

City of Greater Geraldton Local Planning Strategy and Local Planning Scheme No. 1 – Schedule of Submissions

Number & Date	Submitter	Nature of Submission	Comment	Recommendation
1 (30-03-15)	Rowe Group (on behalf of) R & H Cocking Lot 302 (No. 2) Surfside Terrace, Glenfield	Request the alteration of the lands zoning from 'Tourist' to 'Residential R15' for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is considered to be in accordance with the existing nature and scale of surrounding development. • The draft Glenfield Beach Local Structure Plan has identified several sites in the vicinity of the land which may be more appropriate for future tourism development. • Given the existing development at the subject site predominantly serves a residential purpose, the use of the subject site generally accords with the objectives of the 'Residential' zone. • The 'loss' of the land as a 'Tourist' zone will have no impact on the ability to accommodate future tourism development within the locality. 	Given that there are a number of other tourism sites that have more recently been identified in the Glenfield locality, there is no material 'loss' of tourism sites in the locality. The existing development on the land also is in accord with the 'Residential' zone. The 'R15' code is not supported as the surrounding 'Residential' zoned land is coded 'R20' and this coding should be applied for consistency.	Uphold (in part) Submission <u>Local Planning Scheme Map</u> Amend the zoning of Lot 302 (No. 2) Surfside Terrace, Glenfield to 'Residential' with an R-Code of 'R20'.
2 (30-01-15)	CR & BM Wyatt Lot 3106 (No. 6) Clarke Street, Geraldton and the adjacent Pt Lot 3112	I would like to rezone a portion of Lot 3112 to 'Light Commercial'.	The Department of Lands has agreed to, and is processing, the purchase and amalgamation of a triangular portion of Lot 3112 with the adjacent Lot 3106 (No. 6) Clarke Street, Geraldton. The adjacent Lot 3106 is proposed to be zoned 'Service Commercial' and therefore the portion of Lot 3112 proposed to be amalgamated should also have the same zoning.	Uphold Submission <u>Local Planning Scheme Map</u> Amend the zoning of Pt Lot 3112 (as shown on Deposited Plan 75107) to 'Service Commercial'.
3 (06-02-15)	Department of Aboriginal Affairs – (DAA)	DAA notes that the proposal covers a very large area of land across the Geraldton region and coincides with 138 known Aboriginal heritage places. Unable to comment on whether the further approval under the <i>Aboriginal Heritage Act 1972</i> would be required for development/land use in specific instances within the area. Developers/land users be made aware of the Cultural Heritage Due Diligence Guidelines.	The comments are applicable to actual development/land use proposals and will be assessed at the development application stage. The onus will be on the developer to ascertain legislative requirements for any particular development.	Note Submission

City of Greater Geraldton Local Planning Strategy and Local Planning Scheme No. 1 – Schedule of Submissions

Number & Date	Submitter	Nature of Submission	Comment	Recommendation
4 (11-02-15)	Department of Transport	No comment.		Note Submission
5 (05-02-15)	Western Power	General comments were provided on Western Power's transmission and distribution planning, property interests, easement and restrictions zones and development control provisions.		Note Submission
		<p>Scheme reflects a Public Purpose designation for the following sites:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lot 2904 North West Coastal Highway, Spalding. • Lot 503 Durlacher Street, Geraldton. • Lot 1 Eighth Street, Woorree. • Lots 101 and 102 Nangetty-Walkaway Road, West Casuarinas. • Lot 3151 North West Coastal Highway, Rangeway. 	Only Lot 503 Durlacher Street and Lots 101 and 102 Nangetty-Walkaway Road are not zoned for 'Community and Public Purpose – Public Utility (PU)' and should be amended accordingly.	<p>Uphold (in part) Submission</p> <p><u>Local Planning Scheme Map</u></p> <p>Amend the zoning of Lot 503 Durlacher Street, Geraldton and Lots 101 and 102 Nangetty-Walkaway Road, West Casuarinas to 'Community and Public Purpose – PU'.</p>
		The use of statutory planning mechanisms is recommended to secure, protect and manage existing strategic transmission line corridors.	<p>Western Power manages its asset corridors through a combination of privately owned land, easements on freehold land, restriction zones, the use of road reservation corridors and other purposely zoned and/or reserved land under local planning schemes.</p> <p>Where Western Power does not have easements on freehold land, it relies on 'Restriction Zones' to ensure appropriate development occurs in the vicinity of its assets.</p> <p>Western Power is able to apply conditions with respect to restriction zones under the <i>Energy Operators (Powers) Act 1979</i>. Previous legal advice has confirmed that conditions that merely state the requirements of other laws are not appropriate.</p>	Dismiss Submission

City of Greater Geraldton Local Planning Strategy and Local Planning Scheme No. 1 – Schedule of Submissions

Number & Date	Submitter	Nature of Submission	Comment	Recommendation
5 continued		It is recommended that, as they arise, the Local Planning Scheme and the Local Planning Strategy identify indicative future corridor and co-located corridor investigation areas.		Note Submission
		It is recommended that as part of any Local Planning Strategy and Scheme review, provision is made within the Scheme for referral to Western Power where new development is proposed adjacent to electricity infrastructure and within restriction zone distance, with additional contingency for these distribution assets.	The Scheme already contains clause 12.1.1 that allows the local government to consult with any authority it considers appropriate.	Note Submission
		It is recommended to consider the inclusion of a power infrastructure buffer special control area. This would include areas identified within 30metres of the boundary of an electricity transmission easement, restriction zone or land interest which warrants particular control of development in order to protect the infrastructure and manage potential conflicting land use. The extent and nature of control required will depend on the particular characteristics of each site and the nature of development proposed.	Western Power is able to apply conditions with respect to restriction zones under the <i>Energy Operators (Powers) Act 1979</i> and therefore a specific special control area for all power infrastructure is not warranted.	Dismiss Submission
6 (26-02-15)	CLE Town Planning + Design	General direction of the Strategy and flexible provision it makes to achieve the City’s population target is supported.		Note Submission
		The identification of the ‘Moresby Heights’ site for ‘Urban / Rural Living’ around a neighbourhood centre is supported and is consistent with the recently approved local structure plan for the site.		Note Submission
		Would like it confirmed that the Urban Area Strategy Plan (Plan 1 of the Strategy) will be used over the Preferred Growth Scenario (Figure 3 of the Strategy) as the basis for future strategic and statutory planning decisions.	Page 12 of the Strategy specifically states: “The Strategy responds to the outcomes of the <i>Designing our City forum</i> , with the Preferred Growth Scenario providing the basis for preparing the new Strategy and Scheme”. Plan 1 – Geraldton Urban Area Strategy Plan is the plan that will be used for future strategic and statutory planning decisions.	Note Submission

City of Greater Geraldton Local Planning Strategy and Local Planning Scheme No. 1 – Schedule of Submissions

Number & Date	Submitter	Nature of Submission	Comment	Recommendation
6 continued		The continuation of the current 'Development' zoning of the Moresby Heights site is supported.		Note Submission
		<p>Recommend clear provision in the Scheme conferring statutory effect on local structure plans prepared and adopted under schemes superseded by the new Scheme to ensure formal transition.</p> <p>Clause 70 of the draft new <i>Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2014</i> provides a more generic example of transitional arrangements.</p> <p>Without such a provision legal challenges could be raised about the validity of local structure plans prepared under previous schemes.</p>		<p>The clauses referred to are 'deemed provisions for local planning schemes' under the <i>Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2014</i> and therefore cannot be altered.</p>
7 (23-02-15)	P Brumpton Lot 6 (No. 17) Ettrick Court, Cape Burney	<p>Strongly contest the decision to rezone Lot 6 from R50 to R40.</p> <p>This will devalue the land as fewer units could be developed on the site.</p>	This is an oversight and the land should retain its R50 coding.	<p>Uphold Submission</p> <p><u>Local Planning Scheme Map</u></p> <p>Amend the R-Code of Lot 6 (No. 17) Ettrick Court, Cape Burney to 'R50'.</p>
8 (25-03-15)	Department of Agriculture and Food – (DAFWA)	The City participated in a DAFWA project which identified areas of High Quality Agricultural Land (HQAL). DAFWA is pleased to see such a strong reference to the HQAL work in the Strategy and Scheme and commends the City for its adoption as part of the City's overall rural strategy.		Note Submission

City of Greater Geraldton Local Planning Strategy and Local Planning Scheme No. 1 – Schedule of Submissions

Number & Date	Submitter	Nature of Submission	Comment	Recommendation
8 continued		<p>Local Planning Strategy Part One – Section 3.8 Rural Land, page 20 states:</p> <p>“Increasing mining activity in the Mid West Region will continue to place significant demands on the freight network requiring protection of the key transport corridors.”</p> <p>The road and rail networks are also very significant for agricultural industry activity and these place large seasonal demands on both road and rail networks.</p>	<p>Noted. Reference should be made regarding the demand seasonal agricultural activity places on road and rail networks.</p>	<p>Uphold Submission</p> <p><u>Local Planning Strategy Part One</u></p> <p>Modify the first sentence of the second last paragraph for section 3.8 (page 20) to read as follows:</p> <p>“Increased mining and seasonal agricultural activity in the Mid West region ...”</p>
		<p>Local Planning Strategy Part One – Section 3.12 Climate Change, page 22.</p> <p>The phrase ‘protection of high value agricultural soils’ is used in the second paragraph. The word ‘value’ in this context may be misleading, implying use of land values in the analysis.</p> <p>Suggest change the phrase ‘high value’ to ‘high quality’.</p>	<p>Noted. The DAFWA project identified areas of High <u>Quality</u> Agricultural Land (not high value agricultural land).</p>	<p>Uphold Submission</p> <p><u>Local Planning Strategy Part One</u></p> <p>Modify the first sentence of the second paragraph for section 3.12 (page 22) to read as follows:</p> <p>“... and protection of high quality agricultural soils.”</p>

City of Greater Geraldton Local Planning Strategy and Local Planning Scheme No. 1 – Schedule of Submissions

