

City of Greater Geraldton
Local Planning Scheme No. 5 (Greenough) – Amendment No. 20
Schedule of Submissions

Submission Number & Date	Submitter & Affected Property	Nature of Submission	Comment	Recommendation
1 (16/10/2013)	Private Landowner	Support		Note submission
2 (15/10/2013)	Department of Aboriginal Affairs	There are currently no known sites registered with the Department of Aboriginal Affairs within the work areas outlined.		Note submission
3 (21/11/2013)	Private Landowner	No objection in principle to the amendment to the scheme.		Note submission
		<p>Object to the siting of a through road on our western boundary and any road on our eastern boundary for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential for disruption of lifestyle, privacy and rural outlook of our home. • Impact on the security as the house will be easily accessible from the road. • The proximity of the house to the road will cause considerable noise and danger to children and animals and impact on privacy. • No reason why a through road is needed on the western boundary as the southern subdivision is easily accessible to Webber Road. • Increase in traffic to the area will impact the native flora and fauna. 	<p>Whilst all the issues are acknowledged it must be noted that the local structure plan provided with the amendment documentation is indicative only.</p> <p>A further approvals process is required for future structure planning of the area and further opportunity will be provided for public comment.</p> <p>It must also be noted that any roads proposed through private property are at the complete discretion of the landowner to provide and there is no onus put on any landowner to subdivide.</p>	Note submission
4 (21/11/2013)	Private Landowner	<p>Object</p> <p>The land is still used for agricultural purposes. Sheep are regularly grazed on the land in question.</p> <p>The land has not been progressively removed from agriculture. All that has happened is the land has changed from one agricultural land use (arable) to another agricultural land use (pasture). The land is still in active agriculture.</p>	<p>Whilst sheep have recently been grazed on the property it should be noted that this is not a regular occurrence.</p> <p>The ability to utilise the landholdings for a full range of agricultural pursuits permitted by the Scheme is compromised by the proximity to rural residential development. For example the landowner no longer sprays for melon control to enable cropping due to the impact on adjoining lifestyle properties.</p>	Dismiss submission

City of Greater Geraldton
Local Planning Scheme No. 5 (Greenough) – Amendment No. 20
Schedule of Submissions

Submission Number & Date	Submitter & Affected Property	Nature of Submission	Comment	Recommendation
4 continued		<p>The purpose of rural-residential is in-part to provide a transition between high-density residential area and rural agriculture – hence its name rural-residential. There is no conflict with proximity from the existing rural-residential and the existing agriculture.</p>	<p>The comments made are subjective in nature and do not pay regard to the current situation faced by the landowner: whilst it is perceived that there is no conflict on the part of the submitter, this is due entirely to the limited use of the land for agricultural purposes due to the restrictions faced.</p> <p>It is considered that the Moresby Range itself will form a geographical barrier to the extent of rural-residential development for Greater Geraldton as prescribed by the Moresby Range Management Plan, with all agricultural activity contained to the east of the Range.</p>	Dismiss submission
		<p>The document states that the land is fully cleared of all remnant vegetation which is factually incorrect as there are pockets of remnant vegetation in the northern portion of Lot 23.</p>	<p>The pockets of vegetation consist of 2 strands of York gum comprising six trees in total. It should also be noted that all plantings that are on the Range footslopes have been undertaken by the current owner.</p>	Note submission
		<p>The document indicates that ‘due to the soil type most rainfall infiltrates the soil with minimal surface runoff occurring’, which is factually incorrect as runoff and drainage lines from the site feed into Ego Creek to the south west of the site.</p>	<p>The amendment report does not state nor imply that there is no runoff from the site, only that there is minimal runoff due to know geological conditions.</p> <p>The amendment report also states that an urban water management strategy will be required to address the total water cycle and the recommendations of this will inform the detailed structure planning process.</p>	Note submission
		<p>The proposal will lead to development of a lit road network that will have an impact on the visual quality of the area, particularly at night-time where light pollution will be detrimental to the aesthetics of the location.</p>	<p>Rural-residential roads only require flag lighting for safety at intersections and bends. The entire road is not necessarily lit. It is not clear from the submitters comment how this would be detrimental to the “aesthetic”.</p>	Dismiss submission

