

**SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS**  
**PA21/343 – Lot 29, 38 Paterson Street, Mundijong - Child Minding Centre**

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Applicant Response						
DBCA		The Department of Biodiversity Conservation and Attractions - Swan Region Office has no comments on the application.							
DFES		<p>I refer to your email dated 19 April 2021 regarding the submission of a Bushfire Management Plan (BMP) (Version 1.0), prepared by Bushfire Prone Planning and dated 6 April 2021, for the above development application. The BMP is accompanied by a report from the proponent titled "Proposed Child Minding Centre" dated 1 April 2021 for the above development application (DA).</p> <p>This advice relates only to State Planning Policy 3.7: Planning in Bushfire Prone Areas (SPP 3.7) and the Guidelines for Planning in Bushfire Prone Areas (Guidelines). It is the responsibility of the proponent to ensure the proposal complies with relevant planning policies and building regulations where necessary. This advice does not exempt the applicant/proponent from obtaining approvals that apply to the proposal including planning, building, health or any other approvals required by a relevant authority under written laws.</p> <p><b><u>Assessment</u></b></p> <p>1. Policy Measure 6.5 a) (ii) Preparation of a BAL contour map</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="521 1023 1494 1409"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="521 1023 846 1091">Issue</th> <th data-bbox="846 1023 1171 1091">Assessment</th> <th data-bbox="1171 1023 1494 1091">Action</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="521 1091 846 1409">Vegetation Classification</td> <td data-bbox="846 1091 1171 1409">Vegetation Plots 2 and 6 within the Paterson Street Road Reserve cannot be substantiated as Class G Grassland and excluded vegetation with the limited information</td> <td data-bbox="1171 1091 1494 1409">Modification to the BMP is required</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Issue	Assessment	Action	Vegetation Classification	Vegetation Plots 2 and 6 within the Paterson Street Road Reserve cannot be substantiated as Class G Grassland and excluded vegetation with the limited information	Modification to the BMP is required	<p>Photos 2a and 2b in the Bushfire Management Plan show the grassland area of Plot 2 in the fore ground. As per AS3959-2018, the delineation between the forest vegetation and the grassland vegetation is assessed to the unmanaged understorey rather than the canopy line. Vegetation Area 2 is assessed correctly, if not conservatively. Photo 6b shows that all scrub, shrubs and grasses are removed from under tree canopies in this area, trees are underpruned to above 2 metres. This area is managed along with</p>
Issue	Assessment	Action							
Vegetation Classification	Vegetation Plots 2 and 6 within the Paterson Street Road Reserve cannot be substantiated as Class G Grassland and excluded vegetation with the limited information	Modification to the BMP is required							

**SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS**  
**PA21/343 – Lot 29, 38 Paterson Street, Mundijong - Child Minding Centre**

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Applicant Response
		<p>and photographic evidence available. The crown canopy cover appears to exceed 30%, contiguous with Plot 1 – Class A Forest and the potential for revegetation has not been considered.</p> <p>Evidence to support the exclusion of Plot 6 as managed to low threat in accordance with AS3959 is required. An enforceable mechanism is required to provide certainty that the proposed vegetation exclusion can be achieved in perpetuity and that it is enforceable.</p> <p>If unsubstantiated, the vegetation classification should be revised to consider the vegetation at maturity as per AS3959, or the</p>	<p>lawns and gardens to the south as part of an entry statement to the Mundijong Railway Station</p>  <p>In our opinion, no amendment is required to assessed vegetation areas.</p>

**SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS**  
**PA21/343 – Lot 29, 38 Paterson Street, Mundijong - Child Minding Centre**