Number & Date	Submitter	Nature of Submission	Comment	Recommendation
8 continued		<p>Local Planning Strategy Part One – Section 7 Rural Land Strategies and Actions, page 33.</p> <p>The term ‘priority agricultural land’ is used in strategy 1. This term is specifically defined in State Planning Policy 2.5 and suggests that the high quality agricultural land areas have been subject to further consultation and refinement.</p>	<p>Noted. The DAFWA project identified areas of High <u>Quality</u> Agricultural Land. The areas have not yet been subject to further consultation and refinement and therefore should not be referred to as priority agricultural land.</p>	<p>Uphold Submission</p> <p><u>Local Planning Strategy Part One</u></p> <p>Modify strategy 1, section 7 (page 33) to read as follows:</p> <p>“Protect rural land from incompatible land uses and protect high quality agricultural land.”</p>
		<p>Local Planning Strategy Part Two Local Profile and Context Report – Section 13.4 Key considerations / issues, page 73.</p> <p>The first dot point stating that ‘Soil erosion is widespread ...’ is misleading and implies that vast areas of the City are damaged by wind erosion which is incorrect.</p> <p>It is more correct to state that ‘Soil erosion risk is widespread ...’.</p>	<p>Noted. Reference should be made to the <u>risk</u> of soil erosion.</p>	<p>Uphold Submission</p> <p><u>Local Planning Strategy Part Two Local Profile and Context Report</u></p> <p>Modify first dot point, section 13.4 (page 73) to read as follows:</p> <p>“Soil erosion risk is widespread ...”.</p>

City of Greater Geraldton Local Planning Strategy and Local Planning Scheme No. 1 – Schedule of Submissions

Number & Date	Submitter	Nature of Submission	Comment	Recommendation
8 continued		<p>Local Planning Strategy Part Two Local Profile and Context Report – Section 13.4 Key considerations / issues, page 73.</p> <p>There is no mention of soil acidity which is currently one of the most important land management issues on agricultural land in the City.</p> <p>A dot point should be included stating that soil acidity is a serious issue in the CGG. According to DAFWA's 2013 <i>Report card on sustainable natural resource use in agriculture</i>, the current state of soil acidity is poor in the CGG.</p>	<p>Noted. Reference should be made to soil acidity as a key consideration / issue.</p>	<p>Uphold Submission</p> <p><u>Local Planning Strategy Part Two Local Profile and Context Report</u></p> <p>Add a fourth dot point, section 13.4 (page 73) to read as follows:</p> <p>“Soil acidity is a serious issue within the CGG. According to DAFWA’s 2013 Report card on sustainable natural resource use in agriculture, the current state of soil acidity is poor in the CGG.”</p>
		<p>Local Planning Strategy Part Two Local Profile and Context Report – Section 18.1 Basic raw materials, page 104.</p> <p>Southgates dune area is identified in Figure 20 as a valuable limesand resource; however it is not identified in the Figure 19 map of Priority resource areas.</p> <p>The Southgates limesand reserve should be added to the priority resource areas.</p>	<p>The Southgates area is subject to a separate environmental assessment as part of the proposed rezoning of the area. It is not a reserve and is also subject to a land swap with the State government. Given these other planning factors it is not appropriate to acknowledge the area as a 'priority resource area'.</p> <p>The new Scheme does not cover the Southgates area and Figure 19 is an extract from the Local Rural Strategy (2008) and is provided as background information only.</p>	<p>Dismiss Submission</p>

City of Greater Geraldton Local Planning Strategy and Local Planning Scheme No. 1 – Schedule of Submissions

Number & Date	Submitter	Nature of Submission	Comment	Recommendation
8 continued		<p>Local Planning Strategy Part Two Local Profile and Context Report – Section 23.2 Protecting high value land for agriculture, page 121.</p> <p>The term 'high value' should be change to 'high quality'.</p>	<p>Noted. The DAFWA project identified areas of High <u>Quality</u> Agricultural Land (not high value agricultural land).</p>	<p>Uphold Submission</p> <p><u>Local Planning Strategy Part Two Local Profile and Context Report</u></p> <p>Rename section 23.2 (page 121) to:</p> <p>“23.2 Protecting high quality land for agriculture”</p>
		<p>Local Planning Strategy Part Two Local Profile and Context Report – Section 24.2.1 Network pressures, page 125.</p> <p>DAFWA supports the statement for grain movements to be transferred to rail, thereby reducing growing pressures from grain traffic on the road network.</p>		<p>Note Submission</p>

City of Greater Geraldton Local Planning Strategy and Local Planning Scheme No. 1 – Schedule of Submissions

Number & Date	Submitter	Nature of Submission	Comment	Recommendation
8 continued		<p>Local Planning Strategy Part Two Local Profile and Context Report (Supplementary Information) Environmental Profile – Section 2.4.3 Agricultural and pastoral resources, page 32.</p> <p>The second sentence in the first paragraph is incorrect. Broadacre farming is general found across the entire CGG on all arable rural zoned land and is not confined just to the North Midlands in the east of the City around Mullewa.</p>	<p>Noted. Reference should be made that broadacre farming is general found across the entire CGG on all arable land.</p>	<p>Uphold Submission</p> <p><u>Local Planning Strategy Part Two Local Profile and Context Report (Supplementary Information) Environmental Profile</u></p> <p>Replace the second sentence of the first paragraph for section 2.4.3 (page 32) with the following:</p> <p>“Broadacre farming is generally found across the entire City on all arable land.”</p>
		<p>DAFWA has supplied Base Stocking Rate Guidelines for the City.</p>	<p>It is proposed to replace the current site specific stocking rates in the Local Planning Scheme No. 5 (Greenough) with a generic clause in the new Scheme as follows:</p> <p align="center">“3.11.2.2 Stocking rates shall not exceed Department of Agriculture and Food standards.”</p> <p>The Base Stocking Rate Guidelines provided by DAFWA will be used to determine the appropriate stocking rates.</p>	<p>Note Submission</p>

City of Greater Geraldton Local Planning Strategy and Local Planning Scheme No. 1 – Schedule of Submissions

Number & Date	Submitter	Nature of Submission	Comment	Recommendation
<p align="center">9 (10-04-15)</p>	<p>HTD Surveyors & Planners (on behalf of)</p> <p>Geraldton Property Group Lot 9500 (No. 32) Tamblyn Street, Spalding</p>	<p>Object.</p> <p>R40 code be placed over the site instead of the proposed R20 coding.</p> <p>The current coding is R12.5/40/50 which has been in place since 1998. The R20 coding significantly reduces the development potential of the site and the R40 code will ensure the maximum lot yield for the site isn't reduced.</p> <p>The R40 code provides potential for diversification of lot sizes.</p> <p>As the site is close to public transport routes and is within close proximity to the Bluff Point and Glenfield Commercial centres, redevelopment of the lot will have the following benefits:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More efficient use of the land as it is located near public transport and commercial facilities. • Increasing patronage of public transport, cycling and walking. • Improvement in the patronage of local businesses. • Provide a range of housing sizes and types which meet the current and future needs of a growing and diverse population. 	<p>The residential density coding for the Scheme was prepared having regard to the Council and WAPC endorsed Residential Development Strategy.</p> <p>The subject site is reflected in the Residential Development Strategy for 'single density residential (R10-R25)', which is generally consistent with the R20 coding shown for the site.</p> <p>It is important to note that the proposed 'R20' coding is a substantial increase in development potential of the site for single house development from the 'R12.5' code.</p> <p>It isn't a requirement of the Scheme to maintain development potential for landowners but rather to implement the land use planning recommendations from the Residential Development Strategy, which is a specific action in the Strategy.</p>	<p>Dismiss Submission</p>

City of Greater Geraldton Local Planning Strategy and Local Planning Scheme No. 1 – Schedule of Submissions

Number & Date	Submitter	Nature of Submission	Comment	Recommendation
10 (14-04-15)	Shire of Chapman Valley	<p>Re-consider the merits of the Chapman Valley Road realignment for inclusion in the Strategy and Scheme.</p> <p>The WAPC's 1976 Geraldton Region Plan first identified a Primary Distributor Road alignment running between Waggrakine and Moresby. The WAPC's Geraldton Region Plan (1999) and Greater Geraldton Structure Plan (2011) identified the proposed Chapman Valley Road realignment as a District Distributor Road and Regional Distributor Road respectively.</p> <p>The draft Local Planning Strategy removes the proposed alignment and identifies it as a combination of conservation, residential and rural-residential.</p> <p>The current alignment of Chapman Valley Road was recorded as receiving 7,848 vehicles per day by MRWA in 2012 at its western end and can become congested at certain key times such as school drop-off and pick-up, and has a number of driveways directly accessing the road which results in vehicles having to reverse onto the roadway which has potential for conflict with the road's distributor road function. This section of road also recorded a double pedestrian fatality in 2013.</p> <p>Chapman Valley Road will continue to experience greater traffic numbers as the 1,500 – 2,000 lot Moresby Heights development on the northern side of Chapman Valley Road proceeds. The traffic modelling undertaken for the Moresby Heights Structure Plan indicated an additional 2,610 vehicles per day would be put onto the western end of Chapman Valley Road by this development alone.</p>	<p>The Chapman Valley Road bypass was a product of its time and whilst it had reasonable merit and justification in the past for establishing the higher order corridor, it is no longer considered vital to service the Chapman Valley Road catchment and beyond. The City has recently undertaken detailed modelling of the surrounding residential catchment areas with the Geraldton Strategic Transport and Land Use Model.</p> <p>In addition at the time of creation of the bypass concept Chapman Valley Road was the primary heavy vehicle corridor for Main Roads WA, subsequently the heavy vehicles were redirected to Morrell Road / Narra Tarra Road. Chapman Valley Road then became the responsibility of the local authority.</p> <p>The significant residential catchments of the Geraldton Heights estate and also the adjacent Moresby area to the east have been investigated to determine their impacts on Chapman Valley Road. Whilst volumes obviously increase over time, they do not reach a threshold which is considered to trigger the need for an alternative, higher-order transport corridor. These developments also have maximum lot limits applied to control the impact on Chapman Valley Road and clearly define the extent of development before a bridge crossing onto Place Road to the south is constructed. This alternate route is designed to accommodate the approximate 20,000+ daily traffic volumes from these estates via the dual-carriageway of Place Road.</p>	Dismiss Submission

