Technical Report							
Application No: PA23/73							
Lodgement Date:	Lodgement Date: 30 January 2023						
Address:							
Proposal:							
	and 'Community Fac	ility'					
Land Use:	Place of Public	Permissibility:	SA				
	Worship						
Owner:	Owner: Byford Projects 2018 Pty Ltd						
Applicant:	Harley Dykstra (Mira	nda Bowman)					
Zoning:	Urban	Designation:	Mixed Business				
	Development						
Delegation Type:	12.1.1	Officer:	David Quelch				
Site Inspection:		Yes					
Advertising:		Yes					
Internal Referrals:							

<u>Building</u>: A Certified Building Permit application and approval is required prior to construction. Please request the method of SW management. Note: the land is in a Bush Fire Prone Area. No BCA concerns at this stage.

Compliance Department:

- Can we clarify hours operation as lists church operating hours and intention to hire out the facility to others from 6:00am 12:00am Monday-Saturday and Sunday noon-22:00.
- Are the proposed 50 parking bays enough if occupancy is expected to be between 150-300 persons
- Noise impacts condition hours of operation.

Development Contributions: NA - not in a DCA

Emergency Services Department: No comments received.

<u>Environment</u>: A landscape management plan will be required to cover private landscaping and verge landscaping where appropriate.

Conditions:

- 1. Prior to the commencement of works a management plan shall be submitted to the Shire of Serpentine Jarrahdale for its approval.
- 2. The landowner shall implement and thereafter maintain the works in accordance with the management plan approved by the Shire of Serpentine Jarrahdale
- 3. A Streetscape Management Plan, to be submitted and approved prior to the issue of a Building Permit to establish street trees for the adjoining verge of the lot.
- 4. A Landscape Plan must be prepared and include the following detail to the satisfaction of the Shire, prior to commencement of site works:
 - a. The location, number and type of existing and proposed trees and shrubs, including calculations for the landscaping area;
 - b. Any lawns to be established;
 - c. Any natural landscape areas to be retained;
 - d. Those areas to be reticulated or irrigated; and
 - e. Verge treatments proposed.

The landscaping must be completed prior to the occupation of the development, and must be maintained at all times to the satisfaction of the Shire.

A streetscape management plan should be required to cover the planting of trees in the Robertson Road east and west verge areas. The vegetation to complement the verge treatment applied adjacent to all the other lots that are developed in Lot 128 Southwestern. Highway.

Health:

Effluent Disposal

The system they are proposing to connect to is within a separate lot/subdivision. An Aerobic Treatment Unit (ATU) is proposed in the north-western corner of proposed Lot 4. On 25 January 2022, the Department of Health issued an Approval to Construct or Install an Apparatus for the Treatment of Sewage for an ATU within a different portion of Lot 128 South Western Highway, falling within a separate subdivision application.

The subdivision where plan does not demonstrate an available sewerage connection to the proposed lots.

Approval has not been granted for an ATU in the proposed location. As this subject lot does not have an adequate sewerage connection or approval to construct an ATU, the Shire of Serpentine Jarrahdale requests that a Site and Soil Evaluation be prepared prior to subdivision. This Site and Soil Evaluation must demonstrate treatment of the wastewater that will be produced by the subject site. This Site and Soil Evaluation must be in support of the Lots 1, 3 and 128 South West Highway, Byford Local Water Management Strategy dated January 2011, and the Byford Self Storage – Lot 128 South Western Highway, Byford Stormwater Drainage Management Plan dated June 2020.