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Applicant Response												
		<p style="text-align: center;">resultant BAL ratings may be inaccurate.</p> <p><b>2. Policy Measure 6.5 c) Compliance with the Bushfire Protection Criteria</b></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="521 533 1491 887"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="521 533 846 601">Element</th> <th data-bbox="846 533 1167 601">Assessment</th> <th data-bbox="1167 533 1491 601">Action</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="521 601 846 887">Location, and Siting &amp; Design</td> <td data-bbox="846 601 1167 887">           A1.1 &amp; A2.1 – not demonstrated             The BAL ratings cannot be validated for the reason(s) outlined in the above table.         </td> <td data-bbox="1167 601 1491 887">Modification to the BMP is required.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><b>3. Policy Measure 6.6.1 Vulnerable land uses</b></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="521 959 1491 1410"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="521 959 846 1027">Issue</th> <th data-bbox="846 959 1167 1027">Assessment</th> <th data-bbox="1167 959 1491 1027">Action</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="521 1027 846 1410">Bushfire Emergency Evacuation Plan (BEEP)</td> <td data-bbox="846 1027 1167 1410">           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 5.5.2 'Developing a         </td> <td data-bbox="1167 1027 1491 1410">Comment only.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Element	Assessment	Action	Location, and Siting & Design	A1.1 & A2.1 – not demonstrated  The BAL ratings cannot be validated for the reason(s) outlined in the above table.	Modification to the BMP is required.	Issue	Assessment	Action	Bushfire Emergency Evacuation Plan (BEEP)	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 5.5.2 'Developing a	Comment only.	<p>Vegetation Area 1 is a narrow, isolated strip of forest vegetation, approximately 25 metres wide. The size and orientation of this vegetation area would see a reduced radiant heat level affecting the subject site compared to that calculated adopting the BAL separation distances in Table 2.5 of AS3959-2018. If anything the BAL ratings for the subject site are overstated due to the general nature of the Method 1 tables. In our opinion, no amendments are required to BAL ratings.</p> <p>The Bushfire Emergency Plan complies with the requirements of the Guidelines for Planning in Bushfire Prone Areas and associated guidance documents.</p>
Element	Assessment	Action													
Location, and Siting & Design	A1.1 & A2.1 – not demonstrated  The BAL ratings cannot be validated for the reason(s) outlined in the above table.	Modification to the BMP is required.													
Issue	Assessment	Action													
Bushfire Emergency Evacuation Plan (BEEP)	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 5.5.2 'Developing a	Comment only.													

**SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS**  
**PA21/343 – Lot 29, 38 Paterson Street, Mundijong - Child Minding Centre**

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Applicant Response
		<p data-bbox="853 301 1155 671">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.</p> <p data-bbox="519 708 1487 1123">Recommendation – not supported modifications required  It is critical that the bushfire management measures within the BMP are refined to ensure they are accurate and can be implemented to reduce the vulnerability of the development to bushfire. The proposed development is not supported for the following reasons:  1. The development design has not demonstrated compliance to –  Element 1: Location; and  Element 2: Siting and Design.  If you require further information, please contact Richard Trinh, Senior Land Use Planning Officer on telephone number 9395 9709.</p>	
A118400 Coney	1	<p data-bbox="519 1161 1487 1310">Re proposed Child Minding Centre on Paterson Street.  While I have no objection to the proposal, I think it would be good long term for Mundijong to where possible follow the heritage look of the façade on the buildings to avoid a mismatch of development along the main street.</p>	See amended plans

**SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS**  
**PA21/343 – Lot 29, 38 Paterson Street, Mundijong - Child Minding Centre**