City of Greater Geraldton Local Planning Strategy and Local Planning Scheme No. 1 – Schedule of Submissions

Number & Date	Submitter	Nature of Submission	Comment	Recommendation
10 continued		<p>The further subdivision of the 3,000 lot Waggrakine Residential Estate north and south of Chapman Valley Road will increase the number of vehicle movements further, and the Chapman Valley Road realignment is identified on the WAPC endorsed structure plan for this area.</p> <p>The 2,500 lot Woorree New Town development will also generate vehicle trips onto Chapman Valley Road, with a Chapman River crossing that will provide an alternative to some of that subdivision's residents being a long term prospect.</p> <p>The projected domestic vehicle numbers from estates not anticipated in the 1970's will provide greater traffic than originally planned for, thereby warranting the retention of the Chapman Valley Road realignment.</p> <p>The portion of the proposed realignment running directly east off the existing North West Coastal Highway roundabout is contained within a road reserve, and its construction would assist in not only improving safety by reducing the traffic numbers past the Waggrakine primary school but also provide a clear, demarcated strategic firebreak between the remnant vegetation in Spalding Park and the Waggrakine residential area to better meet the requirements of State Planning Policy 3.7 – Planning for Bushfire Risk Management.</p> <p>The remainder of the proposed realignment, once it commences heading north-east is located upon privately owned land that has been identified for road purposes on publically available statutory and strategic planning documents for over 3 decades.</p>	<p>Whilst the volumes of Chapman Valley Road may continue to grow, the speed will not. In fact it is planned in the City's draft Integrated Transport Strategy to progressively implement lower speed limits moving east as adjacent development and traffic volumes grow and to implement changes to the road environment to reinforce the lower, local speed area (e.g. lane narrowing).</p> <p>The cost-benefit of establishing this re-alignment section of Chapman Valley Road is also not acceptable when compared to the current alignment. The anticipated residential traffic is manageable and the serviceability of Chapman Valley Road can be sustained into the future, albeit with decreasing levels of service to traffic.</p> <p>This decreasing level of service (not safety) is considered acceptable and retaining Chapman Valley Road would have a far greater cost-benefit to that of establishing the new road. Without the future Place Road bridge, Chapman Valley Road would gradually become unserviceable (and potentially unsafe) due to overwhelming volumes, however the bridge and Place Road will provide that essential serviceability for the new residential areas.</p>	

City of Greater Geraldton Local Planning Strategy and Local Planning Scheme No. 1 – Schedule of Submissions

Number & Date	Submitter	Nature of Submission	Comment	Recommendation
11 (21-04-15)	Landwest (on behalf of) JC Martin Portion of Lot 104 Meadow Lane, Walkaway	<p>The landholding has a dual zoning in the current Local Planning Scheme No 5. The northern portion of the landholding is zoned 'Rural Smallholdings' and the southern smaller portion is zoned 'Rural'. The multiple zoning is a result of historical planning for the precinct and a previous development plan for the greater locality.</p> <p>A subdivision application has previously been lodged with the WAPC for the creation of rural living lots in accordance with the zoning of the northern portion of Lot 104, and a balance lot which is zoned Rural. The proposed rural zoned lot will be approximately 3.05ha in area. This portion of the landholding has been developed with infrastructure to be expected on a rural living lifestyle lot. The lot is not used for traditional rural purposes and is no longer a part of a larger farming enterprise.</p> <p>A rationalisation of the existing zoning is requested to amend the zoning of the 'Rural' portion of the lot to 'Rural Living' which will accord with the balance of the landholding. This proposed zoning is commensurate with the expected land use profile for the lot, given its size and proximity to the adjoining development area. Permitted uses in the Rural zone would not be viable or desirable in this location due to proximity to more intensive land uses.</p> <p>The proposal will rectify the dual zoning anomaly which exists at present. The area of the Rural zoned portion is compliant with the provisions for the proposed Rural Living zoning and will essentially formalise the existing and proposed on-ground situation.</p>	<p>The subdivision application lodged with the WAPC will in effect rectify the current zoning anomaly.</p> <p>There is a current structure plan over the area (approved as part of Scheme Amendment No. 39) which does not include the southern portion of Lot 104 zoned 'Rural'.</p> <p>The draft new Scheme has a minimum lot size for 'Rural Living' lots ranging from 1ha or as per any applicable structure plan.</p> <p>In the absence of a structure plan that covers the southern portion of Lot 104 it could potentially be further subdivided into 3 lots.</p> <p>The land also lies within the flood prone special control area and is adjacent to the railway. The impacts of flooding and development adjacent to the railway have not been addressed.</p> <p>The above issues of structure planning, flooding and rail impacts are best resolved via a formal scheme amendment process.</p>	Dismiss Submission

City of Greater Geraldton Local Planning Strategy and Local Planning Scheme No. 1 – Schedule of Submissions

Number & Date	Submitter	Nature of Submission	Comment	Recommendation
12 (22-04-15)	Main Roads WA – (MRWA)	<p>It is noted that the Primary Distributor roads are defined in line with MRWA classification procedure.</p> <p>While we recognise that this is a long term strategy, given the current economic climate (which is expected to continue for some time), there is a chance that some projects identified in the plans may not be constructed by MRWA within the lifetime of the scheme or the strategy, if ever constructed by MRWA. We would therefore recommend the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An additional legend item/zone showing 'future roads' or 'future major roads' should be included. This would not have to restrict future roads to being constructed by MRWA or the CGG. In particular, if CGG wishes to construct the northern section of the North South Highway to its own standards, it would never be constructed by MRWA and therefore the reference to 'downgrading' in the Strategy would not be relevant for this part of road. • An additional legend item should be included showing current alignment of planned future roads. Given the lack of certainty over timescales for construction, it does not seem appropriate to have the existing road shown as the future zoning (e.g. residential zoning on the current highway near the Homemaker Centre). This could either be 'existing road (where there is intent to alter in the future)' or 'no zone'. 	<p>The Strategy plan aims to depict an 'ultimate' vision for the City, not just a snapshot of the status of roads as at 2015 and therefore notating existing and future main roads is not considered appropriate.</p> <p>A 'no zone' is not a preferred option. Instead the Scheme proposes to zone roads to correspond with their existing or future adjacent land use thereby reducing the need for amendments to the Scheme when roads are closed or new roads created.</p>	Dismiss Submission

City of Greater Geraldton Local Planning Strategy and Local Planning Scheme No. 1 – Schedule of Submissions

Number & Date	Submitter	Nature of Submission	Comment	Recommendation
12 continued		<p>The strategy refers to implementing the land use recommendations from the Airport Master Plan and the zoning on the scheme maps reflects the land required for the full extension of the runway, which would extend over the current Geraldton – Mt. Magnet Road. This extension to the runway could have a number of impacts on the MRWA network, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requirement for realignment of Geraldton – Mt. Magnet Road; • Impacts on long term outer bypass plans; and • Limitations for use of grade separated interchanges in the area surrounding the runway due to the obstacle height restrictions. <p>Accordingly, we cannot support the proposed zoning in this area. This will be the case until further discussions have taken place and MRWA is satisfied that any works or realignments required as a result of the runway extension have been considered and a future approach has been agreed between CGG, MRWA and any other relevant parties. This would include matters regarding funding of any works.</p>	<p>The inclusion of the land north of the Geraldton – Mt. Magnet Road as ‘Community and Public Purpose – Airport’ is required regardless of whether the ultimate development of a 3,500m runway proceeds or not.</p> <p>There is a need ensure that adequate Runway End Safety Areas are protected via appropriate planning controls.</p> <p>Further discussions will take place should the City progress with any plans for the 3,500m ultimate runway.</p>	Dismiss Submission

City of Greater Geraldton Local Planning Strategy and Local Planning Scheme No. 1 – Schedule of Submissions

Number & Date	Submitter	Nature of Submission	Comment	Recommendation
12 continued		<p>It is considered that a clause should be included under the 'Site and Development Requirements' for Service Commercial, Industrial and Commercial zones requiring any development application incorporating a new or amended access to any road classified as a Local Distributor or above to be supported by, at the very least, an access plan and a transport statement.</p> <p>This recommendation is supported by CGG's Integrated Transport Strategy, which states that Local Distributors and above should not permit direct access to properties for safety reasons. While MRWA recognises that this approach is desirable but not always achievable given lack of availability of alternative accesses for some sites, it is considered that inclusion of this clause would allow for detailed assessment of impacts over an area and the opportunity to control and consolidate access/egress points to the busier roads where possible.</p>	<p>Noted. Provisions should be included in the Scheme to address any potential access issues onto higher order roads.</p> <p>It is appropriate that a clause be included in Part 4 – General Development Requirements of the Scheme rather than specific zones. That way the matter can be applied across all zones (if needed).</p>	<p>Uphold Submission</p> <p><u>Local Planning Scheme Text</u></p> <p>Add a new clause in Part 4 to read as follows:</p> <p>“4.19 Access onto local, district and primary distributor roads</p> <p>Where developments, the subject of an application for development approval under this Scheme, propose a new or modified vehicular access to a Local, District or Primary Distributor Road, a transport assessment may be required.</p>

City of Greater Geraldton Local Planning Strategy and Local Planning Scheme No. 1 – Schedule of Submissions

