ones, work from home and enjoy personal downtime Oakford already has numerous and lengthy power outages due to damaged and failing infrastructure from storms, trees and car accidents and lack of capacity during peak times. Knowing adding a proposal of this size to a system that is already at capacity would be irresponsible of the Shire If the proposal is allowed to proceed, there will be changes to the Bushfire Management strategies of existing properties with no prior notice or consent. This is an unfair burden on existing homeowners who will now be unfairly disadvantaged. Overall, the proposal will not benefit the wider community as it is a private school for church members only. If this proposal is allowed through, it opens the door for other submission also not in keeping with the town planning scheme and threatens the rural lifestyle that the Shire and local residents strive to		
Website	38	I think it's a fantastic proposal in many ways, 1) a Christian school for our children - which is increasingly growing 2) location is fantastic and easily accessible 3) it will grant opportunities for our community as we are a	Support for the development is acknowledged.	Thank you for your submission.

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Applicant Comment	Officer Comment
		growing community 4) it's safe and secure options 5) growth in Oakford has increased since we've moved here 3 years ago there's no other place for our schools to go but here, due to location of our students. Easily accessible for buses, parents, students, ambulances if needed the space. Community bases for sports day. It won't be like anything we have ever had.		
Website	39	The proposal allows access to schooling for more children with a religious background and upholds the religious freedoms within the Shire. I don't believe that it will impact the rural lifestyle nor cause disruption to the Oakford community. As a Christian and a member of the school association which has submitted the application, I believe that this development proposal will only enhance the community by drawing more people and thus more business and growth to the Shire, and provide opportunity for children to access quality education. This school is the one I would send my future children to and I strongly support the proposal.	Support for the development is acknowledged.	Thank you for your submission.
Website	40	The school will provide an opportunity for local infrastructure to be upgraded including Abernathy and Kargotich rds. It will bring more people into the shire and allow for growth in the township of Byford and surrounds. The school will provide a large open space and will not impact any views that people currently have. As this area is a rural area it is an ideal location for a school and in the future this facility may potentially be hired/utilised by the wider community. It in no way impacts on our location even though we are within 500m of the proposed site. I whole heartedly agree with the proposal and support it in full. It is my understanding that this school will be owned and operated by the Free Reformed Churches of which there are already 4 churches in the Shire and it shows that the Shire as a whole is a desirable place to live, work and be educated.	Support for the development is acknowledged.	Thank you for your submission.
Website	41	The proposal to build the school is one to be commended. It is in an ideal location with easy access to main roads and the like. It shows that the Shire is an ideal location for these types of facilities. The school will provide	Support for the development is acknowledged.	Thank you for your submission.

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Applicant Comment	Officer Comment
		the Shire with more residents who will live and work and also send their children to this facility. The plans are aesthetically pleasing and the access to and from the area will not be a problem due to the current upgrades being made to Kargotich Rd; Abernathy Rd. Will good management and planning this facility will make good use of what is currently pasture land and the landscaping proposed for the site will do the shire justice in many aspects. I whole heartedly support the development of the site for a school		
Website	42	The proposal for a new educational establishment is well thought out. As a school with a Free Reformed Christian background, it encapsulates Australian national values of freedom of religion. The location provides ease of access to a Christian education for many citizens of the SJ area. As a member of the Free Reformed Churches I am highly invested in this school proposal, hoping to find employment there when it opens. I hope and pray the SJ Shire will not shut down this proposal due to religious discrimination, but rather see it as an investment in the future of Australia.	Support for the development is acknowledged.	Thank you for your submission.
Website	43	This education institution is a wonderful way for the Shire to expand its horizons and commodities for residents living in the vicinity of the proposed school. Education is limited in this area and as for myself I had to travel an hour on a bus every morning and afternoon to get to a Christian school. As a Christian that has freedom of religion such commodities are a wonderful way in which the Shire can support the diverse range of needs within the community. This school will not only improve the area for more people to populate it but will also demonstrate support for education that is essential in to all youth in WA. I fully support the proposal and see no issue at hand with the school generating too much traffic especially with the planned upgrade for Kargotich Road. Or using too much water (which in my opinion is stupid all the water comes from the same dams so it's not like we are going to run out of water faster). The school is a great expansion for the Shire and one which should be fully supported in order to cater to the	Support for the development is acknowledged.	Thank you for your submission.

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Applicant Comment	Officer Comment
		fundamental rights outlined in our constitution, having accessible education that supports personal beliefs is highly needed and beneficial.		
Website	44	My concerns are generally about the negative impact on our lifestyle. Apart from the obvious semi-rural lifestyle the area afforded us, we purchased our land and built our home because the land west of Kargotich Rd is zoned Rural, allowing us to have a wonderful view across the paddocks and not have to worry about development in the near future. I do not believe that the size and type of this development meets the requirements of 5.1.1 of the Town Planning Scheme No 2, in that it will not be consistent with the orderly and proper planning of the locality and the preservation of the amenity of the locality for current residents. I also have concerns about: - the increase in traffic the school will bring and how difficult it will be to get out of our street in the mornings and afternoons the increase in construction vehicles, trucks, machinery and the associated noise during the construction phase which will go on for years the possibility of damage to our home during the construction phase the amount of water that will be used for irrigation - the noise that the school will create once opened - the use of playing fields after hours or at night with the accompanying lights the addition of a chapel/church which will mean traffic will continue over the weekends the school will cater for a select group of people in the community and I don't see how the rest of the community will benefit from the development. I fail to see how the proposed development will generate local employment and help local businesses. Finally, I have no issue with the building of a school to cater for the Free Reform Community, but I don't think that the proposed site is the correct one. If I wanted to see people and cars when looking out of my windows I would have stayed in suburbia. Thanks	Refer to planning summary below. The application is to be assessed against the objectives of the Rural Zone under LPS 3. Refer to the recommendation re. a Construction Management Plan to the satisfaction of the Shire.	Thank you for your submission. The matters you have raised have been addressed in the report.
Website	45	Oakford is a Special Rural Zone. This proposed school development of 37 Hectares is too large, involving potential traffic numbers and people movements that are very excessive, for a Special Rural Zone. Kargotich Road carries significant traffic with only one lane on each side of the road,	Refer to traffic, noise and planning summaries below.	Thank you for your submission. The matters you have raised have been