4.2 Non-Residential Premises

Please give details of the premises and the nature of use.
 Storage Facility / Factory Units / Office & Warehouse

Public buildings - please detail the licensed maximum occupancy rate: persons

Number of persons on premises and AND any other volumes of liquid waste generated onsite:

Office Staff Customers e Staff (non-showering) Factory	3 10 12 12	30 10 30 70	90 100 360 840
e Staff (non-showering) Factory	12 12	30 70	360 840
Factory	12	10 10 100 12 30 360 12 70 840 24 10 240 15 30 450 3 70 210 18 70 1,260	
· · ·			
A College			
Visitors	24	10	240
e Staff (non-showering)	15	30	450
fice Staff (showering)	3	70	210
Warehouse Staff	18	70	1,260
Visitors	10	10	100
Í	fice Staff (showering) Warehouse Staff Visitors	fice Staff (showering) 3 Warehouse Staff 18 Visitors 10	fice Staff (showering) 3 70 Warehouse Staff 18 70

Please refer to DOH factsheet: "Supplement to Regulation 29 – Wastewater system loading i requirements and details on calculating daily wastewater volumes.

Expected Daily Wastewater Volume: 3,650 Litres / Day

Acoustics

The modelling has not considered night time activities "However, as the Church operates during day periods, this report only the day period noise levels have been modelled."

This must be updated to reflect the operating hours outlined in the report – see below

The proposed hours that the facility would be for the explicit use of the Centrepoint Church are as follows:

OPERATING HOURS:

- Thurs 10am till noon (fortnightly)
- Fri 6:30pm till 8:30pm
- Sun 9am till noon

The proposed hours that the facility would be available for hire by other parties are as follows: OPERATING HOURS:

- Mon 6am till 12am
- Tue 6am till 12am
- Wed 6am till 12am
- Thurs 6am till 12am (excluding fortnightly 10am-12pm youth program slot)
- Fri 6am till 6pm and 9pm till 12am
- Sat 6am till 12am
- Sun noon till 10pm"

Noise modelling refers to noise measurements taken from Banister Road. Modelling is required to be done on a case by case basis. This requires correction.

All architectural drawings ensure table 6.6- Internal Noise Levels are taken into consideration where the Main Meeting Hall (Façade facing Road) is Solid Brick (No Windows) and the Rear Foyer Entrance has a Glass Entry.

From the modelling undertaken, noise received at the development would exceed the above criteria with the noise levels listing in Table 6.5 below.

.__. . _ _ . . _ . _ . _ . _

TABLE 6.5 – FUTURE NOISE LEVELS						
Receiver Location	Noise Levels dB(A)					
Main Meeting Hall (Façade facing Road)	58					
Rear Foyer Entrance	37					

Based on the external noise levels listed in Table 6.6, calculations were carried out to determine various internal noise levels based on the current acoustic performance of the building. The internal noise level comparison to the applicable criteria are contained in

TABLE 6.6 – INTERNAL NOISE LEVELS							
Location	External Future Noise Level dB(A)	Internal Noise Level dB(A)	Comment				
Main Meeting Hall (Façade facing Road)	58	<35	Solid Brick (No Windows)				
Rear Foyer Entrance	37	<35	Glass Entry				

Based on the above, the internal noise level would be between 33-34 dB(A). When comparing to the criteria in SPP 5.4, compliance is achieved with the 40 dB(A) $_{LAeq(day)}$. Therefore, no further noise amelioration is required.

Max accommodation and car parking

Table 6.6 below.

The application refers to maximum 300-seat capacity auditorium of 540m²

three (3) multipurpose kid's rooms of 120m², 64m² and 36m² respectively; a parent's room of 18m²; foyer of 126m², a tea preparation area of 40m² and various amenities including toilets, storerooms, and child's playground area.

<u>Infrastructure</u>: Carpark to be drained and sealed. Crossover to be constructed to the Shire's specifications (concrete, asphalt or paved). Geotechnical report to be completed and provided to the Shire. This will ensure correct drainage principles are followed.

Standard conditions apply:

- 1. Prior to the commencement of the use, vehicle parking, manoeuvring and circulation areas shall be suitably constructed, sealed (asphalt, concrete or brickpavers), drained, kerbed, marked (including disabled bays) and thereafter maintained.
- 2. Prior to the application for a Building Permit, a stormwater management plan (delete if not applicable: consistent with the approved Urban Water Management Plan for the estate) demonstrating how the first (xmm stormwater) is to be contained on site is to be submitted to and accepted by the shire of serpentine Jarrahdale. The endorsed stormwater plan is to be thereafter implemented and maintained.