Number & Date	Submitter	Nature of Submission	Comment	Recommendation
12 continued		<p>Geraldton Southern Transport Corridor – part of the transport corridor will be dedicated as rail, so it will not all be road.</p>	<p>Given the multiple use of the former ‘Geraldton Southern Transport Corridor’ and its purpose to cater for multiple types of infrastructure (not just roads), it is proposed that a new Local Scheme Reserve be introduced.</p> <p>The purpose of the reserve would be ‘Special Purpose – Infrastructure’ and would follow the Geraldton – Mt. Magnet Road alignment generally from Edward Road to the Geraldton Port.</p>	<p>Uphold Submission</p> <p><u>Local Planning Scheme Text</u></p> <p>Add the following to clause 2.2.2:</p> <p>“(h) Special Purpose – Infrastructure.”</p> <p><u>Local Planning Scheme Map</u></p> <p>Amend the zoning of the former Southern Transport Corridor alignment (generally from Edward Road to the Geraldton Port), to ‘Special Purpose – Infrastructure’.</p>
		<p>Geraldton Southern Transport Corridor – there is an intention for an area north of Waverly Street / Keane Drive to be returned to the CGG rather than kept as Primary Distributor. MRWA would be happy to discuss details of boundaries.</p>	<p>When details on actual boundaries is finalised, and a commitment to transfer the land made and accepted by the City, an amendment can be made to the Scheme at that time (if required).</p>	<p>Note Submission</p>
		<p>Lot 201 Goulds Road at the roundabout with Edward Road – this is actually under the ownership of MRWA, although a lease is being negotiated with Brookfield Rail.</p>	<p>The land is shown as a reserve for the purpose of ‘Railways’.</p>	<p>Note Submission.</p>
		<p>The 440 Roadhouse is shown as Commercial whereas all other fuel/service stations shown as Service Commercial. Is there a particular reason for this?</p>	<p>Yes. The 440 Roadhouse is identified as a ‘Local Centre’ in the City’s <i>Commercial Activity Centres Strategy</i> and the proposed ‘Commercial’ zoning reflects the intention of the site to be developed further for commercial purposes.</p>	<p>Note Submission</p>

City of Greater Geraldton Local Planning Strategy and Local Planning Scheme No. 1 – Schedule of Submissions

Number & Date	Submitter	Nature of Submission	Comment	Recommendation
12 continued		Allanooka Springs Road is often seen as a more direct route to Mingenew than either Walkaway-Nangetty or Midlands Road. Has an upgrade to 'District Distributor' been considered?	The City is satisfied with the 'Local Distributor' classification. Agreed, Allanooka Springs Road is often used as a more direct route between Geraldton and Mingenew, however its main and intended function is to facilitate local traffic movements between these centres. The City does not intend for the road to transition over time into a higher order thoroughfare, therefore the higher classification is not considered appropriate.	Dismiss Submission
		On sheet 20, a small area of land is shown north of Walkaway as 'Rural' however the land is owned by the Department of Transport and should be included as road or rail.	Noted. Given the alignment of Edward Road, and the abutting zoning the land should be included as a Primary Distributor road.	Uphold Submission <u>Local Planning Scheme Map</u> Amend the zoning of Lot 123 Edward Road, Walkaway to 'Primary Distributor Road'.
13 (23-04-15)	Public Transport Authority – (PTA)	<u>Rail Planning</u> The report does not appear to address any requirements in regard to the freight corridor within the Scheme. There is also faint reference to the rail alignment in the plans attached to the Scheme.	The Strategy contains specific text regarding freight transport (section 3.4.11) and also a specific action (section 5.5, action 6) to maintain freight accessibility to Narngulu and the Port, with suitable road and railway reservations in the Scheme. The rail alignments are clearly notated on the Strategy maps. The intent to include a reserve for 'Special Purpose – Infrastructure' (refer to submission 12) would further address the freight corridor requirements.	Dismiss Submission

City of Greater Geraldton Local Planning Strategy and Local Planning Scheme No. 1 – Schedule of Submissions

Number & Date	Submitter	Nature of Submission	Comment	Recommendation
13 continued		<p>Brookfield Rail could only consider supporting industrial development in and around the freight corridor and incompatible uses, such as residential housing, are not permitted within proximity of the freight rail corridor. A suitable industry buffer should be included in the Scheme to ensure that no residential development is allowed within a 400m – 500m proximity of operating freight rail.</p>	<p>The <i>State Planning Policy 5.4 – Road and Rail Transport Noise and Freight Considerations in Land Use Planning</i> provides guidance and requirements for dealing with noise sensitive development abutting transport corridors.</p> <p>Recent structure planning has been approved by Council adjacent to the freight rail which adequately addressed the State Policy.</p>	Dismiss Submission
		<p><u>Bus Planning</u></p> <p>PTA notes the indicative plan for future urban expansion and will continue to review its service coverage as the city expands in the future. PTA requests that any structure or subdivision plans are continued to be forwarded to the PTA so that any potential impacts on possible future public transport provision are identified.</p>		Note Submission
		<p>PTA supports the Strategy’s proposal for more intensive development around activity centres and the aim to maintain the Geraldton City Centre as the focal point for all transport nodes.</p>		Note Submission
		<p>References are made in the Strategy to bus priority infrastructure which is supported. However the actual implementation of bus priority infrastructure is only considered important when there are a high number of buses significantly impacted by traffic congestion. Services in Geraldton are currently of a relatively low frequency and are not being greatly impacted by traffic congestion.</p>		Note Submission
		<p><u>General</u></p> <p>References made to delivering a rapid transport system in the long-term are noted. Any future proposals regarding changes to freight rail lines, changes to bus services or future potential rapid transit systems would need to be undertaken in consultation with and agreed to by the PTA.</p>		Note Submission

City of Greater Geraldton Local Planning Strategy and Local Planning Scheme No. 1 – Schedule of Submissions

Number & Date	Submitter	Nature of Submission	Comment	Recommendation
<p align="center">14 (30-04-15)</p>	Brookfield Rail – BR	<p>Concern about how the freight corridor is portrayed within the Strategy. Presently shown in 'Red' as a 'Primary Distributor Road'. The rail corridor needs to be depicted as a rail freight corridor.</p>	<p>The Strategy contains specific text regarding freight transport (section 3.4.11) and also a specific action (section 5.5, action 6) to maintain freight accessibility to Narngulu and the Port, with suitable road and railway reservations in the Scheme.</p> <p>The rail alignments are clearly notated on the Strategy maps.</p> <p>The intent to include a reserve for 'Special Purpose – Infrastructure' (refer to submission 12) would further address the freight corridor requirements.</p>	Dismiss Submission
		<p>Brookfield Rail could only consider supporting industrial development in and around the freight corridor and incompatible uses, such as residential housing, are not permitted within proximity of the freight rail corridor. A suitable industry buffer should be included in the Scheme to ensure that no residential development is allowed within proximity of operating freight rail.</p>	<p>The <i>State Planning Policy 5.4 – Road and Rail Transport Noise and Freight Considerations in Land Use Planning</i> provides guidance and requirements for dealing with noise sensitive development abutting transport corridors.</p> <p>Recent structure planning has been approved by Council adjacent to the freight rail which adequately addressed the State Policy.</p>	Dismiss Submission
<p align="center">15 (29-04-15)</p>	Rowe Group (on behalf of) Jenari Holdings Pty Ltd Lot 2634 (No. 1) Fortyn Court, Mahomets Flats.	<p>Object.</p> <p>Support the consolidation of the City's Town Planning Schemes into a single document however object to the site being zoned 'Mixed Use' for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The City's Commercial Activity Centres Strategy identifies the site as a 'Local Centre'. • The objectives of the 'Commercial' zone are more appropriate and consistent with the intended function of the site as a 'Local Centre'. • Scheme Amendment No. 71 recently rezoned the site to 'Local Centre'. 	<p>Noted. The original intent behind zoning the site 'Mixed Use' was to allow for the possibility of some residential uses on the site.</p> <p>As Scheme Amendment No. 71 has recently been gazetted, there is no objection to zoning the site as 'Commercial' which is consistent with the Strategy and the <i>Commercial Activity Centres Strategy</i>.</p>	Uphold Submission <u>Local Planning Scheme Map</u> Amend the zoning of Lot 2634 (No. 1) Fortyn Court, Mahomets Flats to 'Commercial'.

City of Greater Geraldton Local Planning Strategy and Local Planning Scheme No. 1 – Schedule of Submissions

Number & Date	Submitter	Nature of Submission	Comment	Recommendation
<p>16 (30-04-15) & (01-05-15)</p>	<p>Mid West Ports – (MWPA)</p>	<p>Rail corridor should not be identified as a ‘Primary Distributor Road’. Suggestion to create a new zone ‘Infrastructure Corridor’ seems like a good idea.</p>	<p>Given the multiple use of the former ‘Geraldton Southern Transport Corridor’ and its purpose to cater for multiple types of infrastructure (not just roads), it is proposed that a new Local Scheme Reserve be introduced.</p> <p>The purpose of the reserve would be ‘Special Purpose – Infrastructure’ and would follow the Geraldton – Mt. Magnet Road alignment generally from Edward Road to the Geraldton Port.</p>	<p>Uphold Submission</p> <p><u>Local Planning Scheme Text</u></p> <p>Add the following to clause 2.2.2:</p> <p>“(h) Special Purpose – Infrastructure.”</p> <p>Local Planning Scheme Map</p> <p>Amend the zoning of the former Southern Transport Corridor alignment (generally from Edward Road to the Geraldton Port), to ‘Special Purpose – Infrastructure’.</p>
		<p>In order to reflect land tenure and present uses, Cream Street and some land to the east should be zoned ‘Port’.</p>	<p>The ‘Industry – Light and Service’ zone acts as a transition zone between the residential areas of Beachlands and the Port operations. Regardless of tenure and use, it is not considered appropriate for the ‘Port’ zone to further encroach towards the residential areas. This would also be inconsistent with the EPA’s recommended buffer requirements.</p> <p>The proposed zoning is also reflective of the current ‘Industry – Light’ zoning in Town Planning Scheme No. 3 (Geraldton).</p>	<p>Dismiss Submission</p>

City of Greater Geraldton Local Planning Strategy and Local Planning Scheme No. 1 – Schedule of Submissions