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Applicant Comment	Officer Comment
		seven days a week. The proposed development suggests access from Kargotich Road, which is unrealistic considering stated proposed movements of 1,000 trips morning and 1,000 trips afternoon. This does not take into account movements for sporting fields and performance venues, which involves 7 day usage and night time scenarios. This is totally inappropriate for a Special Rural Zone. The traffic and people movements this proposed development would generate on a seven days a week basis, is a very significant noise and pollution concern for the amenity of a Special Rural Zone. My residence is on Elwood Loop, almost on the corner of Elwood and Kargotich, and directly opposite proposed Hardcourts of this development. Submitted 10/09/23.		addressed in the report.
Website	46	Ground water which we solely rely on, for our home and livestock, also traffic which we are already a black spot for, our rural feels which will be definitely gone and all this for 2 schools our children won't be allowed to attend!	Refer to groundwater license allocation comments above and traffic summary below.	submission. The
Website	47	School isn't even for our kids, our water could be affected, and the traffic will be horrendous.		Thank you for your submission. The matters you have raised have been addressed in the report.
Website	48	Development of land - AMD 192GG 30/05/17 5.1.1 the power conferred by this clause, and Clause 67 of the Deemed Provisions, may only be exercised if the Council is satisfied that: AMD 192 GG 30/05/17 a) approval of the proposed development would be consistent with the orderly and proper planning of the locality and the preservation of the amenity of the locality.	Refer to planning summary below.	Thank you for your submission. The matters you have raised have been addressed in the report.

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Applicant Comment	Officer Comment
		b) the non-compliance will not have any adverse effect upon the occupiers or users of the development or the inhabitants of the locality or upon the likely future development of the locality; and		
		c) the spirit and the purpose of the requirement or standard will not be unreasonably departed from thereby		
		personal safety affected by increased traffic on already busy and unsafe roads not designed for the current levels of traffic.	Refer to traffic summary below.	
		noise and vibration from the traffic and construction will impact my health and wellbeing with heightened and sustained stress response.		
		potential structural integrity damage to my house from the construction vibration.		
		the biased and unethical presentation of data by the surveyors with its executive directors being members of the church creating a conflict of interest.		
		• no benefit to the wider community with access facilities restricted by a 2.4m fence that isn't in keeping with the rural feel of Oakford.		
		the additional proposed 1,000 or more traffic movements in the AM and PM peak periods alone is enough of an adverse effect on the inhabitants of the Special Rural Zone of Oakford locality, let alone the noise, stress of already bursting infrastructure; and		
		and the Oakford Equestrian Centre which is a large horse riding facility across the road will be greatly affected by the increase traffic noise and movement.		
Website	49	For nearly 30 consecutive years immediately prior to moving to Oakford, I lived either on the same road as a school, or within 200m of one. I know exactly what it is like to live near a school, and one of the major reasons I decided to live here was to get away from that. My parents deliberately bought a house in close proximity to a planned school in the early 1980s,	Double up Submission - refer above.	Thank you for your submission. The matters you have raised have been

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Applicant Comment	Officer Comme	∍nt
		several years before it was built. It was a known thing, formed the central focal point of a very well planned development, and residents were able to make informed decisions about living next to a school, prior to it being built. That is in stark contrast to this proposal. Had I known that there was going to be a school on the corner of Kargotich and Abernethy Roads, I wouldn't have moved here. Residents, like me, who have made significant financial and investment decisions to achieve a certain lifestyle, risk having that completely undone. We have made sacrifices, such as not having connections to mains water and sewerage and living further away from key services than others, with the trade-off being that we can aim for the lifestyle that we want. We knew about those constraints, and the cost and inconvenience associated with those was well worth it. However, this proposal threatens that. I am not naive enough to think that Oakford won't get developed further, and I am not automatically opposed to all development. I understand that the Shire has a need to grow, but it needs to be "consistent with the orderly and proper planning of the locality and the preservation of the amenity of the locality." This proposal does not meet those criteria, as per 5.1.1(a) of the Town Planning Scheme No. 2, and I will discuss some reasons for this position below. The proponent relies heavily on the SJ Shire Local Planning Strategy (LPS) to support its proposal. However, they have failed to consider, or deliberately ignored, several pertinent sections. Perhaps most striking is a direct reference to Private Schools. On pages 120-121 of the LPS, the Shire states: "It is critical that the landscape, environmental and indeed economic values of rural land be recognised and protected. Unless there is a clear message that further encroachment of urban development and further fragmentation of land zoned Rural for non-productive purposes will not be contemplated, there is likely to be speculation and pressure for further rezoning." It g		addressed in report.	the