External Referrals:

<u>Main Roads</u>: In response to correspondence received on 8 February 2023 and most recent advice received on 24 March 2023, please be advised Main Roads has no objections to the application subject to the following conditions being imposed:

Conditions

1. Prior to the occupation of the building, a revised transport noise assessment, consistent with the requirements of WAPC *State Planning Policy 5.4 – Road and Rail Noise*, is to be prepared, approved and implemented to the satisfaction of the Shire of Serpentine Jarrahdale, in consultation with Main Roads.

Justification for Condition

To ensure the acoustic requirements are implemented in accordance with State Planning Policy 5.4 – Road and Rail Noise.

Please note Main Roads issued an Information Request on 17 March 2023 requested deficiencies in the transport noise assessment be addressed. Please see attached response for details of required amendments which require reassessment of the noise report.

2. Subject to the findings of the transport noise assessment required by Condition 1, a notification, pursuant to Section 70A of the *Transfer of Land Act 1893* is to be placed on the certificate of title of the proposed lot. The notification is to state as follows:

'The lots are situated in the vicinity of a transport corridor and are currently affected, or may in future be affected by transport noise.'

Justification for Condition

To ensure the acoustic requirements are implemented in accordance with State Planning Policy 5.4 – Road and Rail Noise.

3. Prior to the occupation of the building Robertson Road must be constructed to extend across the frontage of the subject land.

Justification for Condition

Robertson Road must be upgraded to accommodate vehicle traffic prior to the building being occupied.

4. All access shall be via Robertson Road. No access is permitted via South Western Highway.

Justification for Condition

Condition confirms vehicular access requirements. Condition required as the Lot has frontage to both South Western Highway and Robertson Road. Access to South Western Highway is not permitted as per the South Western Highway Access Strategy (enclosed).

5. No development and/or improvements shall be permitted on the land required for future road purposes as shown on the enclosed Main Roads Land Protection Plan 201232-0008 and 201232-0009.

Justification for Condition

Protection of the State Road network and public safety.

6. No earthworks shall encroach onto the South Western Highway Road reserve.

7. No stormwater drainage is to be discharged onto the South Western Highway Road Reserve.

8. The landowner/applicant shall make good any damage to the existing verge within the South Western Highway road reserve.

Advice

a) The upgrading/widening of South Western Highway is not in Main Roads current 4-year forward estimated construction program and all projects not listed are considered long term. Please be aware that timing information is subject to change and that Main Roads assumes no liability for the information provided.

b) The applicant is required to submit an Application form to undertake works within the road reserve prior to undertaking any works within the road reserve. Application forms and supporting information about the procedure can be found on the Main Roads website > Technical & Commercial > Working on Roads.

Should the Shire disagree with or resolve not to include as part of its conditional approval any of the above conditions or advice, Main Roads requests an opportunity to meet and discuss the application further, prior to a final determination being made.

Department of Fire and Emergency Services:

I refer to your letter dated 06 February 2023 regarding the submission of a Bushfire Management Plan (BMP) (Version 1.1), prepared by Smith Bushfire Consultants and dated 22 December 2023, for the above development application.

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.

Assessment

• The decision maker has identified that the proposed development will be a Vulnerable Land Use.

• Development applications for Vulnerable land uses should be supported by an Emergency Evacuation Plan as per section 5.5.1 of the Guidelines.

• Further clarification is required within the BMP of the requirements of SPP 3.7, and the supporting Guidelines as outlined in our assessment below.