Number & Date	Submitter	Nature of Submission	Comment	Recommendation
16 continued		<p>The entire eastern end of the area closest to the 'Infrastructure Corridor' (abutting the caravan park) should be classed as 'Conservation'.</p>	<p>Noted. Reserve 31658 is vested with the City for the purpose of 'Parklands'. The southern portion is shown as 'Conservation' and the northern portion abutting the caravan park should also be zoned as such.</p>	<p>Uphold Submission</p> <p><u>Local Planning Scheme Map</u></p> <p>Amend the zoning of the northern 'leg' portion of Reserve 31658 to 'Conservation'.</p>
		<p>The site and development requirements in the 'Port' zone (Table 8) are unacceptable to MWPA. There is the potential for this requirement to impact on developments on land either that is controlled by MWPA or on land that is controlled by others.</p> <p>MWPA would prefer to see these items as guidance for consideration and incorporation where appropriate.</p> <p>MWPA is not bound by Planning Schemes, and it would seem problematic to develop unreal expectations in the scheme documents.</p>	<p>As stated the MWPA is not bound by planning schemes and therefore the site and development requirements would not apply to land that is owned by MWPA.</p> <p>There is however a need to provide some guidance for land that is not MWPA owned and therefore the subject of planning scheme controls.</p> <p>Clause 4.4 of the Scheme specifically sets out circumstances whereby variations to the site and development requirements can be considered.</p>	<p>Dismiss Submission</p>

City of Greater Geraldton Local Planning Strategy and Local Planning Scheme No. 1 – Schedule of Submissions

Number & Date	Submitter	Nature of Submission	Comment	Recommendation
16 continued		<p>Another objective could be added into the 'Port' zone.</p> <p><i>(c) ensure development is consistent with any MWPA Land Use Master Plan (or the like) and has due regard for the site and the non-mandatory development requirements in Table 8.</i></p> <p>This will provide a partial resolution of the issue, at least in respect of land that is under MWPA control.</p>	<p>It does not seem appropriate that development that is not under the control of the MWPA should have to be consistent with a MWPA Land Use Master Plan. The use of the term 'non-mandatory' is not supported as clause 4.4 of the Scheme allows for variations to the site and development requirements.</p> <p>An objective may be added as follows:</p> <p><i>(c) ensure development under the control of the Mid West Ports Authority is consistent with any MWPA Land Use Master Plan (or the like) and has due regard for the site and development requirements in Table 8.</i></p>	<p>Uphold (in part) Submission</p> <p><u>Local Planning Scheme Text</u></p> <p>Add a third objective to clause 3.10.1 to read as follows:</p> <p>“(c) ensure development under the control of the Mid West Ports Authority is consistent with any MWPA Land Use Master Plan (or the like) and has due regard for the site and development requirements in Table 8.”</p>
17 (01-05-15)	Department of Education – (DoE)	<p>Local Planning Strategy Part One – Section 4.4 Community Facilities action 3, page 25.</p> <p>DoE advises that school sites are identified and set aside in accordance with statutory planning documents. 'Theoretical' catchment areas are determined by the lot yields in a locality. A primary school is located central to its local intake area. It is not essential that a high school is central to its catchment but should be located near major transport links.</p> <p>Final catchment areas and local area intake boundaries are determined once each new school is opened in response to the reality of actual development which has occurred.</p>		Note Submission

City of Greater Geraldton Local Planning Strategy and Local Planning Scheme No. 1 – Schedule of Submissions

Number & Date	Submitter	Nature of Submission	Comment	Recommendation
17 continued		<p>Local Planning Strategy Part One – Section 4.5 Public Open Space, page 25.</p> <p>DoE recommends inclusion of a reference to the planning, development and management of shared open space and facilities that are collocated with school sites.</p>	<p>Action 1 states:</p> <p>“Implement the land use recommendations of the Public Open Space Strategy.”</p> <p>A separate action is not required as the Public Open Space Strategy makes specific reference to neighbourhood and district open space areas being collocated with school or other community facilities to create a community hub.</p>	Note Submission
		<p>Local Planning Strategy Part One – Section 5.2 Community Facilities strategy 3, page 28.</p> <p>DoE develops schools in localities where critical mass of occupied residential development has occurred and where neighbouring schools require relief due to accommodation pressures caused by increased enrolments in alignment with the rate and quantum of that development.</p>		Note Submission
		<p>Local Planning Strategy Part One – Section 5.2 Community Facilities action 3, page 28.</p> <p>DoE does not accept that it is appropriate to ‘discourage school sites in prime coastal urban land’ where the residential development proposed in these locations represents both the need and the nexus for the requirement to develop schools central to their catchment.</p> <p>Self-contained catchment areas in coastal land will be clearly defined by the coastal corridor and major roads and if schools are, as suggested, to be located further inland they will be remote from the very communities they need to serve.</p>	<p>The entire wording of the action is:</p> <p>“Discourage school sites in areas of prime coastal urban land <u>where alternative sites exist that are more centrally located for the anticipated catchment.</u>”</p> <p>The intent is clear (when the action is read in its entirety) that where other sites exist that serve the defined catchment, they are preferred over prime coastal urban land.</p>	Dismiss Submission

City of Greater Geraldton Local Planning Strategy and Local Planning Scheme No. 1 – Schedule of Submissions

Number & Date	Submitter	Nature of Submission	Comment	Recommendation
17 continued		<p>Local Planning Strategy Part Two Local Profile and Context Report – Section 7 Recreation and open space, page 49.</p> <p>DoE recommends some reference should be made about shared open space that is collocated with schools.</p> <p>In addition recreation facilities at existing schools could be considered for inclusion in the overall recreation and open space strategy for maximising useable, good quality active and passive recreation spaces.</p>	<p>The Public Open Space Strategy makes specific reference to neighbourhood and district open space areas being collocated with school or other community facilities to create a community hub.</p> <p>Additionally the Public Open Space Strategy, for each applicable locality, specifically references school sites and acknowledges their role in expanding the open space network.</p>	Note Submission
		<p>Local Planning Scheme – Zoning Table, page 13.</p> <p>Schools located in residential areas are zoned ‘A’. DoE is concerned that this may give the City the power to determine the location of school sites to satisfy the intent of action 3 on page 28 of Part 1 of the Local Planning Strategy.</p>	<p>It is important to note that the definition of ‘Educational Establishment’ does not just refer to DoE provided school sites. It is defined as:</p> <p>“premises used for the purpose of education including premises used for a school, higher education institution, business college, academy or other educational institution.”</p> <p>DoE schools are not bound by planning schemes as they are ‘Public Works’ and therefore the City must have appropriate planning controls to ensure other educational establishments not provided by the DoE can be assessed.</p>	Dismiss Submission
		<p>Local Planning Scheme – Section 4.8 Parking Requirements, page 21.</p> <p>DoE recommends that reference is made to parking and traffic management around school sites, given drop-off and pick-up zones are generally problematic.</p> <p>Requirements could include minimum road reserve widths, maximisation of on-road embayment car parking and dual use pathways to encourage alternative access.</p>	<p>It is considered that the issues raised are adequately covered by ‘Liveable Neighbourhoods (Element 8 – Schools)’ and therefore the Scheme does not need to include these matters.</p>	Dismiss Submission

City of Greater Geraldton Local Planning Strategy and Local Planning Scheme No. 1 – Schedule of Submissions

Number & Date	Submitter	Nature of Submission	Comment	Recommendation
17 continued		<p>Local Planning Scheme – Schedule 5 Parking Requirements, page 79.</p> <p>DoE recommends provisions be included in this schedule for schools given the contentious nature of parking and traffic management around school sites.</p>	<p>It is important to note that the definition of ‘Educational Establishment’ does not just refer to DoE provided school sites. It is defined as:</p> <p>“premises used for the purpose of education including premises used for a school, higher education institution, business college, academy or other educational institution.”</p> <p>Given the variety of ‘Educational Establishments’ that can be developed it is not considered appropriate that a parking rate be specifically defined just for schools. Rather that each application is assessed on its merits.</p> <p>In any event DoE schools are not bound by planning schemes as they are ‘Public Works’</p> <p>It is worth noting that the City did recommend additional parking be provided at a recently constructed DoE school, and the DoE chose not to provide that parking.</p>	Dismiss Submission
18 (04-05-15)	Department of Mines and Petroleum – (DMP)	<p>The Geological Survey of WA (GSWA) provided relevant background information and comments on the mineral, petroleum and basic raw materials resources of the district. In addition, information was provided on four sites within the region that are on the WA Register of Geoheritage Sites.</p> <p>These sites are considered to be unique and of outstanding value within WA. Unfortunately the Strategy does not include this information or the accompanying maps that were provided.</p> <p>We request that the City considers the inclusion of the Geoheritage Site information.</p>	<p>The four Geoheritage Sites are located within land zoned ‘Rural’ within the Scheme. These sites are too small to be identified on strategic plans and as such have not been reflected.</p> <p>The DMP recommended mapping of the mineral deposits, tenements, basic raw materials and reserves and extractive industry licences to be added. The mineral resources and other matters are generally captured in the Part Two of the Strategy – Local Profile and Context Report, namely Map 9, and Figures 19 and 20. Mining tenements, geothermal titles and petroleum titles are expressed in Figure 13 of the Environmental Profile of the Strategy.</p>	Dismiss Submission

City of Greater Geraldton Local Planning Strategy and Local Planning Scheme No. 1 – Schedule of Submissions

Number & Date	Submitter	Nature of Submission	Comment	Recommendation
18 continued		<p>Local Planning Scheme – Section 3.12 Rural zone, page 11.</p> <p>GSWA notes the objective for the rural zone includes:</p> <p>“the need to consider the existence of basic raw materials and the impact of the proposal on existing and potential extractive industry operations in the area”.</p> <p>Recommended that clause 3.12.2.3 (e) be modified to include reference to "basic raw materials <u>and mineral resources</u>".</p>	<p>Noted. Reference should be made to <u>mineral resources</u> in addition to basic raw materials.</p>	<p>Uphold Submission</p> <p><u>Local Planning Scheme Text</u></p> <p>Modify clause 3.12.2.3 (e) to read as follows:</p> <p>“the need to consider the existence of basic raw materials, mineral resources and the impact of the proposal on existing and potential extractive industry operations in the area.”</p>
		<p>Local Planning Scheme – Zoning Table.</p> <p>GSWA acknowledges 'Industry-Extractive' and 'Industry-Mining' as a 'P' use in the Rural Zone, in recognition of the importance of the extractive and mining industry and its compatibility with rural activities.</p>		<p>Note Submission</p>