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Applicant Comment	Officer Comment
		in the LPS to resist pressures, such as private schools wanting to locate		
		on rural land, and that proposals that result in the further fragmentation of		
		rural zoned land will not be contemplated. Had the proponent read this part		
		of the LPS, they would have reconsidered the proposed location. The Shire		
		has an opportunity now to send that clear message that they are seeking,		
		otherwise: "The highly valued rural character of the Shire will be severely		
		compromised if not destroyed if urban development is permitted to		
		continually sprawl outwards." (P 120 of the LPS). In the same document,		
		the Shire outlines how schools will form part of the long-term planning of		
		the areas: "Given the population projections for Byford and Mundijong, it is important that an adequate number of primary and secondary schools be		
		planned for at the structure plan stage and land set aside for this purpose		
		to ensure education requirements will be met in the future." (P 66 of LPS)		
		This proposal isn't part of any structure plan that I am aware of, and the		
		LPS does not include Oakford as a potential site for any school. Reading		
		this proposal in the context of the LPS, and the inconsistencies I've		
		discussed above, this proposal clearly does not meet the requirements of		
		5.1.1(a) of the Town Planning Scheme No.2. It is not consistent with what		
		the Shire plans for this locality, and it has the potential to completely		
		destroy the amenity of the area that is enjoyed not just by those close by,		
		but the entire Shire. Since I received the letter notifying me of this proposal		
		on Friday August 25, 2023, I have spent considerable time reading through		
		the proposal documents in order to make an informed submission on this		
		proposal. I am fortunate that I can somewhat read and understand these		
		documents, but for someone not used to these kinds of reports, at 628		
		pages, it is enough to scare off all but the most determined people. I am		
		familiar with the phrase "baffle them with bull****", and this appears to be		
		a prime example. The proponent may be attempting to bog the Shire		
		officers, and those whose opinions have been sought, down with the sheer		
		volume and bulk of it, in the hope that it just gets waived through without		
		proper scrutiny. It could be argued that the proponent is setting up an		
		expectation that because of the years of work they have already done on		
		the proposal, and the expense that they have occurred, it would be unfair		

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Applicant Comment	Officer Comment
		to them for Council not to allow this proposal to progress. It would not		
		surprise me if Shire officers and Councillors feel intimidated when dealing		
		with certain developers. In addition to that, the residents mostly effected		
		by this proposal have only had a short time to consider their position. Had		
		the inhabitants of the locality been consulted properly, prior to this proposal		
		being submitted, the proponent may have gained a better understanding		
		of the area, and the strong feelings that this now galvanised community		
		has. Since expressing my concerns publicly, I have discovered that I am		
		not alone in my strong opposition to this proposal. Personally, I find it quite		
		staggering that the proponent, and certain individual members of the Free		
		Reformed Church, are of the belief that they can blindside the inhabitants		
		of this locality with such a huge development, and not receive some		
		criticism, or push back. It is the height of arrogance and shows complete		
		disdain for those whom this development will severely adversely effect.		
		Section 5.1.1(b) of the Town Planning Scheme No. 2 states that a		
		noncomplying development "will not have any adverse effect upon the		
		inhabitants of the locality" in order for it to be approved. I will list below just		
		some of the identified 'adverse effects' I think are relevant in this case.		
		Traffic The proponent has estimated that there will be an extra 1,000 traffic		
		movements in both the morning and afternoon peaks. Using Main Roads		
		traffic data, this will triple the traffic volumes at both 7am and 4pm, from		
		approximately 500 to 1500. It will also increase the average daily traffic volume by almost 50%. To suggest that this won't have an adverse effect		
		on the inhabitants is just delusional. Because of the congestion that this		
		will cause at those key pick up and drop off times, the local roads, including		
		those of Oakford Green, will be used as additional pick up and drop off		
		zones, or as staging areas for waiting cars who will then move to the		
		designated zones when called up, like what happens at Perth Airport. It is		
		also worth noting that the Traffic Impact Assessment report may have been		
		compiled using incorrect or misleading information provided by the client.		
		The report states: "The Site primarily functions as an education institution,		
		primarily serving the residential developments surrounding it. Anticipated		
		major attractors/generators in the vicinity of the site include the residential		