**City of Greater Geraldton
Local Planning Scheme No. 5 (Greenough) – Amendment No. 20
Schedule of Submissions**

Submission Number & Date	Submitter & Affected Property	Nature of Submission	Comment	Recommendation
4 continued		<p>The proposal has not addressed the following requirements set out in section 5 of the Scheme:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal has not addressed the impact the development will have on any waterway, including rivers, estuaries, creeks, streams, drainage lines lakes, soaks etc. • The proposal has not sought advice from relevant agencies with regard to appropriate setbacks for development adjacent to waterways. • The proposal has not demonstrated adequate flood protection from a 1 in 100 year ARI flood. • The proposal has not addressed the protection of water resources. • The proposal has not identified management techniques to reduce soil erosion. • The proposal does not include a detailed fire protection strategy. 	<p>It must be clearly understood that the rezoning of the land does NOT involve any development or subdivision.</p> <p>All of the requirements as set out in section 5 of the Scheme will be addressed at detailed structure planning and subdivision phases, which is the normal planning process.</p> <p>The Department of Water (Submission No. 6) requires that a Local Water Management Strategy is submitted at the structure planning stage and this will address water management issues.</p>	Dismiss submission
		<p>The proposal has not addressed the following requirements set out in section 6.3 (Moresby Range Special Control Area) of the Scheme:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Doesn't address how landscape values will be conserved and will result in development that would negatively impact on the landscape values and qualities of the area. 	<p>The rezoning document (section 3.8) acknowledges the visual amenity of the Moresby Range and the importance of identifying and managing the impact of development on the Range. It also delineates that a number of strategic documents endorsed by both the local authority and WA Planning Commission provide guidance on how this should be achieved.</p>	Note submission

**City of Greater Geraldton
Local Planning Scheme No. 5 (Greenough) – Amendment No. 20
Schedule of Submissions**

Submission Number & Date	Submitter & Affected Property	Nature of Submission	Comment	Recommendation
4 continued		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposal will result in more intensive development of the land when the Scheme states that <i>“there is a general presumption against rezoning of the land in the Moresby Range Special Control Area”</i>. 	<p>Section 6.3.4 (a) of the Scheme does in fact state that rezoning in the Moresby Range Special Control Area for more intensive development should not be supported by the local authority; however the submitter does not acknowledge the remainder of the sentence</p> <p><u><i>“unless identified in strategic documents endorsed by the Council or Western Australian Planning Commission.”</i></u></p> <p>The Moresby Range Management Strategy and Moresby Range Management Plan endorsed by the local authority and WA Planning Commission provides guidance on rural-residential development on the western lower slopes of the Moresby Range.</p>	Dismiss submission
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposal is contrary to section 6.4.3 which identifies that the Local Government will not support subdivision applications that create the potential for additional development and intensification of land use. 	<p>It must be clearly understood that the rezoning of the land does NOT involve any development or subdivision.</p> <p>The section 6.4.3 of the Scheme does further state that subdivision may be supported subject to appropriate zoning and an approved structure plan. This rezoning seeks to introduce that ‘appropriate’ zoning based on recommendations contained in the Moresby Range Management Plan. Additionally it will require the preparation of a detailed structure plan.</p>	Dismiss submission

**City of Greater Geraldton
Local Planning Scheme No. 5 (Greenough) – Amendment No. 20
Schedule of Submissions**

Submission Number & Date	Submitter & Affected Property	Nature of Submission	Comment	Recommendation
4 continued		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposal will result in subdivision that will result in a reduction in environmental and visual landscape quality. 	<p>It is subjective to state that rural-residential development will result in a reduction in environmental and visual landscape quality. There is no evidence to support this and indeed once could contend that rural-residential development (and the requirement for revegetation on the lots) will in fact enhance the environmental and visual landscape quality.</p>	Dismiss submission
		<p>Many of the bullet points purporting to support the proposal in section 4 (Statutory Planning Considerations) actually do not address it at all. Supporting statements should address the need to amend the scheme specifically for the two areas in the document and not the balance of the Lot.</p>	<p>Any scheme amendment is required to provide a review of the overall planning framework: state, regional and local.</p> <p>Whilst many of the documents referenced, support the rezoning of the subject portions of the landholding, protection of the state's agricultural precincts for primary production is also an extremely important consideration for the local authority and state government departments.</p> <p>The strategic documents identify this, and identify that removal of the subject land from the general farming zone will not compromise the agricultural production of the remainder of the landholding.</p> <p>Further it will not result in a net loss of land from agricultural production as the portions to be rezoned are not actively used for broadacre farming purposes.</p>	Dismiss submission
5 (21/11/2013)	State Heritage Office	There is no objection to the proposal		Note submission
6 (21/11/2013)	Private Landowner	Support the rezoning		Note submission