City of Greater Geraldton Local Planning Strategy and Local Planning Scheme No. 1 – Schedule of Submissions

Number & Date	Submitter	Nature of Submission	Comment	Recommendation
18 continued		<p>Local Planning Scheme – Part 5 Special Control Areas.</p> <p>GSWA notes that the City has not introduced Special Control Areas around basic material resource areas where there is potential for future land use conflict and recognises that it may be premature to do so.</p> <p>In the absence of Special Control Area protection, it is recommended that the City implement the Environmental Protection Authority 'Separation distances between industrial and sensitive land uses' separation buffers to protect current and future extraction areas from encroaching urban development.</p>	<p>The comments are applicable to actual development/land use proposals and will be assessed at the development application stage.</p>	<p>Note Submission</p>
		<p>Local Planning Strategy Part One – Section 3.8 Rural Land.</p> <p>GSWA notes that the Strategy recognises the importance of protecting basic raw materials (BRM) and other minerals from urban or rural living encroachment to ensure their availability for extraction.</p>		<p>Note Submission</p>
		<p>Local Planning Strategy Part Two Local Profile and Context Report – Section 18 Minerals and Basic Raw Materials</p> <p>GSWA agrees that a ready supply of BRM close to urban areas is important for managing the costs of future land development, and that the identification and protection of the priority resources is a crucial part of the strategic planning.</p> <p>Figure 19 should be updated to reflect the latest information.</p>	<p>Figure 19 is an extract from the Local Rural Strategy (2008) and is provided as background information only.</p>	<p>Note Submission</p>

City of Greater Geraldton Local Planning Strategy and Local Planning Scheme No. 1 – Schedule of Submissions

Number & Date	Submitter	Nature of Submission	Comment	Recommendation
18 continued		<p>Local Planning Strategy Part Two Local Profile and Context Report – Section 19 Mining.</p> <p>GSWA notes that the Strategy recognises the importance of mining revenue and employment within the region and that its key considerations include opportunities to maximise the local benefits of mining, and the need for careful planning of port, rail and road infrastructure to support the mining industry. Some of this section is out-dated. For example, the CME forecasts of workforce projections, and number of projects.</p>	<p>The Local Profile and Context Report was produced in 2013 with the latest available information at that time. When the Strategy and Scheme are due for review the report can be updated at that stage.</p>	Note Submission
19 (04-05-15)	<p>Whelans Town Planning (on behalf of)</p> <p>Developments (Sunset Beach Pty Ltd Sunset Beach Estate</p> <p>North Bay Pty Ltd Glenfield Beach Estate</p>	<p>Conditional support.</p> <p>Welcome the transfer of the Residential R17.5/20/40 zoning to Development zone for the undeveloped balance of Sunset Beach Estate.</p> <p><u>Developer Contribution Plans</u></p> <p>The Scheme has a section for the implementation of Developer Contribution Plans at Part 13. We raise concern at the effect this will have on the additional cost of residential estate development lots and the eventual increase in the retail price of estate lots.</p> <p>In conjunction with this element we understand the City is working on a policy for developer contributions.</p> <p>Request the City continue to consult with developers as this may have the potential to deter investment of capital toward future residential land supply if the current borderline viability is further compromised.</p>	<p>Part 13 – Implementation of Development Contribution Plans is required to be included in every scheme and is simply the mechanism to implement developer contributions should they be applicable.</p> <p>The Strategy has as an integrated transport action (section 5.6 action 2) the following:</p> <p>“Identify the road hierarchy in the Strategy and investigate the development of a simplified road contributions mechanism that is easier to administer.”</p> <p>Staff are currently investigating options for developer contributions for road infrastructure via a policy mechanism. This method will be subject to a rigorous consultation process and further determination by Council.</p>	<p>Note Submission</p> <p>Note Submission</p>

City of Greater Geraldton Local Planning Strategy and Local Planning Scheme No. 1 – Schedule of Submissions

Number & Date	Submitter	Nature of Submission	Comment	Recommendation
20 (04-05-15)	Sunset Beach Community Group	<p>Object.</p> <p>Would like the following documents to be considered and implemented within the Strategy Section 4.1 – Residential Development and Section 4.11 – Coast.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State Planning Policy 2.6 – State Coastal Planning Policy. • Coastal Processes Study – Greys Beach to Sunset Beach. 	<p>The Strategy (section 4.11, action 2) contains the following action:</p> <p>“ensure land use decision making is based on the best available science regarding coastal processes and the need for adequate setbacks.”</p> <p>Given the above action wording, stating specific documents (that may change name or be superseded by other documents over time) is not considered appropriate.</p> <p>In addition the Scheme (clause 12.2) states the following matters that must be considered by local government when dealing with development approval:</p> <p>“(c) any approved State planning policy</p> <p>(m) the amenity of the locality (i) environmental impacts of the development.</p> <p>(n) the likely effect of the development on the natural environment ...</p> <p>(p) the suitability of the land for the development taking into account the possible risk of ... tidal inundation ...”</p>	Note Submission

City of Greater Geraldton Local Planning Strategy and Local Planning Scheme No. 1 – Schedule of Submissions

Number & Date	Submitter	Nature of Submission	Comment	Recommendation
20 continued		<p>Request the City to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implement State Planning Policy 2.6 into the LPS. • Use a planning time frame of 100 years for minimum foreshore setbacks. • Provide additional foreshore setbacks for public access. • Use the 100 year setback recommendations as minimum setbacks from the Coastal Processes Study – Greys Beach to Sunset Beach. 	<p>In accordance with the Scheme and Strategy land use decisions will be made based on the best available science which, at this time, includes the documents quoted as required by the State Planning framework.</p>	<p>Note Submission</p>
		<p>The coastal setback distances for the new development area from Sunset to Glenfield are insufficient for a long term planning horizon.</p>	<p>The area is subject to the Council approved and WAPC endorsed Sunset Beach Structure Plan.</p> <p>The land is proposed to be zoned 'Development' which requires the preparation of a structure plan to facilitate development.</p> <p>Under the Scheme (clause 8.12) structure plans only have effect for 10 years, after which they must be reviewed.</p>	<p>Note Submission</p>

City of Greater Geraldton Local Planning Strategy and Local Planning Scheme No. 1 – Schedule of Submissions

Number & Date	Submitter	Nature of Submission	Comment	Recommendation
<p align="center">21 (04-05-15)</p>	<p>LandWest (on behalf of)</p> <p>Rogue Seas Pty Ltd. Lot 2991 (No. 205 – 7) Shenton Street, Beachlands</p>	<p>Amend the zoning of the eastern portion of the land from 'Industry – Light and Service' to 'Residential R40' for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It would maintain residential use and appearance along both sides of Crowther Street south of Shenton Street, ensuring a full residential precinct in this area. • It would ensure separation of industrial traffic from residential traffic south of Shenton Street. • It would be a logical extension of the existing strip of Residential zoned land along the western side of Crowther Street from Stroud Street north to Shenton Street. • The current planning approval for Lot 2991 Shenton Street sets a clear and logical boundary that can form the delineation between Industry – Light and Service and Residential zoning of the land. 	<p>When you look at the full length of Crowther Street there are only 18 residential lots on the west side, which are a historical legacy.</p> <p>North of these lots is a drainage reserve which marks the start of the 'Industry – Light and Service' zoning for the remaining lots west of Crowther Street heading north to Marine Terrace.</p> <p>The actual Crowther Street road reserve (which is 30m wide) serves as an effective separation distance from the light industrial area to the residential areas to the east.</p> <p>It is not considered appropriate for residential development to encroach further into the western side of Crowther Street which could potentially facilitate warehouse development directly abutting a residence.</p>	<p>Dismiss Submission</p>

City of Greater Geraldton Local Planning Strategy and Local Planning Scheme No. 1 – Schedule of Submissions

Number & Date	Submitter	Nature of Submission	Comment	Recommendation
21 continued		<p>'Caretaker's Dwelling' be changed from not permitted (X) to an incidental, discretionary or permitted use (I, D or P) in the 'Industry – Light and Service' zone and consider a similar change to the 'Industry – General' zone for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The current Town Planning Scheme No. 3 (Geraldton) provides Caretakers Dwelling as a use which can be considered in the current Industrial zoning. • It is commonplace for the use class of Caretaker's Dwelling to be an incidental, discretionary or permitted use in some or all industrial zones in local planning schemes of regional, rural and metropolitan local governments. • Cater for a legitimate need for some businesses to have caretaker's dwellings. 	<p>Whilst it is acknowledged that Town Planning Scheme No. 3 (Geraldton) provides for caretaker's dwellings in industrial areas it is important to note the Local Planning Scheme No. 5 (Greenough) prohibits them in industrial areas.</p> <p>Whilst Geraldton is a regional area, it has a range of residential suburbs, many which are in locations in proximity to industrial areas, which enables employees to be in relative close distances to industrial areas.</p> <p>Allowing caretaker's dwellings in industrial areas raises issues of land use conflict. They can potentially place limits on noise levels generated on an industrial site and would apply not only to industrial activity on the site itself but also to operations on neighbouring properties.</p> <p>The establishment of residential communities in industrial areas is contrary to the principles set out in the State Planning Framework and has the potential to both create an unacceptable environment for residential living and impose constraints on the use of land for industrial purposes.</p>	Dismiss Submission

City of Greater Geraldton Local Planning Strategy and Local Planning Scheme No. 1 – Schedule of Submissions