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Applicant Comment	Officer Comment
		developments located within the Oakford radius." (P145 of proposal) As I		
		will discuss later, the catchment area for this school would not primarily be		
		Oakford, or even the Shire, but surrounding areas as far as Mandurah. Fire		
		On page 242 of the proposal, a post-development BAL Contour Map is		
		shown. It shows that parts of the residential lots backing onto Kargotich Rd, have possibly had sections of the property re-categorised as BAL-FZ		
		due to their proximity to the proposed school. If this is the case, the		
		consequences for those property owners are very significant. It may		
		severely impact on the owner's ability to do things on their property that		
		they would otherwise be able to do, and it may require a caveat or		
		restrictive covenant being placed on the title. This could be a massive		
		adverse effect, and significantly increase the chance of fire to those		
		specific properties, and even the others within the Oakford Green estate.		
		Water This proposal is estimated to take up 35% (14 million litres per year)		
		of the remaining available allocation of ground water. Our ground water		
		systems are already under incredible stress. This will have an immediate		
		adverse effect on the inhabitants of the locality in that the quality, and the		
		amount, of groundwater available will be reduced. As our rainfall continues		
		to trend downwards, aquifer recharge is reduced, and there will be less		
		available for genuine rural activities, and for household water use by many		
		local inhabitants. The proposed site is not in Water Corp's forward planning		
		for potable water or mains sewerage. A sewer line of 3.2km in length would		
		need to be built by the developer and will run directly adjacent to the Bush		
		Forever site on Abernethy Rd. (P502 of the proposal). A potable water line of 2.5km in length will need to be constructed, also running adjacent to the		
		Bush Forever site on Abernethy Rd. (P503 of the proposal). Damage to		
		that protected site would be a devastating loss to the inhabitants of the		
		locality, and also goes against "the preservation of the amenity of the		
		locality" criteria, as per 5.1.1(a) of the TPS. Environment In addition to the		
		environmental concerns raised above, the proposal only pays little regard		
		to the inherent value of a rural landscape as it is, with open grasslands and		
		scattered trees. The proposal admits that some of these trees are used as		
		forage for the endangered black cockatoos but says that they are not worth		

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Applicant Comment	Officer Comment
		keeping. I have also witnessed black cockatoos roosting in the mature		
		trees that line Kargotich Rd. Even though they are not native, they are		
		being used by endangered species here as their preferred roosting sites		
		have been destroyed by developments similar to this. This proposal also		
		makes no mention of the 'Cathedral of Trees' on Abernethy Rd, that is		
		listed on the Significant Trees register of the Shire. That significant stand		
		of trees is already under pressure, and suffering damage from the traffic		
		that is taking that route to avoid the roadworks on Thomas Rd, and the associated congestion at other intersections. It doesn't take a vivid		
		imagination to see what might happen if the school proposal is approved,		
		and the increased traffic takes its toll on one of the locality's only tourist		
		attractions. Telecommunications The locality is only served by an already		
		oversubscribed 'Fixed Wireless' connection. NBN Co has no intention of		
		rolling out underground cable to our area, so allowing for a school of 1,200		
		to be placed in an area that is already struggling with the current numbers,		
		is a significant adverse effect to the inhabitants of the locality. Power - I		
		read in the proposal documents (P505 of the proposal), that the closest		
		substation, Byford, has less than 5MVA capacity available. It could be		
		much less as that is the smallest increment on Western Power's scale.		
		Western Power doesn't have any intention of upgrading that facility as yet,		
		even though this locality is the subject of frequent blackouts due to damage		
		to existing infrastructure from storms, trees and car accidents, and the lack		
		of capacity in the network. Placing an additional load of 850KVA will further		
		degrade the service provision to the inhabitants of the locality and would		
		simply be irresponsible of the Shire to allow this proposal to proceed.		
		Additional Matters The proponent has put up some very thin arguments in		
		support of their proposal. They say that: "This development supports the LPS by increasing the number of education facilities within the region." P42		
		of proposal. In actual fact, they are proposing to close at least two schools		
		(one inside the Shire) and consolidate them onto one campus. So, at best,		
		it keeps education facilities the same, and if they close more than two, then		
		it reduces the overall number of educational facilities. The proponent also		
		claims: "The Strategy also suggests that the key to resolving one of the		

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Applicant Comment	Officer Comment
		local challenges is to encourage economic and business development		
		within the Shire to strengthen local employment and the local economy. This development supports this aim by increasing employment		
		opportunities within the local area." P42 of proposal Once again, this is not		
		true, as the Free Reformed Church of Australia only allows practising		
		members of the Church to be enrolled in, or work at their schools. The		
		number of practising members of the Free Reformed Church of Australia		
		is so small that it doesn't have its own category when it comes to census		
		data. It is classed together with Presbyterian and Other Reformed		
		Churches, so the true number in the Shire is hard to determine. However, it wouldn't be any more than 947, as per the 2021 census, and is much		
		likely considerably less than that total. Further analysis of that census data		
		suggest that the Free Reformed Church makes up only 0.5% of the total		
		numbers in the 'Presbyterian and Other Reformed Churches' category		
		across Australia. Although not precise, it can be extrapolated to give a		
		reasonable estimate of the numbers with the Shire, and how small the		
		educational and employment benefit would be to the Shire. Most of any		
		educational or economic benefit that this proposal might have, will scatter		
		throughout the adjacent Local Government Areas, and our Shire will be left to pick up the tab. That brings me to another point, the proposed plans		
		include a 2.4m high security fence around the entire complex. This is		
		completely out of character with the locality as most properties have post		
		and rail, or post and wire fences, as per Shire requirements. This security		
		fence implies that the facilities, in particular the outdoor playing surfaces,		
		won't be available to the wider community, and will be restricted to just the		
		members of this particular Church. Another aspect of this proposal which		
		is not in keeping with the character of the locality is the two-storey		
		administration building: "The proposed development is generally single		
		storey in nature (with the exception of the secondary school administration building and gymnasium). The secondary administration building is		
		proposed to be two storey in height (9.35m); and provides an identifiable		
		address and orientation for the school." (P 48 of the proposal). So this is		
		suggesting that this building will be visible from quite a distance, and will		

