| Submitter                           | No | Submitter Comments  | Officer Comment  |
|-------------------------------------|----|---|--|
| Department of Primary<br>Industries |    | The Department of Primary Industries and Regional Development (DPIRD) objects to the proposal for the following reasons:  |  |
|                                     |    | • State Planning Policy 2.5 - Rural Planning in section 5.5 states the following:   |  |
|                                     |    | WAPC policy is to:  |  |
|                                     |    | support small scale tourism opportunities, such as bed and breakfast,<br>holiday house, chalet, art gallery, micro-brewery and land uses<br>associated with primary production, within the rural zone;  | Noted: this has been addressed in the body<br>of the report and the 29 August 2022 |
|                                     |    | The proposed restaurant will have a seating capacity of 1000 and the brewery at full production will annually produce 2 million litres of beer. This is a large development, and it cannot be described as a small-scale tourism opportunity or micro-brewery.  | Council Report   |
|                                     |    | • The Shire of Serpentine-Jarrahdale Town Planning Scheme No. 2 (TPS2) states in Clause 5.10.1 the following:   |  |
|                                     |    | The purpose and intent of the Rural zone is to allocate land to accommodate the full range of rural pursuits and associated activities.   |  |
|                                     |    | The proposed restaurant and brewery are not rural pursuits and due to their large size, cannot be regarded as associated activities.  | Officers are satisfied that the development  |
|                                     |    | • The Shire of Serpentine-Jarrahdale Draft Town Planning Scheme No. 3 have the following objectives for the Rural zone:   | meets the objectives of the Rural zone.<br>Importantly the development also meets  |
|                                     |    | To provide for the maintenance or enhancement of specific local rural character.  | the prevailing planning framework.   |
|                                     |    | To protect and accommodate broad acre agricultural activities such as<br>cropping and grazing and intensive uses such as horticulture as primary<br>uses, with other rural pursuits and rural industries as secondary uses in<br>circumstances where they demonstrate compatibility with the primary use. |  |
|                                     |    | To maintain and enhance the environmental qualities of the landscape, vegetation, soils and water bodies including groundwater, to protect  |  |

| Submitter | No | Submitter Comments   | Officer Comment  |
|-----------|----|--|--|
|           |    | sensitive areas especially the natural valley and watercourse systems from damage.   | The Brewery and Restaurant land use are  |
|           |    | To provide for the operation and development of existing, future and<br>potential rural land uses by limiting the introduction of sensitive land uses<br>in the Rural zone.  | discretionary land uses in the Rural zone<br>under draft LPS 3   |
|           |    | To provide for a range of non-rural land uses where they have demonstrated benefit and are compatible with surrounding rural uses.   |  |
|           |    | Due to the magnitude of the proposed restaurant and brewery it is not possible to classify these as secondary uses to agriculture.   |  |
|           |    | The application for the proposed restaurant and brewery (non-rural land<br>uses) does not demonstrate benefit or compatibility with surrounding rural<br>uses. For example, the extra vehicle movements into the property and<br>traffic on rural roads associated with the brewery and restaurant will be<br>significantly greater than that of the surrounding rural land.   |  |
|           |    | DPIRD assessed the revised Nutrient Irrigation Management Plan (NIMP) that includes the waste generation, treatment, and disposal aspects of the NIMP. This assessment is limited to nutrient generation and offtake and DPIRD would like to provide the following comments:   |  |
|           |    | The proposed brewery waste treatment and irrigation is acceptable, and sufficient<br>nutrient offtake will occur with a perennial ryegrass and sorghum combination, if<br>harvested annually by mechanical means. However, annual re-sowing of these<br>crops will be required. DPIRD notes that the proposed pod irrigation system will<br>only suit crops with a low growth height and is therefore not suitable for the<br>irrigation of sorghum. | A condition has been imposed to require a<br>revised NIMP to include additional storage<br>and also replacement of sorghum. Storage<br>of wastewater is proposed to occur<br>between April-September. Additional<br>amendments have also been requested. |
|           |    | It is unclear whether the proponent has committed to adequate winter storage<br>requirements over the June-July period at full operating capacity. The proposed<br>infrastructure (specifically winter storage tanks) should be sized to contain the<br>volume of effluent generated over the June-July period at full production capacity   |  |

| Submitter | No | Submitter Comments   | Officer Comment   |
|-----------|----|--|---|
|           |    | <ul> <li>of 2 million litres per year. DPIRD recommends that storage should also be available for August as rainfall often exceeds evaporation during this period.</li> <li>Planning approval should be conditional on the proponent obtaining the required licences from the Department of Water and Environmental Regulation for prescribed premises (Category 25 and 54) licences and works approval.</li> </ul>  | Noted, however two different processes<br>under separate legislation.   |
| DWER      |    | Thank you for providing the amended development application for a proposed<br>brewery and restaurant received with correspondence dated 14 November 2022<br>for the Department of Water and Environmental Regulation (Department) to<br>consider.<br>The Department has reviewed the application and its position remains that it is   |   |
|           |    | <ul><li>unable to support the application in its current form, due to significant uncertainty around the site's capacity to accommodate this development within relevant environmental and water standards.</li><li>Consistent with previous correspondence, dated 26 August 2022, it is recommended that the Shire appropriately considers potential risk of granting any</li></ul>   | The revised NIMP submitted shows compliance with the EPP targets. The   |
|           |    | planning approval in the absence of certainty with regard to assessment and<br>approvals under Part V of the Environmental Protection Act 1986 (EP Act). Should<br>the EP Act process yield a substantially modified, or unsuccessful, result for this<br>proposal, this could result in significant misalignment of legislative approvals. It<br>should be noted the proponent withdrew an application for a works approval in<br>August 2022, and the Department is yet to receive an amended application. | throughput has been reduced from 5 million<br>to 2 million reducing the amount of waste<br>water produced. A condition of approval<br>has however been sought to ensure a<br>revised NIMP is submitted showing all<br>nutrient sources from the brewery and |
|           |    | Further to the above, through this planning process the proposal has not demonstrated nutrient targets of the Peel Harvey catchment can be achieved, which departs from the requirements of the Environmental Protection Peel Inlet - Harvey Estuary Policy (EPP) (EPA,1992) and State Planning Policy 2.1 (SPP 2.1) Peel Harvey Coastal Plain Catchment (WAPC, 2003).   | restaurant and compliance with the EPP.<br>Additional updates have also been<br>recommended.  |
|           |    | As such, it is recommended the Shire defer decision-making on this proposal until such time as the EP Act process has been substantially progressed or concluded, to ensure a greater level of certainty for the Shire and the proponent.  |   |