Number & Date	Submitter	Nature of Submission	Comment	Recommendation
22 (04-05-15)	LandWest (on behalf of) N Dines Pty Ltd Lots 12 & 13 (No. 96 & 98) Chapman Road, Geraldton	<p>Request the City include an Additional Use (Service Station) over the land as a discretionary ('D') use, for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reflect the long-standing historic and recent use of Lot 12, with inclusion of Lot 13 providing sufficient space for a service station meeting contemporary standards and requirements. • Acknowledge the current widespread retailing trend to co-locate service stations adjacent to shopping centres. • Help maintain the viability and competitiveness of the Northgate Shopping Centre. • Help maintain the primacy of the Geraldton City Centre relative to other centres in Geraldton, consistent with Scheme objectives and recommendations of the Commercial Activity Centres Strategy and City Centre Planning Policy. • Be generally consistent with the City Centre Planning Policy, noting that the subject land is located on the periphery of the City Centre, where urban design considerations differ from the core of the City Centre. • Be consistent with or preferable to other uses which could currently be contemplated within the City Centre Zone. • Assist in the longer term integration of the subject and adjacent land on Chapman Road and Bayly Street with the adjacent shopping centre. • Better capitalise on and maximise the benefits of a highly visible and accessible site. 	<p>Larger shopping centres work on a retail model that incorporates a service station component and given the land has previously been used as a service station it would be appropriate for the land to have this use option.</p> <p>The 'Additional Use' proposal would specifically limit the service station use to the land and not compromise the remaining 'City Centre' zoned land.</p>	<p>Uphold Submission</p> <p>Local Planning Scheme Text</p> <p>Add to Schedule 2 – Additional Uses, the following:</p> <p>“No. A17</p> <p>Description of Land Lots 12 and 13 (No. 96 and 98) Chapman Road, Geraldton Scheme Map 3</p> <p>Additional Use Service Station ‘D’ use</p> <p>Conditions As determined by the local government.”</p> <p>Local Planning Scheme Map</p> <p>Add and an “Additional Use, A17” classification to Lots 12 and 13 (No. 96 and 98) Chapman Road, Geraldton.</p>

City of Greater Geraldton Local Planning Strategy and Local Planning Scheme No. 1 – Schedule of Submissions

Number & Date	Submitter	Nature of Submission	Comment	Recommendation
22 continued		<p>Recommend that the definition of Service Station be amended to replace the word “or” between parts (a) and (b) to “and/or”.</p> <p>The current wording means that a Service Station comprises either the sale of petroleum products, vehicle accessories and convenience goods or the carrying out of minor mechanical repairs to motor vehicles, but not both. Presumably this is not the intention of the definition.</p>	<p>Noted. The intent is to allow for both the sale or petroleum products <u>and / or</u> the carrying out of minor mechanical repairs.</p>	<p>Uphold Submission</p> <p><u>Local Planning Scheme Text</u></p> <p>Modify the definition of ‘Service Station’ in Schedule 1 by replacing the word “or” between parts (a) and (b) to “and / or”.</p>

City of Greater Geraldton Local Planning Strategy and Local Planning Scheme No. 1 – Schedule of Submissions

Number & Date	Submitter	Nature of Submission	Comment	Recommendation
23 (29-04-15)	LandWest (on behalf of) Core International Pty Ltd and Sumbola Consultancy Pty Ltd. Lot 838 (No. 18) Green Street, Spalding	<p>Request that the R40 code be placed over the land instead of the proposed R30 coding.</p> <p>The current tri code of R12.5/40/50 translates to a single house considered at the R12.5 code, with the development of grouped dwelling a to R40 density standards. Whilst multiple dwellings could be contemplated by the R50 code, there is no expectation of multiple dwelling in this locality. The proposed R30 coding represents a substantial down coding and removal of development potential from the subject land.</p> <p>This modification should be supported for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It will maintain the existing development potential of the site, not increase it. • It would maintain the existing development potential which was the basis for its purchase by the current owner. • No explanation of, justification for or specific acknowledgement of the proposed substantial downcoding is provided in the strategic planning documents that form the basis for delineation of density in the Local Planning Scheme. • There is no strategic planning benefit to be gained by down coding the site. • The site is very well located for a substantial medium density development, offering excellent accessibility to a range of services and facilities and close proximity to recreational attractions. This has previously been demonstrated by planning approval. 	<p>The residential density coding for the Scheme was prepared having regard to the Council and WAPC endorsed Residential Development Strategy.</p> <p>The subject site is reflected in the Residential Development Strategy for 'medium density residential (R30-R60)'. The clear intent of the Residential Development Strategy is to prioritise increases in residential density near activity centres. The upper end of the medium density coding (R40-R60) should be provided within the immediate catchment of the activity centres.</p> <p>This approach has been applied consistently across other residential suburbs identified as 'medium density residential' (such as Wonthella, Rangeway and Bluff Point), where the R40-R60 density has been applied in close proximity to the commercial activity centres and the R30 coding reflective of the remaining locality area.</p> <p>It is important to note that the proposed 'R30' coding is a substantial increase in development potential of the site for single house development from the 'R12.5' code.</p> <p>It isn't a requirement of the Scheme to maintain development potential for landowners but rather to implement the land use planning recommendations from the Residential Development Strategy, which is a specific action in the Strategy.</p>	Dismiss Submission

City of Greater Geraldton Local Planning Strategy and Local Planning Scheme No. 1 – Schedule of Submissions

Number & Date	Submitter	Nature of Submission	Comment	Recommendation
24 (29-04-15)	LandWest (on behalf of) Geraldton Land Pty Ltd. Lot 1011 (Plan 246803) and Lot 28 (Plan 232394), Moresby	<p>Modify the extent of 'Development Investigation Area No. 3' in the Local Planning Strategy to exclude Lot 28 and show it as 'Urban / Rural Living' for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lot 28 has been identified in various regional and local planning documents as being a future urban area. Consistency between strategic planning documents and local planning documents is necessary. • Lot 28 has less complicated factors affecting its future development than the balance of the development investigation area. • Division of the land into several different planning precincts will require multiple proposals and studies which may not pertain to Lot 28. • The development investigation area is in multiple ownership which makes comprehensive studies and planning difficult. • Lot 28 (together with Lot 1011) is entirely cleared with the exception of riparian vegetation and is generally located in one landform type. 	<p>The adjacent Lots 1 and 52 to the north were rezoned to the 'Development' zone via Scheme Amendment No. 2. This Amendment did not involve Lot 1011 or Lot 28 at the time.</p> <p>A draft structure plan was subsequently submitted which indicated the future subdivision of Lot 1011 (along with Lots 1 and 52) for both residential and rural living lots, hence the Strategy reflects this.</p> <p>There has been no indication as to what type of development is proposed for Lot 28.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that the Greater Geraldton Structure Plan 2011 shows Lots 28 and 1011 as 'future urban' however the document also purports that it will be superseded once the City has prepared a new Strategy. The 'future urban' designation does not reflect the draft structure planning that has occurred over the land and this is why the Strategy designates 'Urban / Rural Living' for the area that has undergone draft structure planning, with the remaining area as a 'development investigation area'.</p> <p>The 'development investigation area' is appropriate at this time and still enables future development. There is no indication or requirement that entire development investigation areas have to be planned at once. The extent of planning will depend on the complexities of the site and type of development proposed.</p>	Dismiss Submission

City of Greater Geraldton Local Planning Strategy and Local Planning Scheme No. 1 – Schedule of Submissions

Number & Date	Submitter	Nature of Submission	Comment	Recommendation
24 continued		<p>Include Lots 28 and 1011 in the 'Development' zone under the Local Planning Scheme for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The landholding size and its consolidated ownership allow comprehensive structure planning and coordinated staging of development. • The absence of environmental constraints means all considerations can be made through the structure planning process. • Objectives of the Moresby Range Management Plan can be progressively implemented through initial structure planning. • The land has been identified in various planning documents as being suitable for inclusion in the 'Development' zone. 	<p>Given the surrounding extent of the 'Development' zone and the fact that the land is identified on the Strategy as 'Urban / Rural Living' and 'Development Investigation area' the 'Development' zone is considered appropriate.</p> <p>There are little environmental issues with the land so a full environmental assessment is highly unlikely (especially given the adjacent 'Development' zoned areas did not warrant assessment).</p> <p>The objectives of the 'Development' zone in the Scheme are to identify areas that require comprehensive planning and development through a structure planning process.</p> <p>The Strategy also states that for development investigation areas structure planning may be required which is the case in this instance.</p>	<p>Uphold Submission</p> <p><u>Local Planning Scheme Map</u></p> <p>Amend the zoning of Lot 1011 (Plan 246803) and Lot 28 (Plan 232394), Moresby to "Development".</p>

City of Greater Geraldton Local Planning Strategy and Local Planning Scheme No. 1 – Schedule of Submissions

Number & Date	Submitter	Nature of Submission	Comment	Recommendation
<p align="center">25 (04-05-15)</p>	<p>Viva Energy Australia Ltd</p> <p>Lots 377 and 378 (No. 102 and 104) Deepdale Road, Meru</p>	<p>Object.</p> <p>The change of the 'Special Use R2' zone to include a restriction on hazardous uses impacts our proposed use of the site as an unmanned truck stop supplying diesel fuel.</p> <p>Diesel fuel is classed as hazardous but is not classified as Dangerous Goods according to the Australian Dangerous Goods Code.</p> <p>The restriction on hazardous use should not apply, or at a minimum be amended to dangerous goods. The development of a truck stop with underground diesel tanks in an industrial area is common place and can be constructed and operated safely.</p>	<p>Whilst the 'hazardous' classification of diesel fuel, is acknowledged the definition of 'Industry – hazardous' is as follows:</p> <p>“means premises used for an industry which by reason of the processes involved or the method or manufacture or the nature of the materials used or produced requires isolation from other buildings ...”</p> <p>As stated, the storage and supply of diesel fuel can (and is) constructed and operated safely and does not require the separation from other buildings.</p> <p>The <i>unmanned truck stop</i> is classified as a 'Fuel Depot' which is defined as:</p> <p>“means premises used for the storage and sale in bulk of solid or liquid or gaseous fuel ...”</p> <p>Clause 3.16.3 of the Scheme further reiterates this interpretation. If a specific use class is defined in the Scheme then that use is excluded from any other use class described in more general terms.</p> <p>As a specific use class of 'Fuel Depot' is defined it precludes defining the operation as an 'Industry – hazardous'.</p>	<p>Dismiss Submission</p>