1. Policy Measure 6.5 a) (ii) Preparation of a BAL contour map

lssu	e	Assessment	Action
Veg	etation classification	Evidence to support the exclusion of Plot 1 in its entirety as managed to low threat in accordance with AS3959 is required. In particular, images 3 and 4 show areas of grassland to the south of the site. While it appears to be managed, no evidence has been provided of this. Given that there appears to be a subdivision planned (as discussed below), it is conceivable that this land may be under separate ownership and	

	that a mechanism would be required to ensure management in perpetuity.	
Vegetation classification	Vegetation plot 2 cannot be substantiated as Class G Grassland with the limited information and photographic evidence available. In particular, the area between image points 3, 8, 9 and 11 appears from aerial imagery to contain established vegetation.	Modification to the BMP is required.
	The BMP should detail specifically how the Class G Grassland classification was derived.	
	If unsubstantiated, the vegetation classification should be revised to consider the vegetation at maturity as per AS3959, or the resultant BAL ratings may be inaccurate.	
Vegetation Exclusion	In figure 5 (classification post development), part of Plot 2 has been excluded under AS3959 clause 2.2.3.2 (f). The exclusion has been applied over an area indicated to be a <i>Balance Lot</i> . While this proposal is for a development application, it is clear that a subdivision is expected, which would result in management requirement of land on a separate lot and potentially not under the control of the previous owner.	Modification to the BMP is required.
	Furthermore, the BAL rating relies upon exclusion of a section of land noted as "Road Widening".	
	A mechanism is required to provide certainty that the proposed management measures can be achieved	

	in perpetuity and that they are enforceable.	
	If unsubstantiated, the vegetation classification should be revised to consider the vegetation at maturity as per AS3959, or the resultant BAL ratings may be inaccurate.	
BAL Ratings, plans	The distances quoted in in subsection 3.2 are not depicted spatially on any of the plans.	Modification to the BMP is required.
	In addition, the building design has not been overlaid on any of the vegetation or BAL plans.	
	This makes the distances and associated BAL ratings difficult to validate.	
2. Policy Measure 6.5 c) Cor	mpliance with the Bushfire P	rotection Criteria
Element	Assessment	Action
Location, Siting and Design	A1.1 & A2.1– not demonstrated	Modification to the BMP required.
	demonstrated The BAL ratings cannot be validated for the reason	
	 demonstrated The BAL ratings cannot be validated for the reason outlined in the above table. In particular, the decision maker must be certain that there is a mechanism to ensure ongoing management of vegetation required to achieve the APZ in perpetuity and that it is 	
Design	 demonstrated The BAL ratings cannot be validated for the reason outlined in the above table. In particular, the decision maker must be certain that there is a mechanism to ensure ongoing management of vegetation required to achieve the APZ in perpetuity and that it is enforceable. A3.2a & b – not 	required. Modification to the BMP is

	le ly le n n							
A3.6 – not demonstrated	Modificatior	n to the BMP required.						
The BMP acknowledges the driveway does not meet the Solutions.	he Acceptable							
In circumstances where t Solutions are not met the priv to meet all the following requ	vate driveway is							
• requirements in Table 6, Co	olumn 4;							
 passing bays every 200 metres with a minimum length of 20 metres and a minimum 								
the combined trafficable widt	additional trafficable width of two metres (i.e. the combined trafficable width of the passing bay and constructed private driveway to be a minimum six metres): and							
 turn-around area as shown in Figure 28 and within 30 metres of the habitable building. 								
3. Policy Measure 6.6.1 Vul	nerable and High-Risk land	uses						
Issue	Assessment	Action						
Bushfire Emergency Evacuation Plan (BEEP)	The referral has not included a <i>'Bushfire</i> <i>Emergency Evacuation</i> <i>Plan'</i> .	Comment only.						
	As the Shire has indicated that the proposal is a vulnerable use, 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.

Recommendation – Compliance with Acceptable Solutions not demonstrated – modifications required

It is critical the bushfire management measures within the BMP are refined to ensure they are accurate and can be implemented to reduce the vulnerability of the development to bushfire. The proposed development is not supported for the following reasons:

1. The development design has not demonstrated compliance to

Element 1: Location,

Element 2: Siting and Design, and

Element 3: Vehicular Access.

Department of Planning, Lands and Heritage: No comments received.