| Submitter | No | Submitter Comments  | Officer Comment  |
|-----------|----|---|--|
|           |    | In addition, the Department understands the amended development application is<br>to be resubmitted to the Department of Health for assessment, as an application<br>for approval is required for the brewery wastewater treatment apparatus in<br>addition to the restaurant sewage treatment apparatus. This further identifies the<br>need to holistically consider necessary approvals associated with this proposal,<br>given its location upon a seasonally inundated site of transmissive soils, traversed<br>by a major drain connecting to the Peel-Harvey Estuary system. | Noted: the applicant is aware of this as it is a separate process. |
|           |    | Further detailed advice upon the proposal is provided as follows.   |  |
|           |    | 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 of the Environmental Protection Act 1986 (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 premise and makes it an offence to cause an emission or discharge unless a licence is held for the premises.   |  |
|           |    | 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 operation's design capacity will cause the premises to be a prescribed premise as per Schedule 1 of the Environmental Protection Regulations 1987 (Regulations) for the following categories:   |  |
|           |    |   |  |

| Submitter | No | Submitter Comme   | nts  | Officer Comment  |  |
|-----------|----|---|--|--|--|
|           |    | Category  | Category description   | Production or<br>design<br>capacity  |  |
|           |    | 25  | Alcoholic beverage manufacturing:<br>premises on which an alcoholic<br>beverage is manufactured and from<br>which liquid waste is or is to be<br>discharged onto land or into waters.  | 350 kL or more<br>per year of<br>beverage<br>produced  |  |
|           |    | 54  | Sewage facility: premises on which<br>sewage is treated (excluding septic<br>tanks) or from which treated sewage is<br>discharged onto land or into waters   | More than 100<br>cubic meters<br>per day   |  |
|           |    | to become, or bec<br>is undertaken in a<br>EP Act to cause a<br>from the Prescrit | es it an offence to undertake any w<br>come capable of being, a Prescribe<br>ccordance with a works approval. It<br>n emission or alter the nature or vol<br>bed Premises, unless done so ir<br>the or a registration (for operation) is | ed Premises unless the work<br>t is also an offence under the<br>ume of waste, noise or odour<br>n accordance with a works |  |
|           |    | <u>fact sheet – Bever</u><br>The occupier will                                    | regarding this activity can be found<br><u>rage manufacturing</u> (DWER, 2018)<br>also need to comply with the Envir<br>irrespective of whether the premise  | (Fact Sheet).<br>conmental Protection (Noise)  | The revised NIMP submitted shows<br>compliance with the EPP targets. The<br>throughput has been reduced from five<br>million to two million reducing the amount of<br>waste water produced. A condition of |
|           |    | for a brewery an  | ailed, the Department has concerns<br>ad restaurant of this size and cap<br>staurant wastewater that will be   | pacity given the volumes of  | approval has however been sought to<br>ensure a revised NIMP is submitted<br>showing all nutrient sources from the<br>brewery and restaurant and compliance  |
|           |    | brewery wastewa<br>concerns with hyd<br>disposal technolo<br>restaurant) requiri  | ended application now proposes<br>ater between April to September<br>Iraulic loading and capacity, proposi-<br>ogy, and combined volumes of<br>ng on-site disposal throughout the y<br>unclear whether the Department we                 | , the Department still has<br>ed wastewater treatment and<br>wastewater (brewery and<br>year. If the above matters are     | with the EPP amongst other updates.  |

| Submitter | No | Submitter Comments  | Officer Comment   |
|-----------|----|---|---|
|           |    | approval for the proposal as articulated in previous scoping meeting and correspondences.   |   |
|           |    | The Department notes the proponent has previously submitted an application for works approval in May 2022 and that the Department had requested further information. The proponent subsequently withdrew the application in August 2022 and the Department is yet to receive an amended works approval application.   |   |
|           |    | Issue   |   |
|           |    | Nutrient Export Risk – Peel-Harvey Catchment  |   |
|           |    | Advice  |   |
|           |    | The proposal is located within the Peel-Harvey catchment and the proposed development (that would include the irrigation and discharge of brewery and restaurant wastewaters onto land, and the application of fertiliser to proposed crops), has the potential to export significant nutrient loads to the Peel-Harvey Estuary System. Subsequently this development application is subject to the following state policies:   |   |
|           |    | • Environmental Protection Peel Inlet - Harvey Estuary Policy (EPP) (EPA,1992); and   | Minimal vegetation is proposed to be  |
|           |    | • State Planning Policy 2.1 (SPP 2.1) Peel Harvey Coastal Plain Catchment (WAPC, 2003).   | removed. The clearing is supported under TPS 2. Clearing under the <i>Environment</i> |
|           |    | The Peel-Harvey EPP establishes phosphorous loading targets for the Peel-<br>Harvey catchment to be adhered to by new or expanding proposals. To comply<br>with these total loading targets, new (or expanding) operations within the<br>Serpentine River catchment would be required to achieve an export rate for total<br>phosphorous (TP) of 0.29kg/ha/year, as specified within the Department's report<br>Hydrological and nutrient modelling of the Peel-Harvey catchment (DoW, 2011). | <i>Protection Act 1986</i> is a separate process.                                     |
|           |    | The Department's modelling report has also established nutrient input (or application) rates for the Peel-Harvey catchment to achieve the necessary nutrient  |   |