Submitter No	Submitter Comments	Applicant Comment	Officer Comment
	stick out like a sore thumb. Although not explicitly proposed, the proposal documents mention 'Chapel' many times, including this: "The primary and secondary schools are linked by a planted and shaded pedestrian avenue running east west and may connect to a future chapel building." P40 of the proposal. It would be fair to assume that if the proposed school development is approved, then a Church would soon follow, further adversely impacting the inhabitants, and taking away respite on the weekends from the activity of the school. It is also my understanding that religious organisations are exempt from paying taxes and rates, and with the additional stress on the Shire's infrastructure that a development like this will cause, it will become a financial burden as the Shire will have to pay to maintain, and potentially upgrade, the existing infrastructure out of step with forward planning. This will of course flow onto the rate payers of the Shire, of which, very few will be able to use these facilities as mentioned above. Finally, it would also be remiss of me not to mention that there are several examples of conflicts of interest in this proposal. Firstly, both of the Executive Directors of the surveyor for this proposal, Harley Dykstra, are members of the Free Reformed Church of Australia, with one of them even being the Chairman of the Free Reformed Schools Association, which is the client for this proposal. I am also of the understanding that the 'Senior Planning Consultant' for 'element' is also a member of the Church and is in fact on the board of 'Seek Wisdom', which is the Free Reformed Church's study centre. There are most likely more connections, and more blurring of the lines, but these conflicts of interest cut to the heart of our society, as Shire officers and Councillors rely on accurate and truthful information in order to make informed decisions. Any hint of real or perceived bias should be enough on its own to preventile feedback on this proposal, and if you require any more information from me, o		

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Applicant Comment	Officer Comment
Website	50	Increase in traffic Why can't this school be built in the industrial/commercial area between Bishops Road and Mundijong Road? Isn't there already a school like this in Byford?		Thank you for your submission. The matters you have raised have been addressed in the report.
Website	51	I am writing to you, the Serpentine Jarrahdale Shire, regarding the Proposed Educational Establishment - Lot 218, 575 Abernethy Road, Oakford due to the direct impact this proposal will have on me personally. Given that I am a reasonably new resident in the scheme of Oakford residents, there has been some significant decisions and proposals being pushed forward by Council that has proven to have significant impact on my locality, wellbeing and direct financials given the changes. Alone, the proposal put forward conflicts with the requirements of 5.1.1 of the Town Planning Scheme No 2. Increasing traffic on an already busy and unsafe road, that is not designed for current levels of traffic, should be the only arguments needed to reject the plan.	Refer to the planning summary below.	Thank you for your submission. The matters you have raised have been addressed in the report.
		Kargotich Road is not sufficient for an additional 1000+ cars from out of suburb in these peak windows daily. I made the effort to touch base with council prior to my purchase on Stadamy Street, Oakford to ensure that the current Tonkin Highway design/proposal was current and request any information regarding any intended changes to that of Kargotich Road, within the direct vicinity to Abernethy Road to ensure that information that was on hand from online research was current and factual. Upon this information and confirmation that there was no foreseeable works approved, we decided to purchase on Stadamy Street in May 2021. Unfortunately, since our purchase, there has been significant changes to road designs with a roundabout plan along Kargotich Rd, directly impacting my line of sight from our living room to the corner of Abernethy and Kargotich Roads. This has caused great concern stress and worry. We as a younger family really stretched ourselves financially to give ourselves	Refer to traffic summary below.	

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Applicant Comment	Officer Comment
		what we considered an opportunity of a semi-rural lifestyle. Since this purchase we have consistently been met with surprise changes and proposals in our immediate locality, with the proposed school being another. With the recent changes/traffic detours from Kargotich Road along Abernethy Road, we have only had a mere taste of what is to come. To say that this has been more than noticeable and directly impacted the road noise and exacerbated traffic is an understatement. Knowing know that the plan to close Abernethy Road off at Hopkinson on the Main Roads/Tonkin Hwy Proposal has been eliminated, to become a major roundabout and gateway out of Byford, has and will continue to directly impact us in many ways, daily. I can only write to highlight my personal, financial and wellbeing impacts, of which I struggle to grasp each day given recent proposals. I can only hope that there is reasonable rejection with such a development that goes directly against the grain of the zoning, direct impact on the residents and locality.		
Website	52	There are a number of concerns I have in regard to this proposed development. My family bought our home over 2 years ago, opting for a quiet semi rural lifestyle for our 2 children. At that time we enquired about the Tonkin Hwy development and knew of how that could impact us potentially in the future. However, this proposal in question has far more impacts than we ever had concerns about with the Tonkin Hwy development - and even that seems to have changed significantly in the last couple of years. Having a massive school (and potential church dwelling - given there are over 500 car bays in the proposal. No school has that many car bays allocated for staff & parent only parking) located within 200m of our home does not retain the semi rural lifestyle of Oakfords occupants and poses a huge influx of traffic and road noise and even safety concerns in regard to the feeding roads (Abernethy and Kargotich). My home is located directly adjacent to Abernethy Road and we have a view of Kargotich Road from our main front windows. The increase in traffic from the recent Kargotich Road closure and upgrades is significant and has impacted us in the increased level of road noise and delay in	Refer to traffic summary below.	Thank you for your submission. The matters you have raised have been addressed in the report.