Within a Bushfire Prone Area:	Yes
-------------------------------	-----

Attachments:

• CL67 Table

Deemed Provisions – Cl 67 Matters to be considered by Local Government

a) The aims and provisions of this Scheme and any other local planning scheme operating within the area	YES ⊠	NO □	N/A □	
Comment: Land Use Permissibility- pursuant to the 'Shire of Serpentine Jarrahdale Loc Planning Scheme NO. 2', the subject site is located within the 'Urban Development Zon with a 'Mixed Business' designation and the proposed 'Place of Public Worship' is a 'S use which means that Council may, at its discretion, permit the use after notice of the application has been given in accordance with Clause 64 of the Deemed Provisions.				
The proposed 'Place of Public Worship' (including incidental uses) is considered to be a reasonable planning outcome given the site is located within a 'Mixed Business' local structure plan area which anticipates a variety of land uses that cannot be conveniently or economically accommodated within centre zone or industrial zones.				
Note- pursuant to TPS NO.2, a 'Place of Public Worship means land and buildings used for the religious activities of a church but does not include an institution for primary, secondary or higher education, or a residential institution'.				
b) The requirements of orderly and proper planning including any proposed local planning scheme or amendment to this Scheme that has been advertised under the <i>Planning and</i> <i>Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015</i> or	YES ⊠	NO □	N/A □	

	any	other	proposed	planning	instrument	that	the	local	Τ
ļ	gove	ernmen	t is serious	ly conside	ring adopting	g or a	pprov	ving	

Comment: Land Use Permissibility- pursuant to the 'Shire of Serpentine Jarrahdale Local Planning Scheme NO. 3' (draft amendment), the subject site is located within the 'Service Commercial Zone' and the proposed 'Place of Worship' is an 'A' use which means that Council have discretion to approve the development. In this case, the subject site is located within a 'Mixed Business' local structure plan area and will service the needs of the local community.

Note- pursuant to TPS NO.3, a 'Place of Worship means premises used for religious activities such as a chapel, church, mosque, synagogue or temple'.

c) any approved State planning policy	YES	NO	N/A
	\boxtimes		

Comment:

SPP3.7- Planning in Bushfire Prone Areas- the proposed development is considered to comply with this policy.

SPP5.4- Rail and Road Noise- a condition of approval will require an updated Acoustic Assessment to ensure that the development to complies with State Planning Policy 5.4 - Road and Rail Noise.

d) any environmental protection policy approved under the <i>Environmental Protection Act 1986</i> section 31(d)	YES	NO	N/A ⊠
Comment:			
e) any policy of the Commission	YES	NO □	N/A ⊠
Comment:			
f) any policy of the State	YES	NO □	N/A ⊠
Comment:			
g) any local planning policy for the Scheme area	YES ⊠	NO □	N/A
Comment: The proposed development has been assessed in accordance with and are considered to comply with the following LPP's:			

- Local Planning Policy 1.4 Public Consultation on Planning Matters Policy
- Local Planning Policy 1.6 Public Art for Major Developments
- Local Planning Policy 2.4 Water Sensitive Design (LPP2.4)
- Local Planning Policy 4.11 Advertising Policy
- Local Planning Policy 4.15 Bicycle Facilities Policy (LPP4.15)
- Local Planning Policy 4.16 Tree Retention and Planting

h) any structure plan, activity centre plan or local	YES	NO	N/A
development plan that relates to the development	\boxtimes		

Comment: The subject site is located within the Lots 1, 3 and 128 South Western Highway Local Structure Plan. Pursuant to this LSP, the subject site is designated as 'Mixed Business' zone. The north most part of the LSP area has been developed in association with a range of uses permissible within the 'Mixed Business' zone. Due to the larger developments that have taken place, and the associated larger allotments, the northern 'loop' road was not required. Therefore, the frontage of lots span between South Western Highway to the east and Robertson Rd to the west.