| Submitter | No | Submitter Comments   | Officer Comment   |
|-----------|----|--|---|
|           |    | export loads. These need to be less than 6.5 kg/ha/year for phosphorous and less than 45 kg/ha/year for nitrogen.  | Noted: However, this is subject to a separate regulatory process.   |
|           |    | As per Department of Primary Industries and Regional Development (DPIRD) soil mapping, this site is on Bassendean Sand (sandplain and broad extremely low rises with imperfectly drained deep or very deep grey siliceous sands) which is poorly nutrient retentive. These areas are generally not suitable for annual and perennial in-ground horticulture (including irrigated pasture) due to the high nutrient export risk. Therefore, advice should be sought from DPIRD.       |   |
|           |    | The onus of proof will rest with the proponent to demonstrate any proposal meets<br>the objectives of the aforementioned policies and guidance through the<br>preparation and submission of a suitable Nutrient and Irrigation Management Plan<br>(NIMP) to support the development application.   |   |
|           |    | The application included an amended NIMP and Site and Soil Evaluation (SSE) report that provided details as to how the proposed development's nutrient inputs will be managed to achieve target rates. However, the NIMP and SSE is to include all on-site sources of nutrients (brewery and restaurant wastewater, and any applied fertiliser), and demonstrate how these nutrients will be managed across the development site to meet target rates for the Peel-Harvey catchment. | Noted: Amendments have been recommended to the NIMP and SSE to show all nutrients generated by the development and compliance with the SSE. |
|           |    | Further comments on the NIMP and SSE report are found below at Attachment 1.   |   |
|           |    | Issue  |   |
|           |    | Native Vegetation Protection   |   |
|           |    | 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  |   |
|           |    | <ul> <li>it is done after the person has received notice under Section 51DA(5) that<br/>a clearing permit is not required</li> </ul>   |   |

| Submitter | No | Submitter Comments   | Officer Comment |
|-----------|----|--|-----------------|
| <b></b>   |    | •  |                 |
|           |    | Issue  |                 |
|           |    | Groundwater Licence  |                 |
|           |    | Advice   |                 |
|           |    | The subject lot is located within the Serpentine Groundwater Area (Serpentine 3 Subarea) which is proclaimed under the Rights in Water and Irrigation Act 1914. Any groundwater abstraction in this proclaimed area for purposes other than domestic and/or stock watering taken from the Superficial aquifer, would be subject to licencing by the Department.  |                 |
|           |    | The Department acknowledges an application for a licence to construct a bore<br>and to take water from the Leederville resource has been submitted and is<br>currently under assessment. The Serpentine 3, Leederville resource is close to<br>fully allocated, however the requested 50,000 kilolitres per annum was available<br>at the time of application.   |                 |
|           |    | The Department notes that the amended development application states that 30,000 kilolitres per annum will be required due to the proposed reduced volume of beer to be produced. The applicant may therefore be required to provide revised groundwater requirements.   |                 |
|           |    | The issuing of a groundwater licence is not guaranteed and is dependent on the Part V EP Act process being substantially progressed or concluded, and subsequent planning approval. If a licence is issued, it will contain a number of conditions that are binding upon the licensee. Please contact the water licensing section on 9550 4222 or <a href="http://www.water.wa.gov.au/licensing">www.water.wa.gov.au/licensing</a> for further guidance. |                 |
|           |    | Issue  |                 |
|           |    | Noise Assessment Report  |                 |
|           |    | Advice   |                 |
|           |    | Please see Attachment 2 for the Department's technical review of the amended<br>Environmental Noise Report dated 17 October 2022 prepared by Gabriels Hearne<br>Farrell Pty Ltd.   |                 |

| Submitter | No | Submitter Comm   | ents   | Officer Comment  |  |  |
|-----------|----|--|--|--|--|--|
|           |    | The advice provi<br>considered to infe<br>At this point, the<br>consultation inclu | ocess.   |  |  |  |
|           |    | Page/Section Topic   | Issue  | Suggested changes  |  |  |
|           |    | Nutrient and Irrigation Manager  | ment Plan – dated November 2022<br>The nutrient inputs for the proposed development is to<br>include all sources of nutrients including brewery and<br>restaurant wastewaters and fertiliser application, and<br>demonstrate how water quality rates for the site will be<br>achieved. | Update water quality inputs to include brewery wastewater,<br>restaurant wastewater (sewerage and klichen wash water)<br>and fertiliser. |  |  |
|           |    | Page 13, Section Groundwater LI<br>3.8   |  | er requirements as weil as amending the licence application foe<br>e the reduced water requirements.<br>at<br>e<br>e                     |  |  |
|           |    | Page 20, Table 7 Expected Wast<br>Quantity   | to be incorrect.   | 3,170 kL) and Year 5 should be 8,144 kL (rather than 6,440 kL).  |  |  |
|           |    | Page 20, Table 8 Calculated Yea<br>– Pre treatment                                 |  | Corrections to be made. Corrections to be made for all tables detailing rates and loads.   |  |  |
|           |    |  | 1  | ·  |  |  |