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Applicant Comment	Officer Comment
		commutes to and from our home. Noting the severe deterioration of Abernethy Road in both directions. I have grave concerns this infrastructure will be the start of more "suburban" developments and Oakford will no longer be the semi-rural "country" lifestyle it currently holds.		
Website	53	We have lived in our current address for the past 6 years. We brought in this area to create a semi rural lifestyle for our 2 boys. We love the fact that there are paddocks all around us, cows, sheep and horses. We aren't on top of our neighbours and we enjoy the relative peace and quiet. All our dreams of a semi rural lifestyle have come shattering down on us by the proposed building of a new K-12 school that will be adjacent to the back of our block. The following reasons are why we strongly oppose any sort of this development going ahead:		Thank you for your submission. The matters you have raised have been addressed in the report.
		1. The proposal doesn't comply with Section 5.1.1 of the Town Planning Scheme. This development is not consistent with the proper planning of the locality and will not preserve the amenity of the local surroundings. If this allowed to go ahead then where will the development cease? This school could become the thin edge of the wedge, paving way for further higher density housing, increased traffic, and the loss of the rural surroundings that we all bought into.	The proposed development is to be assessed on the objectives of LPS 3.	
		2. This development will have adverse effects on the inhabitants (us) of the locality. The expected traffic movement alone at drop off and pick up times (in addition to normal traffic) will create further havoc on roads that find it hard to already withstand the daily traffic. There will be a back log of cars on a road that will not be able to handle it. The local roads will become quasi drop off and pick up points. Not to mention the noise this extra traffic will create. If there is a church attached like every other FRC School, means there will be no respite from traffic even on the weekends.		
		3. A major road will go from 80km to 40km within the school zone. A major disruption for a road that is a thoroughfare out to Thomas Rd.		

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Applicant Comment	Officer Comment
		4. We are concerned about the financial impact from increased rates to pay for the repairs to damaged roads.		
		5. The environmental impact to black cockatoo habits pushing an endangered species closer to extinction with the clearing of all the land. 6. The potential structural integrity damage to our house from the construction vibration.		
		7. There will be no benefit to the wider community with access to facilities restricted by a 2.4m fence. This alone does not keep within the rural feel of Oakford. Plus attendance to the school is reserved for church members only.		
		8. I feel there will be a reduction in our quality of life due to the noise from the school and the impact from such large number of students will have such a great impact on the area with things like already limited internet services.		
		9. Also the change to our Bushfire Management Strategies, which considering we built here first, should not have to change to accommodate a new structure that is totally unwanted in the area.		
		10. Finally, the biased and unethical presentation of data by the surveyors with executive directors being members of the church is a total conflict of interest.		
		I certainly hope you take into consideration our strong stance against this proposal. We are the ones who have built our homes here for a reason. We have worked hard to get the lifestyle we appreciate and really don't want it all affected by a proposed school that could be built somewhere else that isn't going to impact the surrounding residents in the same way.		
Website	54	We have lived in our current address for the past 6 years. We brought in this area to create a semi rural lifestyle for our 2 boys. We love the fact that there are paddocks all around us, cows, sheep and horses. We aren't on top of our neighbours and we enjoy the relative peace and quiet. All our	Double-up submission. Refer above.	Thank you for your submission. The matters you have raised have been

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Applicant Comment	Officer Comme	ent
		dreams of a semi rural lifestyle have come shattering down on us by the proposed building of a new K-12 school that will be adjacent to the back of our block. The following reasons are why we strongly oppose any sort of this development going ahead:		addressed in report.	the
		1. The proposal doesn't comply with Section 5.1.1 of the Town Planning Scheme. This development is not consistent with the proper planning of the locality and will not preserve the amenity of the local surroundings. If this allowed to go ahead then where will the development cease? This school could become the thin edge of the wedge, paving way for further higher density housing, increased traffic, and the loss of the rural surroundings that we all bought into.			
		2. This development will have adverse effects on the inhabitants (us) of the locality. The expected traffic movement alone at drop off and pick up times (in addition to normal traffic) will create further havoc on roads that find it hard to already withstand the daily traffic. There will be a back log of cars on a road that will not be able to handle it. The local roads will become quasi drop off and pick up points. Not to mention the noise this extra traffic will create. If there is a church attached like every other FRC School, means there will be no respite from traffic even on the weekends.			
		3. A major road will go from 80km to 40km within the school zone. A major disruption for a road that is a thoroughfare out to Thomas Rd.			
		4. We are concerned about the financial impact from increased rates to pay for the repairs to damaged roads.			
		5. The environmental impact to black cockatoo habits pushing an endangered species closer to extinction with the clearing of all the land. The amount of trees that will be cleared is devastating.			
		6. The potential structural integrity damage to our house from the construction vibration.			
		7. There will be no benefit to the wider community with access to facilities restricted by a 2.4m fence. This alone does not keep within the rural feel			