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Applicant Response
A117900 Starkey	2	I have no objection to the proposed Centre as long as its structure COMPLIMENTS our country town Heritage style like the Chemist and not a colourbond modern eyesore.	
A174800 Hughes	3	We are fully in agreeance with this proposal.	
A177800 Nardelli	4	The proposed child care building for 38 Paterson Street, Mundijong is ugly and totally out of character with the existing buildings (hotel, hairdresser and pharmacy).  Also there is inadequate parking for the potential drop off and pickup.	See amended plans
A118001 Vander Ros	5	We are against a childcare centre being built on the main street. We feel the main street of the town should be kept mainly for retail / café / bakery etc.  In addition, we are concerned about how it will affect traffic on Paterson Street and also the extra noise of all the kids playing outside. There is already a primary school with noise that really carries throughout the day.  We feel the childcare centre should be placed in an estate etc. and not on a main road.  The Shire has one chance in making great decisions in developing in the area. People are here for the quiet, country lifestyle, with that more old buildings on the main street. A childcare centre would spoil the feel of the area and the preliminary drawings show a building that would look very out of place for the character of this town.	See amended plans
Online submitter - anon	6	Mundijong is an old town abd the building structure does not fit in the style of the town – too modern. I assume the building will be going down the block and not  MUNDIJONG IS AN OLD TOWN AND THE BUILDING STRUCTURE DOES NOT FIT IN THE STYLE OF THE TOWN - TOO MODERN. I	See amended plans

**SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS**  
**PA21/343 – Lot 29, 38 Paterson Street, Mundijong - Child Minding Centre**

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Applicant Response
		ASSUME THE BUILDING WILL BE GOING DOWN THE BLOCK AND NOT ACROSS THE FRONT. WILL THERE BE ENOUGH ROOM FOR PARKING? THE IDEA OF A CHILD CARE CENTRE IN THE TOWN IS GREAT.	
Online submitter - anon	7	The proposed building design does not comply with the Paterson Street Design Guidelines in any way. Architectural design is not at all sympathetic to the 19th and 20th century character of the precinct. The building materials of front facade are not timber or brick as per guidelines. The roof is proposed to be flat and not pitched. The front facade will have an awful impact on streetscape with the main feature being a 2 storey concrete panel wall with no windows or other features. This also does not comply with the active frontage requirements of the design guidelines which require 60 percent of the front facade to be glazed. No front verandah is proposed. This building will be an eyesore and should not be approved.	See amended plans
Online submitter - anon	8	I fully support a child minding center in town however oppose the front elevation and think it should 100% coincide with the elevations of the doctors surgery, hair dresser and pub. The elevation does not suit the area or the neighbouring buildings and needs to be adjusted accordingly.	See amended plans
Online submitter - anon	9	Keep the concrete buildings for byford. Yes we need a child care center but not like this. Not only does this not match the rest of the designs guidelines other businesses needed to follow in town. it doesn't even match the towns vibe and design needs to be looked at as this is hideous.	See amended plans
Online submitter - anon	10	I have daycare aged children and would love a second option.	
Online submitter - anon	11	While I am in full support of a childcare facility in this location, I feel that the design does not fit within the character of the area or Main Street designs and will detract from the charm and historic significance of nearby buildings - The medical facility is a good example of fitting in with the streetscape	See amended plans

**SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS**  
**PA21/343 – Lot 29, 38 Paterson Street, Mundijong - Child Minding Centre**

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Applicant Response
Online submitter - anon	12	1. Industrial design doesn't fit with the existing streetscape of Patterson Street 2. being 2 story - it doesn't fit with existing streetscape of Patterson Street 3. being 2 story - it impacts on privacy of surrounding neighbors, of which I am 4. Lets not set a precedence for ugly and/or 2 story development proposals for Patterson Street 5. Poor planning regarding parking - pickup and drop off (64 children) means increased traffic which I don't see being accounted for, nor assessed, in the proposal. Patterson Street at this location is single lane with center islands. 6. Proximity to pub / proposed site of drive through - adding to more traffic.	See amended plans
Online submitter - anon	13	Mundijong is a beautiful OLD town with lovely character buildings. While the proposed day care is very much needed, the design is horrible. All modern precast concrete with absolutely no character, and in the Main Street. It will be an absolute eyesore. I think it's horrible.	See amended plans
Online submitter - anon	14	Nothing directly. It would lessen the burden of families in the area who seek childcare; we have to drive 20 minutes to thomas road for our centre!	
Online submitter - anon	15	Do not believe the structure of the building is in keeping with the towns main street scape. Hardware store may cause allergy issues with some children (ie: hay, chemicals, dust)	See amended plans