| Submitter    | No  | No Submitter Comments   |   |  |   |   | Officer Comment                         |
|--------------|---|-------------------------|---|--|---|---|---|
|              |   | Page/Section            | Торіс   | Issue  | Suggested changes   | 1 |   |
|              |   | Page 22, Section 4.4    | Wastewater Treatment –<br>P Precipitation and MBR | As above, include kitchen wastewater detail within<br>hydraulic loading rates.   | Update  | 1 |   |
|              |   | Page 29, Section 5      | Nutrient Leaching<br>Controls                     | The third dot point states that wastewater will be stored in<br>tanks between June and July. However, winter rainfail<br>begins in May and peak groundwater levels occur to<br>September. The Department still has concerns that the<br>stile would be unable to manage the reduced volumes of<br>threwery and restaurant wastewater requiring on-site<br>disposal. This still requires assessment under Part V of<br>EP Act as well as advice from Department of Health.<br>In addition, buffers and setbacks are required between<br>proposed irrigation areas and low lying and wetland<br>areas. |   |   |   |
|              |   | Site and Soll Eva       | luation Report – dated                            | October 2022   |   | - |   |
|              |   | Page 15, Section 3.2    | Proposed Treatment<br>Systems                     | Please demonstrate how this commercial wastewater<br>system will achieve water quality targets for the Peei-<br>Harvey cathoment? A nutritent balance taking into<br>consideration all nutrient inputs (brewery, restaurant and<br>fertiliser) for the site's proposed activities should be<br>included to determine the site's capacity to manage the<br>land use based on highly transmissive soils and high<br>groundwater.   | Update and provide a table to include nutrient inputs from all<br>the proposed activities and demonstrate how the site can<br>manage within water quality target rates of the Peel-Harvey<br>catchment. |   |   |
|              |   | Page16, Table 7         | Hydraulic Loading                                 | It appears that the daily hydraulic loading is for sewerage<br>per person and does not include the kitchen's washing<br>wastewater. As the restaurant can hold up to 2,000<br>patrons per day. that would be a considerable amount of<br>glass and distwashing wastewater that is not accounted<br>for in the hydraulic loading.   | The hydraulic loading and nutrient inputs is to include kitchen<br>wastewater.  |   |   |
|              |   | Page/Section            | Торіс   | Issue  | Suggested changes   |   |   |
|              |   | Page 19, Section<br>3.4 | Disposal Area                                     | This section describes the treated effluent to be used as<br>imigation. Earlier in the report, it is proposed to discharge<br>via leach drains.  | Please clarify and amend where necessary.   |   |   |
|              |   |                         | Contingendes                                      | No contingency actions have been included if there are<br>instances where the wastewater treatment systems fails<br>(ie ices of power, mechanical breakdown of equipment,<br>leaks, etc).  | Please update.  |   |   |
| DWER (Noise) |   | 1. Introdu              | iction  |  |   |   | Noted: Development will be subject to a |
|              | This advice was prepared for the Shire of Serpentine Jarrahdale in response t<br>a request for comment dated 14 November 2022 on the updated information for<br>a JDAP Application – Restaurant and Brewery at 1248 Karnup Road,<br>Serpentine. |                         |   |  |   |   | Noise Management Plan                   |

| Submitter | No | Submitter Comments  | Submitter Comments  |  |                                    |  |  |  |  |
|-----------|----|---|---|--|------------------------------------|--|--|--|--|
|           |    | <b>2. Documentation</b><br>In support of this request, the Shire ma<br>form the basis of this technical expe<br>specific advice.  |   |  |                                    |  |  |  |  |
|           |    | Material / document name  |   |  |                                    |  |  |  |  |
|           |    | Environmental Noise DA Report: Proposed<br>Brewery – 1248 Karnup Rd, Serpentine<br>(Proj No. 22004) – Prepared for Bright<br>Tank Brewery Co.   | Gabriels Hearne<br>Farrell Pty Ltd  | 17/10/2022   |                                    |  |  |  |  |
|           |    | Addendum to Development Application –<br>DAP reasons for Deferral Bright Tank<br>Brewing – Proposed Brewery (Use Not<br>Listed) and Restaurant: Lot 201 (1248)<br>Karnup Road, Serpentine   | Taylor Burrell<br>Barnett   | 9/11/2022  |                                    |  |  |  |  |
|           |    | Environmental Noise DA Report: Proposed<br>Brewery – 1248 Karnup Rd, Serpentine<br>(Proj No. 22004) – Prepared for Bright<br>Tank Brewery Co.   | Gabriels Hearne<br>Farrell Pty Ltd  | 17/02/2022   |                                    |  |  |  |  |
|           |    | Development Application: Lot 201 (1248)<br>Karnup Road, Serpentine – Restaurant<br>and Brewery (Use Not Listed) – prepared<br>for Bright Tank Brewery Co.   | Taylor Burrell<br>Barnett   | 20/04/2022   |                                    |  |  |  |  |
|           |    | <b>3. Advice</b><br>At the request of the Shire of Serpe<br>Branch (ENB) of the Department<br>reviewed the Environmental Noise DA<br>Pty Ltd (GHF), as well as the Develop<br>(Review) Report to the Shire on 8 J<br>revised the proposal to reduce the size<br>as relocate the development north-e<br>areas. | of Water and<br>Report prepared<br>ment Applicatior<br>une 2022. Sinc<br>and scale of the | Environmental Regulat<br>I by Gabriels Hearne Far<br>n, and provided a Techni<br>e then, the developer h<br>e proposed brewery, as w | ion<br>rell<br>ical<br>nas<br>vell |  |  |  |  |

| Submitter | No | Submitter Comments  | Officer Comment |
|-----------|----|---|-----------------|
|           |    | ENB's review of the proposed addendum indicates that there is no change to the structure and design of the large hospitality venue (restaurant) attached to the north side of the brewery. The proposed functions and operational scenarios of the  |                 |
|           |    | Advice on the updated Environmental Noise DA Report for the proposed restaurant and brewery development – 1248 Karnup Rd,   |                 |
|           |    | Serpentine, prepared for the Shire of Serpentine Jarrahdale   |                 |
|           |    | Department of Water and Environmental Regulation 2  |                 |
|           |    | hospitality venue have not changed in the addendum. Therefore, the only change<br>to the noise emission levels at the neighbouring noise sensitive receivers from the<br>restaurant is due to the relocation of the hospitality venue, which is now about 100<br>m closer to the two closest residential buildings to the east and northeast, but<br>about 100 m farther away from the closest noise sensitive premises to the<br>southwest. It can be expected that noise emission levels from the proposed<br>development will be increased at the neighbouring noise sensitive premises<br>located to the east and northeast and decreased to the southwest, when<br>compared with the original development application lodged in April 2022. The<br>noise modelling results from GHF's updated report confirm this expectation. |                 |
|           |    | ENB notes that the changes of the buffer distance from the proposed hospitality venue to each of the neighbouring noise sensitive premises are not very significant. Hence the changes to the modelled noise emission levels at the closest neighbouring noise sensitive premises are also not significant. All the assessment conclusions and noise mitigation and management measures proposed in the original development application documents are still valid. As such, the comments and advice ENB noted in the Technical (Review) Report dated 8 June 2022 are still valid.  |                 |
|           |    | 4. Limitations  |                 |
|           |    | Technical expert advice in any field is subject to various limitations. Important limitations to the advice include:  |                 |

