

## SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS

No.	Name/Address of Submitter	Summary of Submission	Proponent Comment	Officer Comment	Council Recommendation
	Environmental Protection Authority PO Box K822 PERTH WA 6842	<p>The Environmental Protection Authority (EPA) considers that the proposed scheme amendment should not be assessed under Part IV Division 3 of the <i>Environmental Protection Act 1986</i> (EP Act) but nevertheless provides the following advice and recommendations.</p> <p><b>ADVICE AND RECOMMENDATIONS</b></p> <p><b>1. Environmental Issues</b></p> <p>Native vegetation and fauna linkages</p> <p>Advice and recommendations regarding the Environmental Issues</p> <p>The vegetation within the proposed scheme amendment area is highly likely to be of strategic importance to maintain a level of connectivity between the Torndirrup National Park to the south, and the City of Albany reserve to the north.</p> <p>Advice from DEC indicates that if the amendment is adopted using the current proposed subdivision plan the associated clearing and fuel reduction strategies for the Fire Management Plan will adversely</p>		<p>Noted Staff at the City and the proponents had discussions with the DEC Albany Office regarding changes to the subdivision plan. The discussions Included: Relocation and clustering of building envelopes; Use of a higher level of bush fire protection building standard under AS 3959.</p> <p>It is recommended that any approval of the amendment be subject to the recommended modifications as discussed</p> <p>With Officers at the DEC.</p>	<p>The submission is noted.</p>

## SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS

No.	Name/Address of Submitter	Summary of Submission	Proponent Comment	Officer Comment	Council Recommendation
		<p>affect native vegetation and fauna linkages across the amendment area.</p> <p>Where possible the linkages between Torndirrup National Park to the south and the City of Albany reserve to the north should be retained in their natural state.</p> <p>In order to minimize clearing of these linkages, while providing appropriate bushfire protection for residents, the EPA highly recommends consultation with the DEC Albany Office and the Fire and Emergency Services Authority of Western Australia. Changes to the subdivision plan that should be investigated include: Relocation and clustering of building envelopes; Use of a higher level of bush fire protection building standard under AS 3959, for example BAL-29 or BAL-40, so that buildings offer better protection against bushfire attack. If buildings offer better protection a reduction in the requirement to reduce fuel load in the Hazard Separation Zones may be possible.</p>			

## SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS

No.	Name/Address of Submitter	Summary of Submission	Proponent Comment	Officer Comment	Council Recommendation
1	Water Corporation 629 Newcastle Street LEEDERVILLE WA 6007	<p><b>Water</b> Reticulated water is currently available to the subject area. If extensions are required, all water mains must be laid within the existing and proposed road reserves, on the correct alignment and in accordance with the Utility Providers Code of Practice.</p> <p><b>Wastewater</b> The subject area falls outside a planned sewerage catchment. If reticulated sewerage is required to serve the development the developer should arrange for Sewerage Planning to be undertaken.</p> <p><b>Urban Water Management</b> Water strategy and management issues should be addressed in accordance with the State Water Strategy 2003, State Water Plan 2007, and Department of Water document Better Urban Water Management.</p> <p><b>General Comments</b> The principle followed by the Water Corporation for the funding of subdivision or development is one of user pays. The developers are expected to provide all reticulation if required.</p>		<p>At the time of subdivision the connection of any new lots to reticulated water will be required.</p> <p>It is expected that the developer will make the necessary contributions to the cost of upgrading infrastructure.</p>	The submission is noted.

## SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS

No.	Name/Address of Submitter	Summary of Submission	Proponent Comment	Officer Comment	Council Recommendation
		A contribution for water headworks may also be required. In addition the developers may be required to fund new works or the upgrading of existing works and protection of all Water Corporation works. The Water Corporation may also require land being ceded free of cost for works.			
2	Department of Health PO Box 8172 Perth Business Centre WA 6849	Information provided by Landform Research in regard to the site indicate that on-site disposal of wastewater is achievable.  The Department of Health has no objection to the modified subdivision guide plan.	Noted.	Nil.	The submission is noted.
3	Department of Water PO Box 525 Albany Western Australia 6331	The Department of Water reviewed the proposal and has no objections.	Noted	Nil	The submission is noted
4	Department of Environment and Conservation 120 Albany Highway ALBANY WA 6330	DEC does not support this proposed amendment in its current form and recommends that modifications to the proposed plan of subdivision and the fire management plan are made in order to retain as fauna linkages several existing areas of un-modified native vegetation connectivity	P3. Land to the north is zoned Special Residential and also accommodates a Tourist (Chalet) Development site. As a result, this area will be extensively cleared for development with vegetation modified further for	Staff at the City and the proponents had discussions with the DEC Albany Office regarding changes to the subdivision plan. The discussions	The submission is noted and Partially upheld.  any approval of the amendment be subject to the recommended

## SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS

No.	Name/Address of Submitter	Summary of Submission	Proponent Comment	Officer Comment	Council Recommendation
		<p>between Torndirrup National Park, Reserve 43477 and other vegetated private lots to the south of the subject land and various City of Albany reserves to the north, including the karri woodland Reserve 29531, Reserve 43531, Reserve 43527, Reserve 45735 and Lake Vancouver Reserve 48916 and its associated catchment, and the Vancouver Peninsula (Reserves A 25295 and 49672)...</p> <p>Native vegetation connectivity between these various reserves should be a fundamental objective within the scheme amendment area.</p> <p>In its advice to the City of Albany regarding this scheme amendment (24 October 2011), the Environmental Protection Authority (EPA) advised that where possible these fauna linkages should be retained in their natural state. The EPA recommended that consultation should occur with DEC in order to minimize clearing of the linkages.</p> <p>On the basis of informal discussions that you initiated with the consultant</p>	<p>fire protection.</p> <p>The Fire Management Plan (FMP) and council's review show that to adequately protect existing development, the subject land required widespread fuel load reduction. As a result of this, even without the proposed development, it is questionable where it is possible to achieve the DEC desire for a strategic unmodified native vegetation connection. The only way for this to really be achieved would be for lots to be acquired by the DEC as they become available.</p> <p>P4. The EPA noted that "where possible" these linkages should be retained in their natural state. Unfortunately given current and approved development along with the effect of the lot sizes of existing development and the requirements of contemporary fire protection controls, it appears unlikely that these linkages can be retained in their natural state.</p> <p>P5. Inaccurate. The two</p>	<p>Included: Relocation and clustering of building envelopes; Use of a higher level of bush fire protection building standard under AS 3959.</p> <p>It is recommended that any approval of the amendment be subject to the recommended modifications as discussed</p> <p>With Officers at the DEC.</p> <p>Required modifications should include the increase in fire protection standards required for new dwellings to BAL 29 or BAL 40 to allow for an improved vegetation connectivity across current Lots 8 and 9. a minor readjustment westwards of the indicative building</p>	<p>modifications as discussed to the satisfaction of DEC</p>

## SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS

No.	Name/Address of Submitter	Summary of Submission	Proponent Comment	Officer Comment	Council Recommendation
		<p>and DEC, it appears likely that modifications to the subdivision plan and to the associated fire management plan may be possible in order to achieve this goal.</p> <p><b>IN CONCLUSION</b> As it stands this proposed amendment will result in the total modification of native vegetation across the whole of the subject land.</p> <p>There are currently good fauna linkages across the current six lot sub-division which provide connectivity between the Torndirrup National Park in the south and the Vancouver Peninsula including a significant Conservation management category wetland (Lake Vancouver) in the north. There is also a good linkage to Reserve 29531 which is largely remnant karri woodland and to Reserve 43531 between Austin Road and Karrakatta Road. Both of these reserves are vested in the City of Albany and the karri reserve in particular provides habitat for native species including Baudin's and Carnaby's Black Cockatoo.</p> <p>Unless the fire protection standards required for new dwellings are</p>	<p>components are - of the additional six lots and – updating the provisions relating to fire protection (amongst other things) for new development on the lots.</p> <p>P6. Inaccurate. Components involve replacing the current requirements for a 50m LFA (low fuel area), maintained to BPZ (building protection zone) levels, with a 20m BPZ and a 20m HSA (hazard separation area, within which vegetation is thinned and environmental/ aesthetic functions will remain). There is also the stipulation of fire safe dwelling construction standards and the strategic linking of the fire access network benefiting the wider area.</p> <p>The Fire Management Plan and Fire Hazard Assessment has been prepared to Planning for Fire (PFF) standards. This is the prevailing fire safety standard and concerns itself with</p>	<p>envelope on proposed Sub-lot 10 (south east corner of Lot 7) would also allow for the retention of an undisturbed vegetation linkage along the eastern boundary of the subject land between Austin Road and Reserve 43531 .</p>	

## SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS

No.	Name/Address of Submitter	Summary of Submission	Proponent Comment	Officer Comment	Council Recommendation
		<p>increased to BAL 29 or BAL 40 the conservation connectivity across current Lots 8 and 9 will be lost. A better conservation outcome would be to not include these two lots in the subdivision proposal.</p> <p>While retention of connectivity across current Lots 8 and 9 is the priority, a minor readjustment westwards of the indicative building envelope on proposed Sub-lot 10 (south east corner of Lot 7) would also allow for the retention of an undisturbed vegetation linkage along the eastern boundary of the subject land between Austin Road and Reserve 43531 .</p> <p>As a corollary to these comments, it is recommended that in future draft fire management plans which include areas of native vegetation be discussed with DEC before formal inclusion into scheme amendments or subdivision proposals. This would help in stream-lining the subsequent processing of proposals.</p> <p><i>Please refer to the submission received from DEC for more detailed comments</i></p>	<p>prevailing vegetation types for hazard ratings. Also, in the context of Planning for Fire, where wider HSAs can be provided, this is preferred as the method to reduce risk levels.</p> <p>In this instance, HSAs can be provided along with improved construction methods to actually reduce the amount of land that needs to be fuel reduced to BPZ levels (from 50m to 20m). Without the controls to be introduced, the FMP found that the entire site required some hazard reduction. As a result, the existing high hazard levels (existing denser bush areas) cannot be considered as the condition they would remain in the long term. The win -w that by increasing the fire safety levels by increasing construction requirements and graduating the reduced fuel areas, the over all level of significant vegetation modification is reduced whilst at the same time permitting controlled</p>	<p>Staff Note this comment.</p>	

## SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS

No.	Name/Address of Submitter	Summary of Submission	Proponent Comment	Officer Comment	Council Recommendation
			<p>and limited subdivision.</p> <p>P8. This voluntary option currently exists for all landowners in the state.</p> <p>P9. In this instance PFF and councils own assessment require significant vegetation modification to cater for the existing development. The proposed development quantifies and reduces the level of top tier hazard reduction (BPZ) required.</p> <p>P10. To comply with existing fire protection requirements significantly more top tier vegetation modification is required than is the following subdivision and the application of the up to date controls.</p> <p>P11. Accepted.</p> <p>P12. Opinion Noted.</p> <p>P13. Inaccurate. Outside building envelopes there will be a 20m area of limited hazard reduction/vegetation modification (6 photos show the level (or lack of) clearing/hazard reduction required in these areas.</p>		

**SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS**

No.	Name/Address of Submitter	Summary of Submission	Proponent Comment	Officer Comment	Council Recommendation
			<p>P14. Opinion Noted.</p> <p>P15. As the site stands, with the outdated combination of fire protection requirements, application of Planning for Fire – without the proposed additional fire protection mechanisms included in the proposal, would necessitate the entire 12.1ha to be significantly hazard reduced.</p> <p>P16. Accepted. Most landowners have not implemented the 50m low fuel area requirements and the site does not meet applicable standards or appear to be adequately managed. As a result, more robust, legible and applicable (enforceable) fire protection requirements are included in the proposal.</p> <p>P17. Opinion Noted.</p> <p>P18. Hazard reduction to HSA levels (6 -8t/ha) is n considered “clearing”. The attached photos show areas maintained to this level. Most environmental, aesthetic and amenity benefits will obviously</p>		

**SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS**

No.	Name/Address of Submitter	Summary of Submission	Proponent Comment	Officer Comment	Council Recommendation
			<p>remain.                      Also, in terms of fuel reduction activities and the interpretation of clearing, it should be noted that there is periodic fuel reduction burns in the national park area flanking Austin Road. This reduces the fuel loads, reduces the risk to the greater Goode Beach locality the national park but is not considered clearing.                      P19. Inaccurate. As the area is, at the moment, significant site wide vegetation modification is necessary. The proposal actually reduces the level of required vegetation modification in many areas by basically improving fire access and increasing the fire safety rating required of new dwellings.                      P20. Noted. The fire plan has been prepared and endorsed on the basis of the applicable state policy.                      P21. Hazard Separation Areas at 6                      "clearing" in all situations. Also see note at</p>		

## SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS

No.	Name/Address of Submitter	Summary of Submission	Proponent Comment	Officer Comment	Council Recommendation
			<p>P18.</p> <p>P22. A construction standard of BAL19 for new dwellings was seen by the fire plan and council's officers to be the best compromise between building protection and reducing the need for vegetation modification.</p> <p>P23. Inaccurate. The site is not fire safe. To be fire safe, the area would currently require site wide fuel reduction and an expansion of low fuel areas (BPZs) to 50m. By virtue of the controls included within the proposal, a reduction in level of fuel reduction and reducing BPZ and HSA requirements by 10m in width is possible. On all fire protection advice, leaving the site as it is even with the current level of development is not acceptable. Not ideal but the compromise is a possibility; ie, Increase dwelling construction requirements for Future Lots 5, 6, 7 &amp; 8 to BAL29</p>		

**SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS**

No.	Name/Address of Submitter	Summary of Submission	Proponent Comment	Officer Comment	Council Recommendation
			<p>and reduce the combined BPZ &amp; HSA requirements accordingly. As a result of the connection across existing Lots 8 &amp; 9 is retained.</p> <p>P25. Similarly, not ideal but building envelope relocation to the west for Future Lot 10 could be undertaken to maintain the linkage in that area.</p> <p>P26. Noted. Council &amp; FESA are the fire authorities and responsibility rests with them. Also, the opportunity for input is already provided within pre advertising and referral processes.</p> <p>Summary Action.</p> <p>Increase dwelling construction requirements for future Lots 5, 6, 7 &amp; 8 to BAL29 and reduce the combined BPZ &amp; HSA requirements accordingly in accord with plan previously provided.</p> <p>Relocate building envelope of Future Lot 10 to the west in accord with plan previously provided.</p>		

## SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS

No.	Name/Address of Submitter	Summary of Submission	Proponent Comment	Officer Comment	Council Recommendation
5	Robert Paul Hornsby PO Box 5462 Albany W A 6332	<p>I am a long-term resident at 39 (Lot 3) McBride Road, Goode Beach having purchased the property in 1999.</p> <p>I oppose the new plan of subdivision and the Amendment for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The proposed subdivision diverts from the original (and successful) intention in creating Special Rural Zone No. 5 which was to create a rural residential retreat emphasising minimal impact on both the landscape and natural vegetation.</li> <li>2. The reduction of lot size to one hectare is akin to re-zoning the lands from Special Rural to Special Residential, which is not what was originally planned for the locality.</li> <li>3. The proposed subdivision will eventually destroy the retreat environment of seclusion, peace and quiet, and tranquillity within the area. The proponents subjectively claim that because of the existing</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. View Noted.</li> <li>2. Proposal is not for Special Residential development. 1ha lots are Special Rural. Existing lots to the north and east being 4000m2 and 6-7000m2 are Special Residential.</li> <li>3. Existing and approved subdivision in the immediate area (abutting the subject land) have changed the character of SRZ No. 5. This proposal simply fits in with that changing character. Lots remain within the special rural band so as to provide graduation between the existing much smaller special residential and</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Noted</li> <li>2. Noted and agree that this was not originally planned. a change in strategy allows for densification for a more efficient use of land were the land is capable</li> </ol>	The submission is noted

## SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS

No.	Name/Address of Submitter	Summary of Submission	Proponent Comment	Officer Comment	Council Recommendation
		<p>development in the area, and the approved development yet to occur, accommodation of the proposal will not change the character of the Goode Beach Village. This may be the case but is hardly the point- the proposal will significantly change the intended character of Special Rural Zone No.5.</p> <p>4. The proposed subdivision and additional lots will severely impact upon both the landscape and the natural vegetation through the erection of six more houses and potential outbuildings - the natural vegetation through clearing for houses, outbuildings, building and land fire protection areas (as required under the provisions of the Development Guide Plan itself (and other legislation), and hazard separation zones.</p> <p>5. With a maximum building envelope of 2,000 square metres allowed per block, building protection zones plus</p>	<p>residential lots to the north, north east and east and the large special rural lots south of McBride road.</p> <p>4. Building envelopes, building standards and fire protection requirements have been specifically planned to have minimum impact. By the use of these measures, the gross level of vegetation modification to ensure fire safety is reduced.</p> <p>5. Not accepted. Building envelopes may effectively be a maximum of 2000m<sup>2</sup>. Experience shows however that landowners use much less area. Areas shown for "Hazard Separation" are not cleared in the conventional sense. In these areas fuel levels are reduced and managed as such.</p> <p>Photos follow showing that significant vegetation density remains to provide for environmental and</p>	<p>3. Noted the proposed change will have some affect on the character of the Special rural area.</p> <p>4. Noted This impact was considered and the use of shared building envelopes and higher levels of AS3959 have been utilised to reduce this impact It is however still likely to have a visual impact.</p>	

## SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS

No.	Name/Address of Submitter	Summary of Submission	Proponent Comment	Officer Comment	Council Recommendation
		<p>driveways and firebreaks the area fully cleared is considerable. When the hazard separation zones are added the ground cleared is at least 50% of the new blocks.</p> <p>6. The proponent in their submission at Item 7.0 seem to suggest that clearing will be even greater than this, based on the Landform Research Report dated 28/07/11, page 4, 72.5% of the land will be subject to some form of clearing, that is, only 27.5% of natural remnant bush will remain. This will adversely impact the area, see paragraph 9. They also say that clearing is reduced by fuel reduction areas being shared across boundaries but this is only true in regard to two of the six new blocks.</p> <p>7. The blocks on the southern side of Zone 5 border the Torndirrup National Park and Reserve 43477. 5 of the 6 blocks on the northern side of Zone 5 border Reserves 8019, 7100, 29531 and 43531. The</p>	<p>aesthetic functions.</p> <p>6. Not accepted. The report outlines that less clearing is required for building envelopes and building Protection zones.</p> <p>7. Noted.</p>	<p>5. And 6 Noted As the existing required protection areas and fuel reduction is not in place the future impact should be considered with this in mind</p> <p>This impact was considered and the use of shared building envelopes and higher levels of AS3959 have been utilised to reduce this impact It is however still likely to have a visual impact.</p>	

## SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS

No.	Name/Address of Submitter	Summary of Submission	Proponent Comment	Officer Comment	Council Recommendation
		<p>National Park and those Reserves hold an abundance of native flora and fauna, habitat, birdlife and ecosystems of global significance. The proponent, in their submission at 6.2 (para 6) suggests that the fauna from the National Park 'could access the site'. In fact, the fauna (and birdlife) roam through the whole of Zone 5 at will.</p> <p>8. The proponents suggest that the species in the area are relatively small and so are unlikely to be significantly impacted on by the addition of six dwellings. If the species are so small, then I would suggest that they will be significantly impacted by the clearing of such large areas of native vegetation. This will have a great impact on the territorial habits of the fauna and birdlife; their habitats and ecosystems. These are ecosystems with high biodiversity values and need protecting.</p>	<p>8. Unclear.</p> <p>9. SRZ No. 5 being privately owned Special Rural zoned land is already removed from the conservation estate. The area, being surrounded on two sides by much more intensive residential development will always be compromised in its environmental function. The proposal meets this context by making provision for development whilst applying continued fire protection and clearing controls to minimise overall impacts and improve fire safety.</p> <p>10. SRZ No. 5 being privately owned Special Rural zoned land is already removed from the conservation estate. The area, being surrounded on two sides by much more intensive residential development will always be compromised in its environmental function. The proposal meets this context by making provision for development whilst applying continued fire</p>	Noted	

## SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS

No.	Name/Address of Submitter	Summary of Submission	Proponent Comment	Officer Comment	Council Recommendation
		<p>9. In terms of natural remnant vegetation, zone 5 plays an important role as it acts as an essential corridor to preserve habitats for flora and fauna and maintain biodiversity. To quote from planning principle 4.2 in the Albany Local Planning Strategy, 'The decline of species is often caused by fragmentation or isolation of habitats.</p> <p>10. The most important vegetation linkages connect areas of high conservation value such as national parks and reserves.' One could not find a more obvious example of an important linkage, Zone 5 beings surrounded by Torndirrup National Park and Crown Reserves 43477, 8019, 7100, 29531 and 43531.</p> <p>11. I am advised by the DEC that they have concerns regarding the clearing of vegetation linkages, particularly any clearing on existing lots 5 and 7 which will compromise the fauna linkages form the National Park through to the</p>	<p>protection and clearing controls to minimise overall impacts and improve fire safety.</p> <p>Noted. See 9. above.  11. Noted. See 9. above.  12. Demand and viability are not valid planning rationales. Examples mentioned are for Special Residential (smaller) lots with significantly different characteristics to the lots included within Amendment No. 239.  13. Agreed. This is not a reason in itself but is a valid consideration given this context ensures lesser environmental and amenity impact than were the area dominated by larger lots and given an appropriate level of infrastructure servicing already exists.  14. Not relevant.  15. Not relevant.  16. Noted. Temporary and transient impacts are possible from a number of other activities that may be</p>	<p>10 and 11 Noted, Staff have discussed this matter with the DEC and modifications are being proposed to ensure the retention of some of these linkages.</p>	

## SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS

No.	Name/Address of Submitter	Summary of Submission	Proponent Comment	Officer Comment	Council Recommendation
		<p>Karri Forest, Lake Vancouver and Vancouver Peninsula. I share those concerns.</p> <p>12. There is no demand for this type of life-style block in the area. The Hayn Road subdivision some two to three years ago seems to be for eight blocks of 6001 square metres - all appear to be unsold. The La Perouse Court subdivision about five years ago seems to be for at least nine blocks around 2,000 square metres six appear to be unsold. The La Peruse Road subdivision over five years ago was for 10 blocks of about 4,000 square metres - seven appear unsold.</p> <p>13. The fact that the locality is dominated by lots a third to a fifth smaller than that prevailing in Zone 5 is not a valid reason for intensification.</p> <p>14. Six of the eleven owners, 55% of blocks directly affected in McBride Road are not involved in the subdivision. As they've all been advised of the</p>	<p>undertaken within the area but these are also possible from a number of other activities that may be undertaken within the area regardless of the proposal.</p> <p>17. Not accepted. Given the approved Hayn Road Special Residential lots &amp; Tourist Development (chalet) site, McBride Road will accommodate something in the order of 31 dwelling units of traffic.</p> <p>The potential additional 6 lots resulting from this proposal is less than 20% - well within the capability of the road.</p> <p>18. See 17. above.</p> <p>19. Not accepted. A small increase in lot numbers (6) in the context of the level of development and population in the Goode Beach locality would be difficult to measure.</p> <p>20. See 19. above.</p> <p>21. See 19. above.</p> <p>22. See 19. above.</p> <p>23. Inaccurate. The proposed fire protection</p>	<p>12 to 14 the comment are noted</p>	

## SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS

No.	Name/Address of Submitter	Summary of Submission	Proponent Comment	Officer Comment	Council Recommendation
		<p>monetary gains to be had from subdivision one can conclude that all prefer the retreat lifestyle above monetary gain.</p> <p>15. The proponent claims that five of those not involved in the process do not object to the proposal but as the proposal was put in a mercenary fashion one wonders whether the long term impacts were considered at the time they are said not to have objected.</p> <p>16. The peace and quiet and tranquillity within the area is unsurpassed and on many days one can hear the waves break on Goode &amp; Cable Beaches, several kilometres away. The subdivision, clearing and building of 6 house, hazard and protection zones, and many outbuildings will create excessive and prolonged noise from Bobcats, Bulldozers (particularly as they reverse and a very loud safety beeper comes on) and Contractors (most of whom want to share their CDs and</p>	<p>measures actually improve the fire safety of the subject and surrounding land.</p> <p>24. Not accepted. The existing context of the area, existing support, existing lot size and approved development in the area, ability to improve fire safety, make this area and proposal a positive.</p> <p>Impacts will be minor and controlled. Given the location of development of Lot 3</p>	<p>15 Comment is noted the support for the proposal is formally assessed as part public consultation phase of the amendment process.</p> <p>16. it is likely that there will be a marginal increase in the impact on the amenity of the surrounding lots.</p>	

## SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS

No.	Name/Address of Submitter	Summary of Submission	Proponent Comment	Officer Comment	Council Recommendation
		<p>Radio with the whole neighbourhood).</p> <p>17. It will also create a much heavier traffic flow and thus more traffic noise on Vancouver Road, Austin Road and McBride Road and will increase the danger of traffic accidents due to the layouts of Austin and McBride Roads.</p> <p>18. Subsequent to any subdivision and building there is likely to be at least a 50% increase in traffic flows and traffic noise along McBride Road with unwelcome ramifications for the residents of Austin Road, particularly when traffic flows downhill to Vancouver Road and it is easy to exceed the speed limit of 60 kph.</p> <p>19. There is also likely to be at least a 50% increase in population noise from lawnmowers, chainsaws, farm bikes, trail bikes (including more riding illegally in the National Park), machinery, music and from barking dogs.</p>		<p>17 and 18 The change in traffic at a full built out scenario is likely to increase from a current planned 96 vehicle movements a day to 144 vehicle movements a day (variable of 8 vehicle movements a day per lot is used in the calculation).</p> <p>19 to 24. It is likely that there will be a marginal increase in the impact on the amenity of the surrounding lots.</p>	

## SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS

No.	Name/Address of Submitter	Summary of Submission	Proponent Comment	Officer Comment	Council Recommendation
		<p>20. More dogs in the area will also lead to more dogs attacking fauna in the Torndirrup Nation Park and on Reserves.</p> <p>21. There will also be a large increase in population pollution from wood fires and burning of firebreaks and garden refuse together with landscape pollution from the roofs of many more buildings.</p> <p>22. There is Banksia dieback in the zone which will be spread as a result of the considerable increase in traffic flow arising from the subdivision.</p> <p>23. There will be an increase in fire danger for the area, particularly for the lots south of McBride Road, despite the fire control measures suggested. It is a confirmed fact that besides lightning, fires are caused by people.</p> <p>24. Having majority landowner support and support for controlled intensification within the Albany Local Planning Strategy are insufficient</p>		<p>In general Although the concerns raised are generally valid, the impact is not considered that much more adverse especially viewed in the context of the broader area that includes the adjoining special residential area and the likely impact that this will have once developed.</p>	

## SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS

No.	Name/Address of Submitter	Summary of Submission	Proponent Comment	Officer Comment	Council Recommendation
		<p>reasons to jeopardise the biodiversity and tranquillity of the area. Having peace and quiet and tranquillity as an environment to live in is hard to find and is why people moved to this area to live in the first place. The subdivision is an exercise for monetary gain at the expense of destroying this environment.</p> <p>I trust my opinion will be considered, and the Councillors of the City of Albany have the opportunity to appreciate this amazing location for what it is, and reaffirm that stance by upholding my objections and rejecting the application for planning scheme amendment.</p>			
6	Roy Frederick Machin Rositer Road ,Goode Beach	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Raised a matter regarding the plans not showing recently completed houses.</li> <li>2. Concerns were also raised about possible storm water and drainage (associated with the lots on Rositer Road) impacts on proposed lots 10 and 11.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Correct. The existing residential lots, for the purposes of forward planning, are assumed developed with residential dwellings. P3-5. Noted. At the time of subdivision, council will require the construction and drainage of the Lot 11 access and strategic fire break. Whilst at the time of</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The existing residential lots, for the purposes of forward planning, are assumed developed With residential dwellings.</li> <li>2. Appropriate Storm Drainage infrastructure</li> </ol>	The submission is noted

## SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS

No.	Name/Address of Submitter	Summary of Submission	Proponent Comment	Officer Comment	Council Recommendation
		<p>please refer to the submission for more detail.</p> <p>.</p>	<p>development on Lot 11, council will require stormwater drainage buildings and impermeable surfaces.</p>	<p>will be required as a condition of subdivision all pre development flows will have to be taken into consideration in the design of the stormwater system.</p>	
12		•	•		