**City of Greater Geraldton
Local Planning Scheme No. 5 (Greenough) – Amendment No. 20
Schedule of Submissions**

Submission Number & Date	Submitter & Affected Property	Nature of Submission	Comment	Recommendation
6 continued		Interest in how this future development/subdivision occurs, and how the required road access from Mills Road through the property to the rezoned south west/southern portion is negotiated in a voluntary process.	<p>Whilst all the issues are acknowledged it must be noted that the local structure plan provided with the amendment documentation is indicative only.</p> <p>A further approvals process is required for future structure planning of the area and further opportunity will be provided for public comment.</p> <p>It must also be noted that any roads proposed through private property are at the complete discretion of the landowner to provide and there is no onus put on any landowner to subdivide</p>	Note submission
		<p>Specific concerns and interests are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Keeping the area as something different and special compared to the rest of Moresby and other lifestyle living areas like Woorree where small blocks, buildings, fences, and trees have closed in the landscape 	<p>Woorree has minimum lot size of 1 hectare and the intention of this proposal is to provide a variety of lots sizes from 1 to 4 hectares.</p>	Note submission
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maintaining the visual amenity and sense of open space. Part of this involves not permitting the planting of tall trees (non-local natives to this part of the landscape) and certainly not palm trees/exotic trees. The Amendment 20 report and the various plans refer to this requirement of only permitting local native species to fit into the landscape and support the development of the Moresby Ranges as a natural area. Typically these conditions on developments are not well enforced by Local Government. 	<p>The City has the ability to enforce development conditions under the relevant legislation.</p>	Note submission

City of Greater Geraldton
Local Planning Scheme No. 5 (Greenough) – Amendment No. 20
Schedule of Submissions

Submission Number & Date	Submitter & Affected Property	Nature of Submission	Comment	Recommendation
6 continued		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Keeping to the concept of building envelopes to ensure buildings are separated, and do not impact on rural and ocean views by guiding their placement 	<p>The Amendment proposes to insert RR7 'Additional Requirements and Modification' into Schedule 11 of LPS5 to help guide placement.</p> <p><i>A Detailed Area Plan shall be prepared for each proposed lot ...identification of building envelopes and/or building exclusion area.</i></p>	Note submission
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Keeping access for kangaroos by restricting dogs to building envelope areas (fenced house yards), and managing fencing types so boundary fenced are stock (wire/mesh) fences not solid fences such as colorbond, so kangaroos can continue to move across the landscape are not pushed out of the area by restrictive fencing and uncontained dogs. 	<p>Dividing fences are dealt with under the <i>Dividing Fences Act 1961</i> and considered under the City's Dividing Fences Local Planning Policy for the definition of a sufficient fence.</p> <p>The issue of dogs is not relevant to the rezoning and is dealt with under their own legislation.</p>	Dismiss submission
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not allowing cats as pets in the proposed rezoned area. There are no stray cat issues in our area and there are plenty of small birds and lizards that frequent our property. The area needs more small shrubs for small bird habitat to connect to the Moresby Ranges, and the Moresby Ranges does not need new development area to be a source of wandering cats that will then require control effort and cost. 	<p>This matter is not relevant to the rezoning and the issues of cats are dealt with under their own legislation.</p>	Dismiss submission

City of Greater Geraldton
Local Planning Scheme No. 5 (Greenough) – Amendment No. 20
Schedule of Submissions

Submission Number & Date	Submitter & Affected Property	Nature of Submission	Comment	Recommendation
6 continued		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Road access via Mills Road across our property to the 'southern portion' – the report indicated that road connection to Mills Road can be achieved subject to detailed structure planning and landowner agreement. It is not clear to us if this process would be totally voluntary on our behalf ie only subject to our negotiated consent, or if there are planning mechanisms that could impose this road access across our property without our consent. On this point, can the City of Greater Geraldton please reply in writing to us to confirm what mechanism would be used to establish road access across our property to the 'southern portion' as part of the process to support development/subdivision? We are keen to receive some written direction on this to allow us to consider our future options for our property. Existing road network – with the 'Moresby Heights' development about to start increasing traffic along Webber Road, any development at the end of Mills Road will obviously add more traffic pressure onto Webber Road. Webber Road is likely to require increased maintenance (increasing costs) as a result of this proposed development along with the 'Moresby Heights' development. Developers should be contributing to the road network upgrade. 	<p>Whilst all the issues are acknowledged it must be noted that the local structure plan provided with the amendment documentation is indicative only.</p> <p>A further approvals process is required for future structure planning of the area and further opportunity will be provided for public comment.</p> <p>It must also be noted that any roads proposed through private property are at the complete discretion of the landowner to provide and there is no onus put on any landowner to subdivide.</p> <p>The City will ensure the Submitter is provided with the requested information pertaining to the detailed structure planning and subdivision phases.</p>	Note submission
7 (27/11/2013)	Department of Water	Local Water Management Strategy is to be provided at structure planning phase.	Section 3.4 of the rezoning document states that a detailed Local Water Management Strategy will be provided in the structure planning phase.	Note submission
8 (26/11/2013)	Main Roads WA	<p>No objection to the proposal.</p> <p>Encourage the minimisation of direct lot access onto Chapman Valley Road.</p>	The access comment is noted and at the structure planning stage Main Roads will have further opportunity to comment.	Note submission