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Applicant Comment	Officer Comment
		of Oakford. Plus attendance to the school is reserved for church members only.		
		8. I feel there will be a reduction in our quality of life due to the noise from the school and the impact from such large number of students will have such a great impact on the area with things like already limited internet services.		
		9. Also the change to our Bushfire Management Strategies, which considering we built here first, should not have to change to accommodate a new structure that is totally unwanted in the area.		
		10. Finally, the biased and unethical presentation of data by the surveyors with executive directors being members of the church is a total conflict of interest.		
		I certainly hope you take into consideration our strong stance against this proposal. We are the ones who have built our homes here for a reason. We have worked hard to get the lifestyle we appreciate and really don't want it all affected by a proposed school that could be built somewhere else that isn't going to impact the surrounding residents in the same way.		
Website	55	We are objecting to the proposal, as the road structure is not able to handle the congestion of peak traffic for the school. Personal safety affected by the increased traffic on already an extremely busy road, due to not being designed for increased traffic. Environmental impact to the wildlife, especially the black cockatoo habits pushing an endangered species closer to extinction. Financial impact from increased rates to pay for the repair to roads, which are not in a suitable condition. The school is going to have 2.4m fencing, which certainly does not keep the rural appearance or feel. Plus no benefit to the wider community, attendance for the school is reserved for church members only. Reduction in the quality of life living on rural / special rural property due to the number of students and teachers will have due to noise and also on the limited internet services. The biased	Refer to traffic summary below. Refer to comments re. fencing above.	Thank you for your submission. The matters you have raised have been addressed in the report.

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Applicant Comment	Officer Comment
		and unethical presentation of data by the surveyors with executive directors being members of the church creating a conflict of interest.		
Website	56	Traffic with 1200 students will be too much. Excess use of ground water, 2.4m high security fence locked so the local residents would not be able to use.	Refer to traffic summary below and comments regarding groundwater licencing and fencing above.	Thank you for your submission. The matters you have raised have been addressed in the report.
Website	57	Traffic with 1,200 students will be too much. Excess use of ground water, 2.4m high security fence locked so the local residents would not be able to use.	Double-up. Refer above.	Thank you for your submission. The matters you have raised have been addressed in the report.
Website	58	Increased traffic on Kargotich Rd. McKenna Drive has no turn-in access and is dangerous now trying to get in and out of the street with the amount of traffic we already have. It will be even harder with buses, dump trucks, and cars. I also feel that the road is unsafe now and not designed for this level of traffic and the noise and vibrations are going to increase too. The financial impact of increased rates to repair these roads. A 2.4m fence isn't in keeping with the rural feel. and very concerned that it's estimated to be using 14 million litres of water to maintain its ovals and gardens.	Refer to traffic summary below. Refer to fencing and groundwater license comments above.	Thank you for your submission. The matters you have raised have been addressed in the report.
Website	59	We moved here in 2020 to live a rural lifestyle, making this our forever home. This proposal does not comply with Section 5.1.1 of the Town Planning Scheme. We will be severely impacted as our property backs onto Kargotich Rd opposite the proposed site. The 2.4 metre high security fence doesn't fit in with the rural setting The added 14 million litres of ground water would reduce the water table.	Refer to the planning and traffic summary below.	Thank you for your submission. The matters you have raised have been addressed in the report.

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Applicant Comment	Officer Comment
		There is also a conflict of interest by the surveyors with executive directors being members of the Free Reformed Church therefore I find this biased and unethical. There will be very few SJ Shire students benefiting from this as all students (parents) attending must be a member of the Free Reformed Church. They will also have additional extra curricular activities including sport, music and performance events outside of school teaching hours including weeknights, weekends and school holidays. The Free Reformed Church will also add extra traffic congestion for non school hours. Not to forget the 10 school buses they have planned in time to come.		
		The Tonkin Hwy extension is a fantastic idea and well needed to ease that traffic pressure, but the extra 1500+ vehicles during school drop off's, pick up's and out of normal school hours (Church meetings etc.) will be chaotic and the few extra roundabouts will not alleviate the traffic situation. Also the danger of having multiple students of all ages riding push-bikes and scooters on the already congested roads would be very catastrophic to say the least. This proposed complex would not benefit the SJ Shire or SJ ratepayers as a huge majority of attendees are not SJ Shire ratepayers as they will be coming from other areas. I believe the only outcome would be to keep with the rural setting of small acerage lots therefore benefiting SJ Shire and community.		
		I very strongly oppose this development. This is causing undue stress and is impacting my health and well-being. This will not just be your normal run of the mill K-12 school. It is much more than that. There appears to have been a lot of sneakiness regarding this proposal. There has also been incorrect information given to the planners regarding existing roads, for a better looking proposal. SJ ratepayers deserve better than this		
Website	60	Increase of traffic noise increase in vehicles this is a Rural area I moved here 28 years ago for the peace and quiet not for this.	Refer to comments provided above.	Thank you for your submission. The matters you have raised have been

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Applicant Comment	Officer Comment
				addressed in the report.
Website	61	I fully oppose this campus development/educational establishment. This proposal does not comply with Section 5.1.1 of the Town Planning Scheme. This development will have adverse affects on our rural area; Reduced water table levels within the area Unimaginable amounts of extra traffic Extra curricular activities outside of school hours including evenings and weekends 7 days a week. Reduced quality of life, due to large amounts of noise coming from 1,200+ students during sporting and outside activities, including weekends. (my property backs onto Kargotich Rd) The Free Reformed School Association has been sly and cunning in giving incorrect and misleading information. The biased and unethical data presentation would be a conflict of interest with executive directors being members of The Free Reformed Church. I believe this would not benefit SJ ratepayers/community or SJ Shire in any way. This area would be better suited for rural living.	Refer to planning summary below. Refer to comments provided above.	Thank you for your submission. The matters you have raised have been addressed in the report.
Website	62	Increase in traffic; Water run off to the area; Drop in the level of the water table; Reduction of enjoyment of home.	Refer to comments provided above.	Thank you for your submission. The matters you have raised have been addressed in the report.
A401999	63	I would like to submit my proposal that the Proposal for the FRSA Oakford school campus not be approved. I believe that the area surrounding us would better suit maybe more properties of 2.5-5 acre size blocks and keeping with estates such as Oakford green and Cavallo estates and other estates building up around us. The School does not keep the rural living that we bought into, and it would severely impact the local roads surrounding it. Even with road upgrades and roundabouts installed nearby would not suffice. The roads would	Refer to comments provided above.	Thank you for your submission. The matters you have raised have been addressed in the report.