| Submitter            | No | Submitter Comments  | Officer Comment  |  |
|----------------------|----|---|--|--|
| Department of Health |    | <ul> <li>The DoH provides the following comment:</li> <li>Wastewater Management As highlighted in the DoH's previous correspondence, this site is captured under the Government Sewerage Policy (2019) and has large sewage sensitive areas that restrict the use of available land for disposal of wastewater generated from the brewery and restaurant. The DoH is of the opinion that effective management of both systems (especially the effluent disposal for the brewery), has not been adequately demonstrated in the documentation. The DoH is therefore not able to support this proposal until the following has been provided or demonstrated: <ol> <li>Sizing of both onsite wastewater treatment and disposal areas in consideration of the requirements of the Government Sewerage Policy (2019), and to ensure that the minimum setbacks as per the policy are met.</li> <li>Scaled drawings for the restaurant wastewater leach drain disposal system need to be shown in the plan design. The proposed area appears to be sized for the restaurant patronage and staff numbers; however, this requires confirmation.</li> <li>Further details on the proposed brewery wastewater system including confirmation that it is sized to peak and non-peak performance and scaled drawings of the proposed brewery effluent disposal area. </li> <li>Further details are required of any proposed use of wastewater recycling for brewery use for further assessment in accordance with the Department's Guidelines for the Non-potable Uses of Recycled Water in Western Australia.</li> <li>Areas that may require fill over locations that are subject to inundation and/or flooding in a 10 percent annual exceedance rainfall event should not be used as a disposal area. </li> <li>When the above have been demonstrated, a separate application to install the restaurant and brewery onsite wastewater systems will be required to be submitted to local government for assessment prior to submission to the DoH for assessment and approval. Furthermore:</li> </ol></li></ul> | The sewerage waste water system for the<br>restaurant has been based on 2,000<br>patrons visiting the site and the waste<br>waters on the overall reduced throughput.<br>The SSE demonstrates that the restaurant<br>wastewaters once treated will meet the<br>relevant Australian and New Zealand<br>standards.<br>An updated SSE however has been sought<br>to align with generally align with DWER<br>comments. |  |

| Submitter         | No | Submitter Comments  | Officer Comment   |
|-------------------|----|---|---|
|                   |    | <ol> <li>Both wastewater treatment systems will be required to have engineer certification as part of the application, to ensure the prescribed water quality criteria for each system is met, please see link:<br/>https://ww2.health.wa.gov.au/Articles/A E/Certification-for-installation-of-wastewater-treatment-systems</li> <li>If the treated wastewater is intended to be recycled for beneficial purposes within the brewery, a separate Recycled Water Quality Management Plan (RWQMP) may be required in accordance with the "Application Process for approval of a recycling water scheme":<br/>https://ww2.health.wa.gov.au/Articles/A E/Application-process-for-approval-of-recycling-water-scheme</li> </ol> |   |
|                   |    | The DoH also recommends the proponent contact the Department of Water and<br>Environmental Regulation to determine if these systems fall into their criteria<br>requiring assessment; and encourages the proponent to ensure the design of the<br>proposed wastewater systems can accommodate any proposed future expansion<br>without increasing a risk to public health.  |   |
|                   |    | <b>Drinking Water Management</b><br>The proposal to ensure a water supply which meets potable water quality as<br>specified under the Australian Drinking Water Quality Guidelines – 2011.  |   |
| Water Corporation |    | Thank you for referring the additional information to the Corporation for comment.  |   |
|                   |    | The advice provided previously (attached below) is still relevant and should be considered as part of the Shire's and the DAP determination.  |   |
|                   |    | Servicing   |   |
|                   |    | The subject land is remote from water and wastewater services.  |   |
|                   |    | Drainage  |   |
|                   |    | The subject area falls within the Serpentine Drainage Catchment in the Mundijong Drainage District, a rural drainage system. The Serpentine Branch Drain runs along the western boundary of the subject site.   | Noted: development will be subject to a Stormwater management Plan. |

| Submitter | No | Submitter Comments  | Officer Comment |
|-----------|----|---|-----------------|
|           |    | Rural drains are not designed to give flood protection at all times and some<br>inundation of land can be expected. Water Corporation maintains its existing<br>drains to ensure they are capable of clearing water from adjacent rural properties<br>within three days of a storm event, where contours and internal drainage make<br>this physically possible.  |                 |
|           |    | To determine the flood level the developer should contact the Department of Water and Environmental Regulations regarding the Drainage and Water Management Plan which includes the subject area.   |                 |
|           |    | Developments within this catchment are required to contain the flows from a one<br>in one-hundred-year storm event on site. Discharge to Water Corporation drains<br>must be compensated to pre-development levels. No adverse discharge or runoff<br>from the subject land would be allowed into our drainage system.  | Noted:          |
|           |    | Protection of Services  |                 |
|           |    | It should be noted that an existing drainage channel is located in close proximity<br>to the subject land (plan attached). Due consideration will be required when<br>developing in this area. The developer is required to fund the full cost of protecting<br>or modifying any of the existing infrastructure which may be affected by the<br>proposed development. In accordance with Section 90 of the Water Services Act<br>2012 whenever development is proposed near Water Corporation assets the<br>applicant/developer/owner needs approval prior to construction. This should be<br>done by submitting an Approval of Works application. For information about this<br>application please follow this link: |                 |
|           |    | https://www.watercorporation.com.au/home/builders-and-developers/working-<br>near-our-assets/approval-for-works   |                 |
|           |    | General   |                 |
|           |    | This proposal will require approval by our Building Services section prior to commencement of works. Infrastructure contributions and fees may be required to be paid prior to approval being issued.   |                 |