Robertson Road has already been partially constructed to service the existing approved developments. Upgrades to South Western Highway/Robertson Road intersection has already been undertaken as anticipated by the LSP. Officers consider the development is generally compliant with the LSP.

i) any report of the review of the local planning scheme that has been published under the <i>Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015</i>	YES	NO □	N/A ⊠
Comment:			
j) in the case of land reserved under this Scheme, the objectives for the reserve and the additional and permitted uses identified in this Scheme for the reserve	YES	NO □	N/A ⊠
Comment:			
k) the built heritage conservation of any place that is of cultural significance	YES □	NO □	N/A ⊠
Comment:			
I) the effect of the proposal on the cultural heritage significance of the area in which the development is located	YES	NO □	N/A ⊠
Comment:			
m) the compatibility of the development with its setting including the relationship of the development to development on adjoining land or on other land in the locality including, but not limited to, the likely effect of the height, bulk, scale, orientation and appearance of the development	YES ⊠	NO □	N/A
Comment: The proposed development is considered to be compatible with the development in its setting, taking into consideration the future expected development as determined by the current and pending planning framework.			
 n) the amenity of the locality including the following – I. Environmental impacts of the development II. The character of the locality III. Social impacts of the development 	YES ⊠	NO □	N/A
Comment: The proposed development is considered unlikely to result in any significant environmental or social impacts or any impacts on the character of the locality.			
o) the likely effect of the development on the natural environment or water resources and any means that are	YES	NO □	N/A ⊠

proposed to protect or to mitigate impacts on the natural			
environment or the water resource			
Comment:	VEO		
p) whether adequate provision has been made for the landscaping of the land to which the application relates and whether any trees or other vegetation on the land should be preserved	YES ⊠	NO	N/A □
Comment: no vegetation removal is required while a condit Landscape Plan to show planting within the front open space			equire a
q) the suitability of the land for the development taking into account the possible risk of flooding, tidal inundation, subsidence, landslip, bushfire, soil erosion, land degradation or any other risk	YES ⊠	NO □	N/A □
Comment: The land is considered to be suitable for the proposito be unduly affected by the potential impact of any risk listed		pment and	d unlikely
r) the suitability of the land for the development taking into account the possible risk to human health or safety	YES	NO □	N/A
Comment:			
 s) the adequacy of – I. The proposed means of access to and egress from the site; and 	YES ⊠	NO □	N/A □
II. Arrangements for the loading, unloading,			
 II. Arrangements for the loading, unloading, manoeuvring and parking of vehicles Comment: the proposal has been referred to Council's Engin no concerns with the proposal. Further, Main Roads supponditions. 	port the p		
 II. Arrangements for the loading, unloading, manoeuvring and parking of vehicles Comment: the proposal has been referred to Council's Engin no concerns with the proposal. Further, Main Roads support of the proposal. 	port the p	roposal si	ubject to
 II. Arrangements for the loading, unloading, manoeuvring and parking of vehicles Comment: the proposal has been referred to Council's Engin no concerns with the proposal. Further, Main Roads supponditions. t) the amount of traffic likely to be generated by the development, particularly in relation to the capacity off the road system in the locality and the probable effect on traffic 	vert the p	noposal si NO □	ubject to N/A □
 II. Arrangements for the loading, unloading, manoeuvring and parking of vehicles Comment: the proposal has been referred to Council's Engin no concerns with the proposal. Further, Main Roads supponditions. t) the amount of traffic likely to be generated by the development, particularly in relation to the capacity off the road system in the locality and the probable effect on traffic flow and safety Comment: The proposed development is considered to be additional system of the proposed development is considered to be additional safety 	vert the p	noposal si NO □	ubject to N/A □
 II. Arrangements for the loading, unloading, manoeuvring and parking of vehicles Comment: the proposal has been referred to Council's Engin no concerns with the proposal. Further, Main Roads supponditions. t) the amount of traffic likely to be generated by the development, particularly in relation to the capacity off the road system in the locality and the probable effect on traffic flow and safety Comment: The proposed development is considered to be actraffic impacts of the development. u) the availability and adequacy for the development of the 	Poort the p YES ⊠ cceptable in YES	NO	ubject to N/A U the likely
 II. Arrangements for the loading, unloading, manoeuvring and parking of vehicles Comment: the proposal has been referred to Council's Engin no concerns with the proposal. Further, Main Roads supp conditions. t) the amount of traffic likely to be generated by the development, particularly in relation to the capacity off the road system in the locality and the probable effect on traffic flow and safety Comment: The proposed development is considered to be act traffic impacts of the development. u) the availability and adequacy for the development of the following – 	Poort the p YES ⊠ cceptable in YES	NO	ubject to N/A U the likely
 II. Arrangements for the loading, unloading, manoeuvring and parking of vehicles Comment: the proposal has been referred to Council's Engine no concerns with the proposal. Further, Main Roads support conditions. t) the amount of traffic likely to be generated by the development, particularly in relation to the capacity off the road system in the locality and the probable effect on traffic flow and safety Comment: The proposed development is considered to be activatific impacts of the development. u) the availability and adequacy for the development of the following – Public transport services 	Poort the p YES ⊠ cceptable in YES	NO	ubject to N/A U the likely
 II. Arrangements for the loading, unloading, manoeuvring and parking of vehicles Comment: the proposal has been referred to Council's Engine no concerns with the proposal. Further, Main Roads supponditions. t) the amount of traffic likely to be generated by the development, particularly in relation to the capacity off the road system in the locality and the probable effect on traffic flow and safety Comment: The proposed development is considered to be activative impacts of the development. u) the availability and adequacy for the development of the following – Public transport services Public utility services 	Poort the p YES ⊠ cceptable in YES	NO	ubject to N/A U the likely