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Applicant Comment	Officer Comment
		struggle with the need for 1,200 students to get to school every day, the speed reductions would be a burden to Kargotich Rd and if the school was also a church then I take it there would be no relief to weekends and school holidays either. Currently the intersection of Kargotich and Abernethy Roads are being used as a detour and its already a nightmare.		
		The roads are a deep concern for traffic and more so the noise of a school and the sheer size of it just impacts the whole area and our life style out here that we have deeply invested into. I think maybe somewhere else where it doesn't impact the local estates out here where people have horses or ride dirt bikes etc.		

NATURE OF CONCERN	APPLICANT RESPONSE
Traffic Generation and Abernethy Road – Kargotich Road Roundabout	The applicant submitted a Transport Impact Assessment with the development application (refer to Appendix F) which outlines all traffic considerations (worst case scenario) associated with the development proposal. The TIA concludes all access proposed by the development will operate at an appropriate level of service with excess parking bays onsite to accommodate for peak hour pick up and drop off efficiencies.
	The roundabout at the intersection of Abernethy Road-Kargotich Road was funded within stage two of the Hypergrowth Road Program due to background traffic growth within the locality and the anticipated change in traffic distribution following the construction of Tonkin Highway.
	The applicant was advised by the Shire that within the OCM on 16 October, the previous funding allocation for the roundabout construction within Stage 2 of the hypergrowth road program was recommended to be reallocated to accommodate escalating construction costs and timely delivery within the funding time allocation. This has resulted in the withdrawal of funding for the roundabout construction with the hypergrowth road program requiring further funding to enable construction.
	A supplementary technical note has been provided to the Shire Staff for assessment, outlining the proposed development Stage 1 may be accommodated within the existing intersection configuration at the opening year (2028). We acknowledge the conservative traffic generation at opening for the secondary school (2028) is considered on the basis of full build out of the Secondary School which our client does not anticipate to occur

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

NATURE OF CONCERN	APPLICANT RESPONSE
	until 2040. However, for a robust assessment, the worst-case scenario was considered. The technical note identifies the Abernethy Road and Kargotich Road intersection will operate at an acceptable level of services, with minor delays during peak am and pm periods.
	The Applicant acknowledges that the roundabout is planned to be constructed by the Shire on the basis of increased background traffic demand within the locality. The delayed opening of the secondary campus (Stage 1), will enable sufficient time for further black spot funding applications and the next state election (2025) to secure funding for the construction of the roundabout within the hypergrowth road program.
Noise and Amenity Considerations	An amended acoustic assessment was prepared by Herring Storer which included ambient noise levels of the locality and the proposed noise generation of the development.
	The amended acoustic report concluded the proposed development noise emissions are equal to or less than the current modelled ambient noise levels associated with passing traffic.
	Refer Acoustic Report – Rev 2 04/10/2023.
LPS 3 Rural Zone objectives	The Shire of Serpentine Jarrahdale's Local Planning Scheme No. 3 was gazetted on 22 of September, 2023.
	An Educational Establishment is considered a discretionary (D) land use within the Rural Zone of LPS 3. Further detailed discussion regarding the development proposal meeting the objectives of the Rural Zone are outlined within the DA report at Appendix B – Planning Framework.
Future expansion plans of the FRSA	The proposed development seeks approval from the Metro Outer JDAP for an educational establishment only as outlined on the development plans.
	No additional uses or expansion plans are proposed by this application.
Safety and security	The fencing around the perimeter of the school site is proposed to be black fencing to a height of 2.4m for student security and safety of students as provides for at existing school campuses within the Shire.

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

NATURE OF CONCERN	APPLICANT RESPONSE
	The applicant anticipates a condition of development approval for the construction of the perimeter fence to the satisfaction of the Shire.
Construction Management Plan	The applicant acknowledges potential impacts on nearby residents during construction and recommends a standard construction management plan be submitted to the Shire for approval prior to the commencement of works.
Clearing of Native Vegetation and potential black cockatoo foraging habitat.	Existing native vegetation onsite is scattered and completely degraded due to ongoing grazing of the land by livestock. Vegetation located along the Abernethy Road and Kargotich road frontages which define the landscape amenity of the locality are to be retained and enhanced with infill planting as per the landscape masterplan.
	Clearing of existing vegetation onsite is to be minimised to retain the existing tree canopy. Subject to detailed design, minor clearing of vegetation may be required and subject to a clearing permit application for determination by DWER.
Groundwater licensing and water allocation	The applicant advises that the current school campus at Armadale has two superficial groundwater licenses (L205182), and the Byford campus has a single license (L203296) which are proposed to be relocated to the subject site.
	The licenses total 28,650KL, approved for irrigation of ovals and playing fields which is considered sufficient for the proposed campus irrigation requirements.