| Submitter | No | Submitter Comments   | Officer Comment   |
|-----------|----|--|---|
| A17300    |    | For further information about building applications, the developer should follow this link:         https://www.watercorporation.com.au/home/builders-and-developers/building/lodging-a-building-application         I fully support the proposal of a restaurant and brewery.   |   |
| A17300    |    | The location is perfect, it provides for a place for the community to take their families and friends for social interaction without having to drive to Mandurah, Baldivis or Perth.<br>We have very little like facilities in our district.   | Noted   |
| A53000    |    | <ul> <li>We object.</li> <li>We strongly object to the application and proposal for a Craft Brewery and<br/>Restaurant at 1248 Karnup Road, Serpentine and support our Shires previous<br/>decision on this matter agreeing in full with the reasons cited by them. Additionally,<br/>the proposed site adjoins our back boundary (Northern corner) and we are<br/>concerned about the following potential impacts</li> <li>Environmental Noise: <ul> <li>Related to brewery operations and delivery trucks etc</li> <li>Outdoor entertainment facilities with music and large crowds of people</li> <li>Large carparking areas</li> </ul> </li> </ul> | Noise appears to generally comply with the<br>Environmental Protection (Noise)<br>Regulations 1997. The development will be<br>subject to a strict Noise Management Plan<br>to further reduce noise emissions from the<br>development.<br>Service delivery vehicles are to occur<br>during operating hours only. Nothing before<br>7am or after 7pm.<br>Car parking areas will be screened from<br>view from all vistas by the presence of<br>existing and proposed vegetation. |

| Submitter | No | Submitter Comments  | Officer Comment  |  |
|-----------|----|---|--|--|
|           |    | <b>Ground Water Reserves:</b><br>In the 35 years we have lived on our property we have noticed a significant drop in ground water levels due to sub-divisions, increased population and warming climate and drought and several mature Red Gums and Jarrahs in the area have died. We feel the water resources a Brewery would take would greatly compound                                    | This is a separate process, no approval has<br>been granted by DWER. The applicant is<br>seeking to extract water from the<br>Leederville Aquifer which is confined form<br>the superficial aquifer. |  |
|           |    | this problem going forward and negatively impact our fragile environment.<br>Rural Zoning   |  |  |
|           |    | We understand that our property and the proposed Brewery site fall directly within<br>a rural buffer zone. We greatly value our current rural lifestyle and the peace and<br>quiet the area affords us. It is our home and sanctuary. Surely a large 'Brewery<br>and Restaurant' is not Rural but a Commercial or Light Industrial enterprise even<br>if they do run a few sheep on the side? | The development is considered to meet the existing and prevailing planning framework. This is addressed within the report.   |  |
|           |    | Local Business Impact   |  |  |
|           |    | The Serpentine community is looking forward to the 'Serpentine Tavern' reopening soon and will enthusiastically support this small business. The proposed brewery is a franchised big business with no invested interest in our Serpentine heritage, rural identity or established locals who will become reluctant neighbours.   | Noted, however not a planning consideration.   |  |
| A50200    |    | Traffic Issues - Roads inadequate and dangerous   | Road upgrades are being proposed.  |  |
|           |    | More drunken / dangerous drivers  | Officers have recommended channelised left and right turns to safely allow vehicles  |  |
|           |    | <u>Social Issues –</u> Noise, lights, anti social drinkers  | to que to enter site and for vehicles  |  |
|           |    | <u>Rural area –</u> Industry in farming area. People came here for lifestyle and quiet  | including trucks to pass.<br>The development will be subject to a Noise<br>Management Plan and Lighting Plan to<br>ensure that the rural amenity is maintained.                                      |  |
| A33200    |    | We strongly support the proposal of a restaurant and brewery.   | Noted  |  |

| Submitter No |  | Submitter Comments   | Officer Comment  |
|--------------|--|--|--|
|              |  | Serpentine is very lacking social / entertainment businesses.  |  |
|              |  | The other positive is the employment it will provide for locals.   |  |
| A21914       |  | We would like to raise our further objection to the proposed above-mentioned DA and revisions in the DA.   |  |
|              |  | Overall we do not believe an industrial scale cannery belongs in a rural zone. We appreciate that the costs of setting up in a rural zone may be significantly cheaper than an industrial area but the impact this will have on existing residents should be a priority.   | The development is considered to meet the existing and prevailing framework as discussed in the body of the report.  |
|              |  | Whilst the shire has expressed a desire to encourage tourism, which we support, we cannot disregard or ignore that our rural land is/has been, predominantly used for cattle and equine activities so future development must be of a scale and nature to compliment this. |  |
|              |  | We acknowledge that the Developers have made concessions to nearby<br>landholders in their revised DA but we believe there are still issues serious enough<br>to warrant the rejection of this DA.   |  |
|              |  | After reviewing the amendments, we have the following concerns:  |  |
|              |  | 1. The original car park was set for 251 vehicles, now it's 324 plus 2 coach parking bays. An explanation is required for the increase when the general guidance after the first DA from both the Shire and JDAP, was to scale back the excessive size of the project.     | The applicant has amended the site plan to reflect the 251 bays initially proposed.  |
|              |  | 2. By moving the entry east, to avoid the opposite neighbouring driveway, the proposed emergency access (now also linked to the existing driveway) appears to be approximately 35m from the main entry.  | The Guidelines for Planning in Bushfire<br>Prone Areas requires emergency access in<br>two different directions, the proposed                                    |
|              |  | As someone who was a volunteer firefighter for the SJ community for 20 years,<br>I know from experience that a running fire will cross that distance very quickly<br>with no hope of being able to safely evacuate a 1,000 person venue.                                   | emergency access meets this. The<br>development will also be subject to an<br>Emergency Evacuation Plan which will<br>prescribe that the venue is closed on high |
|              |  | 3. The revised document states 16,500 cubic meters of overburden will be required to raise some lower reticulated areas to 1.5m above the water table.   | fire rating days.  |