Comment: The proposed development is considered to be adequately serviced taking into account those matters listed above.

Comment: w) the history of the site where the development is to be located YES NO N/A	v) the potential loss of any community service or benefit resulting from the development other than potential loss that may result from economic competition between new and existing businesses	YES □	NO □	N/A ⊠
	w) the history of the site where the development is to be			

Comment: The land has been granted subdivision approval by the Western Australia Planning Commission (WAPC) to create three lots as shown on the figure following. The subject development would be located within the next stage of Lot 128 and is proposed to be Lot 4.

Lot 1 contains the existing warehouse (self storage) development which is now in operation and works associated with the intersection of Robertson Road and South Western Highway have been completed.

Lots 2 and 3 were subject to a previous approval granted by Council for four buildings (3,070m2) across the two lots comprising of:

- One Automotive Repairs (897m2);
- Six Warehouses (between 114m2 and 452m2 each);
- Five Light Industries (between 88m2 and 97m2 each);
- Two Showrooms (286m2 and 298m2);
- 78 car parking bays;
- 792m2 of soft landscaping;
- Construction of Robertson Road along the full length of the eastern boundary of the development area; and
- Two crossovers onto the Robertson Road Reserve.

Subsequently, the development on Lot 2 was amended from the approved automotive vehicle repair shop and one warehouse unit to an automotive repair shop and three light industrial/warehouse units. This was approved by Council on 15 August 2022.

x) the impact of the development on the community as a whole notwithstanding the impact of the development on particular individuals	YES □	NO □	N/A ⊠	
Comment:				
y) any submissions received on the application	YES ×	NO	N/A	
Comment: four objections have been received. Refer to 'Summary of Submissions' for details of objections and officer's response.				
Za) the comments or submissions received from any authority consulted under clause 66	YES ⊠	NO □	N/A □	

Comment: Refer to external referral section of the assessment.

In relation to DFES referral comments, it is acknowledged however that DFES has requested modifications to the BMP to clarify how this rating would be achieved particularly in relation to the land to the south being required to be managed grassland. DFES has commented that this land is to be subject to a further subdivision and therefore would be outside of the applicant's control to ensure it is managed in perpetuity. Officers consider that as there is currently no approved subdivision, this area can currently be maintained.

Once subdivided the land will be developed for purposes consistent with the Structure Plan which would result in it being managed.

DFES has also queried the vegetation classification of Plot 2 and the impact this could have on the BAL rating, and whether it would be a higher BAL than 12.5. This issue has been conditioned as part of the Officer recommendation.

Zb) any other planning consideration the local government considers appropriate	YES □	2	N/A ⊠
Comment:			