| Submitter | No | Submitter Com                                      | iments  |  |  | Officer Comment  |
|-----------|----|--|---|--|--|--|
|           |    | require abo  | out 870 trucks  |  | n carry 19 cubic meters, this will<br>nto that location on what can be<br>sibility.            | subject to a Traffic Management Plan<br>during the construction phase of the<br>development to ensure passing motorists                        |
|           |    |  |   | ds and procedures a elling predictions?  | are aware of the development.<br>The development will be subject to a Noise<br>Management Plan |  |
|           |    | so we can<br>very early                            | many conflictin<br>l and revised D<br>accept some<br>stage for us to<br>ally should it be |  |  |  |
|           |    | reported to<br>a sign of<br>accommod               | o speak as if thi<br>disrespect_to f<br>late a distillery                                 | oore) in a media ir<br>is DA was a given to<br>the process. He al<br>and winery in the fu<br>e size of the operati | This is not part of this application.  |  |
| A32900    |    | Please find att<br>the revised E<br>Brewery, Lot 2 | ached a summ<br>Development <i>A</i><br>201, 1248 Karnu                                   |  |  |  |
|           |    | DA<br>Addendum                                     | Overview &<br>Revised<br>Development<br>Plans<br>Page 1                                   | Brewery Footprint reduced by 30%   | Height has been increased by<br>1.66m ie visual impact is now<br>greater                       | The development will be screened with the existing vegetation on and adjoining the site providing at minimum filtered views of the development |
|           |    |  | Page 1  |  | Carpark has increased from 251 bays to 324 plus 2 coach bays                                   | The plans have been amended to reflect 251   |

| Submitter | No | Submitter Comments |  |  | Officer Comment  |
|-----------|----|--------------------|--|--|--|
|           |    | Page 1             | "Beer Brewing is a<br>recognised<br>agribusiness"  | A 1000 seat restaurant is not a recognised rural activity  | The development is considered to meet the existing and prevailing framework  |
|           |    | Page 3             | SJ Shire draft LPS3  | Future development is not<br>mentioned as a priority over<br>existing/historical activities<br>within the SJ Shire rural zones ie<br>cattle and equestrian pursuits  | The draft LPS 3 is a seriously entertained documents and required to be given consideration in decision making.  |
|           |    | Page 4             | Spent Grain  | Stable fly is a declared pest<br>under the Biosecurity and<br>Agricultural Management Act of<br>2007.<br>Control measures for on-sold<br>spent grain (in conflict with<br>recommended control<br>measures unless removed<br>regularly) to local farmers has<br>not been identified in terms of<br>minimising the proliferation of<br>this pest which has both<br>economic and implications | The development will be subject to a Waste<br>Management Plan. The WMP will be<br>prepared in accordance with the relevant<br>Local Law which will address this issue. |
|           |    |                    | Reference to<br>current size and<br>scale of alcohol<br>production<br>facilities within the<br>Shire is misleading<br>if it is being used to<br>suggest there is<br>already a<br>precedence. | Millbrook refer to themselves as<br>"small-batch" and represent<br>only about 3% of the total<br>Fogarty Group business.<br>King Road Brewery does not<br>have an industrial cannery<br>attached to its tourism outlet.  | The development is considered to meet the existing and prevailing framework.   |

| Submitter | No | Submitter Com                                | iments              | Officer Comment   |   |  |
|-----------|----|--|---------------------|---|---|--|
|           |    | Noise  | Appendix C          | Revised<br>environmental<br>noise report  | Whilst the modelling report<br>indicates compliance, it needs<br>to be noted that crowd noise,<br>multiple car doors shutting,<br>ambient music and live<br>entertainment are not expected<br>nor common place in a rural<br>setting. | The development is considered to meet the existing and prevailing framework. The large setbacks to boundaries of the development are appropriate to manage noise and the development will be subject to a NMP. |
|           |    | Size & Scale                                 | Appendix D          | Comparison to King<br>Road Brewery of<br>1520m2 vs Bright<br>Tank of 2100m2   | Far fewer dwellings surrounding<br>this location, single storey<br>profile, no residential driveways<br>opposite business entrance and<br>closest neighbour are twice the<br>distance from the site<br>compared to Bright Tank.       | Noted  |
|           |    | Nutrient<br>Irrigation<br>Management<br>Plan | Appendix E          | Public health   | Mosquito management plan not submitted.   | This is required as a condition of approval.   |
|           |    | Site & Soil<br>Evaluation                    | Appendix F<br>2.8.4 | The majority (4 of<br>the 6) of the<br>groundwater<br>monitoring bore<br>holes gave a<br>groundwater depth<br>of less than the<br>required 1.5m | Misleading to use an average of<br>the two bores closest to site<br>(0.73 & 2.32) to deliver a<br>combined figure of 1.53m bgl  | Fill will be required to be imported to site to<br>ensure all irrigation areas meet the 1.5m<br>separation requirement.  |
|           |    |  |                     | Reference re:<br>"peak groundwater<br>levels generally  | Provision for storage tanks<br>mentions the capacity for 2<br>months in June & July.  | Storage of brewery wastewaters will occur between April-September.   |

| Submitter | No | Submitter Con            | nments              |  | Officer Comment   |   |
|-----------|----|--------------------------|---------------------|--|---|---|
|           |    |                          |                     | occur in September<br>to October"            |   |   |
|           |    | Access<br>upgrades       | Appendix H          | Public safety and fire management            | It is likely that in the event of a<br>running bush fire, 20-30m<br>distance between access roads<br>is inadequate and 1000 patron<br>and staff could not be<br>evacuated safely.   | The proposed emergency access driveway<br>meets the bushfire planning framework as<br>it provides access in an east and west<br>direction.                                |
|           |    | Biological<br>Assessment | Appendix 3<br>4.1.4 | Phascogales – not<br>included in report      | Phascogales were identified at<br>409 Rapids Road the 27/10/22.<br>Fauna report and photo sent to<br>DBCA.<br>Conservation status listed as<br>"vulnerable and conservation<br>dependent"   | A very small portion of the site is proposed<br>to be cleared due to the slight relocation of<br>the development. The vegetation clearing<br>meets the TPS 2 requirement. |
|           |    | Personal                 | 3.3.2               | Reference to<br>'standard<br>business" hours | The commonly accepted<br>definition in Australia is 9-5pm 5<br>days a week. The combined<br>business hours of both<br>operations, 7 days/week means<br>no reprieve for neighbours.  | Operating hours will be conditioned 11am-<br>10pm on Monday public holidays only,<br>Thursday-Friday 11am-10pm and<br>Saturday-Sunday 8am-10pm                            |
|           |    |                          |                     | Fire safety                                  | The proximity of the site and<br>the nature of the business<br>presents an increased bush fire<br>risk to surrounding residents<br>who are likely to be more safety<br>conscious through living in a<br>rural setting than outside<br>visitors who may also be<br>smoking and drinking. | The development is subject to a Bushfire<br>Management Plan and Emergency<br>Evacuation Plan.   |

| Submitter | No | Submitter Comments   |  | Officer Comment   |  |  |
|-----------|----|--|--|---|--|--|
|           |    | Consultation   | The representative<br>for Taylor Burrell<br>Barnett indicated<br>to the MODAP<br>panel on 29/8/22<br>that neighbours<br>had been<br>consulted.   | This may be the case for<br>some residents however<br>the owners of the<br>property most impacted<br>by the DA, 409 Rapids<br>Road, have never been<br>contacted/consulted.   |  | Development has been advertised in<br>accordance with Local Planning Policy 1.4:<br>Public Consultation for Planning Matters   |
| A32700    |    | <ul> <li>addressed more than the addressed more than the addressed more than the address and the amended plan for we are sponsibility/liability be fact come to fruition addressed more than the address the address the address the addressed more than the addressed more than the address the addre</li></ul> | n to the above application of the above application of the above application of the appli | ation and as amended o<br>of additional traffic projecte<br>inds of decision makers mu<br>solute safety.<br>Ins from Government Age<br>d that no ill effects will occu-<br>ie issues are satisfied incl<br>ionths . If Council not 100%<br>serious and where will<br>usage to produce beer do<br>le? As current studies sho | n the<br>ed this<br>ust be<br>encies<br>ur. All<br>uding<br>5 sure<br>II the<br>pes in | Road upgrades have been proposed and<br>conditioned appropriately.<br>The NIMP will be required to comply with<br>the EPP targets and will be subject to<br>updates as detailed in the report.<br>The applicant seeks to extract water from<br>the Leederville Aquifer. This will be subject<br>to approval by DWER who are the<br>regulatory body of this process are. The<br>applicant based on their operational needs<br>have estimated an amount of 30,000kl<br>required a total of 50,000 kl is proposed to<br>be applied for. |

| Submitter | No | Submitter Comments  | Officer Comment  |
|-----------|----|---|--|
|           |    | 4. Waste water controls – the decision makers must have completed all due diligence and take advice from the appropriate advisory agencies after the first negative reports provided the control of potential increase of mosquitos, stable fly are also issues needing to be addressed.  | The development will be subject to a<br>Mosquito Management Plan and Waste<br>Management Plan toa dress these issues.                    |
|           |    | 5. Lack of infrastructure within the Shire to monitor and control every day situations that will arise out of alcohol fuelled traffic accidents (estimated 2000 extra vehicles on a Saturday and Sunday) noise issues, disturbances requiring police attendance, general unacceptable social behaviour etc.   | The development will be subject to road upgrades prior to commencement.  |
|           |    | 6. This proposal is not in accordance with Council policy of rural pursuits and to claim own grown beef and other produce on this land is unachievable and without experience or knowledge.   | The development is considered to meet the existing and prevailing planning framework.  |
|           |    | 7. For this total application contract of \$7M (to allow to go above Council decision) what financial information has been discovered to guarantee the applicants have the resources to complete such a project?  | No such information has been requested or submitted as part of this process.   |
|           |    | I make this decision to oppose once again this application and urge Council to follow the same decision they previously made in rejecting the proposal.   | Noted.   |
|           |    | Also Council should influence MODAP to come to the same rejection conclusion.   |  |
| A32801    |    | As owners of property on Rapids Road, Serpentine we thank you for the opportunity to make this further submission to object to the proposed development at Lot 201, 1248 Karnup Road, Serpentine.   |  |
|           |    | We continue to object to the proposed development because of the following two major concerns:  |  |
|           |    | <ol> <li>In our submission to the Shire of Serpentine Jarrahdale of 10 June, 2022 we<br/>outlined the potential undesirable consequences that the proposed irrigation of<br/>land at Lot 201, 1248 Karnup Road may have on the Peel-Harvey Estuary. The<br/>WA Department of Primary Industries and Regional Development indicated the<br/>proposed development at this site could not be deemed an appropriate rural<br/>pursuit. Furthermore, the proposed development does not align with the S-J</li> </ol> | The submitted NIMP complies with the EPP targets and will need to comply with these targets at all times and will be subject to updates. |

| Submitter | No | Submitter Comments   | Officer Comment   |
|-----------|----|--|---|
|           |    | Shire's categorization of a rural pursuit. Therefore, as a non-rural pursuit, the potential for nutrients applied as fertilizer to the irrigated land to ultimately end-<br>up in the Peel-Harvey Estuary, as detailed in our submission of 10 June, 2022, has not been fully addressed. | The development is considered to comply<br>with the existing and prevailing planning<br>framework.  |
|           |    | 2. We would expect that relevant Agencies will be requested to monitor that all MODAP and S-J Shire recommendations to be carried out before and during the proposed development are executed in full?   |   |
|           |    | If the Agencies are unable to give assurances they have the financial resources<br>and qualified personnel to perform both these immediate and long-term tasks, the<br>proposed development should be rejected.<br>We thank you for consideration of this submission.                    | Conditions of approval have to be adhered<br>to at all times. The Shire's compliance team<br>will regulate non compliance with any<br>conditions of approval if approved. |