City of Greater Geraldton Local Planning Strategy and Local Planning Scheme No. 1 – Schedule of Submissions

Number & Date	Submitter	Nature of Submission	Comment	Recommendation
26 (04-05-15)	<p>HTD Surveyors & Planners (on behalf of)</p> <p>Aeges Pty Ltd. Deepdale Estate</p>	<p>Object to the Rural Living zone, clause 3.11.2.5 requiring 3% of the lot area to be revegetated.</p> <p>At present, Deepdale consists of very limited existing and remnant vegetation. The purpose of the Rural Living Zone is to provide residential living in a rural area. Clause 3.11.2.5 contradicts this objective, as rural land should be anticipated to be cleared for rural pursuits such as grazing of livestock and bushfire mitigation. This is supported by the following land uses being classed as ‘A’ in the zoning table that require cleared land:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agriculture Intensive Agroforestry Industry – Rural Rural Pursuit Telecommunications Infrastructure Winery <p>Considering the above, the requirement of 3% re-vegetation does not assist in achieving the purpose of the Rural Living zone as a number of land uses applicable to the zone are land uses that require cleared land.</p>	<p>It is important to note that the current Local Planning Scheme No. 5 (Greenough), clause 5.14.4 requires the planting and maintenance of <u>at least</u> 20 native or locally acceptable trees as a possible requirement for development. Additionally, clause 5.14.13, requires the subdivider to plant trees within specified road reserves.</p> <p>The objectives of the ‘Rural Living’ zone, clause 3.11.1 (when read in their entirety) place considerable emphasis on remnant vegetation, biodiversity, natural environment and landscape values.</p> <p>The Scheme provisions aim to limit clearing of vegetation except for purposes listed in the Scheme. It would be anticipated that clearing of vegetation for required land uses would not impact on the ability to achieve the 3% revegetation requirement.</p> <p>It is important to note that the requirement of 3% of land area for revegetation is at the subdivision stage and does not impact on landowners seeking to develop or use their existing lots.</p>	Dismiss Submission

City of Greater Geraldton Local Planning Strategy and Local Planning Scheme No. 1 – Schedule of Submissions

Number & Date	Submitter	Nature of Submission	Comment	Recommendation
26 continued		<p>In addition, the subject clause does not specify what constitutes 3% of the land or the level/intensification of re-vegetation required. The 3% re-vegetation requirement also places a restriction on developers as purchasers rarely purchase land with re-vegetation controls in place. Rather, purchasers prefer to undertake their own vegetation methods.</p>	<p>Revegetation density rate is site specific according to the condition of the landscape and the vegetation complex.</p> <p>It is important to note that the current Local Planning Scheme No. 5 (Greenough), clause 5.14.4 requires the planting and maintenance of at least 20 native or locally acceptable trees as a possible requirement for development. Additionally, clause 5.14.13, requires the subdivider to plant trees within road reserves.</p> <p>It should be noted that a revegetation requirement has existed for the Waggrakine rural living area since July 2011. Since that time a number of subdivisions have been approved in the locality and revegetation conditions met.</p>	Dismiss Submission
		<p>Further, the subject clause does not outline any bushfire management methods for the zone; given a 20m hazard separation zone from any dwellings would be required. The cash in lieu option does not specify where the money will be used.</p>	<p>Bushfire management is covered by the <i>Planning and Development (Bushfire Risk Management) Regulations 2014</i>.</p> <p>The intent (as with all cash-in-lieu funds) is to spend the money on positive biodiversity outcomes in the general locality.</p>	Note Submission
		<p>The requirements of the subject clause also add a considerable cost to future subdivisions in Deepdale that could result in adverse development opportunities for the locality. The current cash in lieu charge of \$10.50/m² and the large minimum lot size of 1ha could financially strain subdivisions.</p>	<p>It is important to note that the current Local Planning Scheme No. 5 (Greenough), clause 5.14.4 requires the planting and maintenance of at least 20 native or locally acceptable trees as a possible requirement for development. Additionally, clause 5.14.13, requires the subdivider to plant trees within road reserves.</p> <p>It should be noted that a revegetation requirement has existed for the Waggrakine rural living area since July 2011. Since that time a number of subdivisions have been approved in the locality and revegetation conditions met.</p>	Dismiss Submission

City of Greater Geraldton Local Planning Strategy and Local Planning Scheme No. 1 – Schedule of Submissions

Number & Date	Submitter	Nature of Submission	Comment	Recommendation
26 continued		Suggested Amendment – To respond to the issues described above, the subject clause could require the retention of existing natural vegetation outside building envelopes where possible, rather than 3% re-vegetation that may not be native, is difficult to calculate and could be located all together in one corner of a lot. This also avoids the potential for any re-vegetation efforts being cleared for rural pursuits in the future and will not adversely affect any subdivisions in Deepdale financially.	Clause 4.4 of the Scheme specifically sets out circumstances whereby variations to the site and development requirements can be considered. Deepdale could certainly be considered for a variation given the extent of cleared land and the adjacent Chapman River system. Indeed the 3% revegetation requirement could be best directed into further management of the Chapman River foreshore and not form part of the subdivided lots at all.	Note Submission
27 (04-05-15)	Midwest Planning Consulting	Support. Amend the following typos in the Local Planning Scheme: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Table of Contents and Part 1, Section 1.4 (page 1). The title should read “Notes do not <u>form</u> part of the Scheme”. • Schedule 1, Terms Referred to in Scheme, delete the first referenced definition of amenity as it is referred to twice. 		Uphold Submission <u>Local Planning Scheme Text and Strategy</u> Correct all grammatical errors.

City of Greater Geraldton Local Planning Strategy and Local Planning Scheme No. 1 – Schedule of Submissions

Number & Date	Submitter	Nature of Submission	Comment	Recommendation
28 (04-05-15)	P Connolly Lots 132, 1395-1398, 1511 and 1717 (No's. 1 and 29) Whitfield Place, Beachlands	<p>Request that Lots 132, 1395-1398, 1511 and 1717 (No. 1 and 29) Whitfield Place, Beachlands be rezoned to 'Mixed Use' instead of the proposed 'Commercial' zone for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Lots are currently zoned 'Local Centre' under the current Town Planning Scheme No. 3 (Geraldton) which permits residential development. • The lots potential for strictly commercial development is limited due to their size, half of which are under 200m². • Mixed use development would complement the ongoing long term residential development been carried out in the area by the Department of Housing. • It will promote a less intense commercial development type which is more appropriate in this area. 	<p>Noted. The original intent behind zoning the site 'Commercial' was to protect the lots against uses which may undermine its role as an activity centre.</p> <p>However, it is recognised that the 'Mixed Use' zone will assist with providing development which is of an appropriate design and scale and will provide a diversity of use that will complement the existing area.</p>	<p>Uphold Submission</p> <p>Local Planning Scheme Map</p> <p>Amend the zoning of Lots 132, 1395-1398, 1511 and 1717 (No's. 1 and 29) Whitfield Place, Beachlands to 'Mixed Use'.</p>
		<p>The site and development requirements for the 'Mixed Use' zone should be amended to allow a plot ratio of 1.5 to 2.0 instead of the proposed 1.0.</p> <p>This would allow for an office or shop at street level with a residence above, particular given that nil setback are likely given the small lot size.</p>	<p>It is not considered warranted to amend the plot ratio requirements for the entire 'Mixed Use' zone based on specific development requirements of individual lots.</p> <p>Clause 4.4 of the Scheme and Part 6 of the Residential Design Codes allows for the variation of development standards. This allows for variation on a case by case basis which is likely to be more responsive to site constraints.</p> <p>It is important to note that the plot ratio for these lots under the current 'Local Centre' zone of Town Planning Scheme No. 3 (Geraldton) is 0.75, therefore the development potential is already increased.</p>	<p>Dismiss Submission</p>

City of Greater Geraldton Local Planning Strategy and Local Planning Scheme No. 1 – Schedule of Submissions

Number & Date	Submitter	Nature of Submission	Comment	Recommendation
28 continued		Car parking requirements should be modified to allow consideration for areas where verge parking has historically been permitted.	It is not considered appropriate to put a specific clause in the Scheme for existing on road parking given that there are provisions within the Scheme to take into consideration relevant arrangements for vehicle parking (clause. 12.2 q) and variations to the development standards (clause 4.4).	Dismiss Submission
29 (04-05-15)	P Connolly	Should include an additional use of 'liquor store' for the Moonyoonooka Store as it is also an existing use.	The liquor store component of the Moonyoonooka store is considered to be incidental and supplementary to the primary use as a service station. It is not considered appropriate for the site to potentially have a 'stand alone' liquor store but rather liquor sales be supplementary to some form of fuel supply and associated convenience retail.	Dismiss Submission
		The definition of restricted use appears to state what the land in Schedule 3 can be used for, but Schedule 3 itself states what the land can't be used for.	The clauses referred to are 'deemed provisions for local planning schemes' under the <i>Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2014</i> and therefore cannot be altered. Schedule 3 lists the restrictions on the uses (even if the restriction is to not permit certain uses).	Dismiss Submission

City of Greater Geraldton Local Planning Strategy and Local Planning Scheme No. 1 – Schedule of Submissions

Number & Date	Submitter	Nature of Submission	Comment	Recommendation
29 continued		Development approval is not required for a 'home office' however this is not defined within the scheme text.	Noted. A definition should be included for 'Home Office' under Schedule 1 of the Scheme.	<p>Uphold Submission</p> <p><u>Local Planning Scheme Text</u></p> <p>Insert a definition of 'Home Office' in Schedule 1 (Terms used) as follows:</p> <p>“home office means a dwelling used by an occupier of the dwelling to carry out a home occupation if the carrying out of the occupation:</p> <p>(a) is solely within the dwelling; and</p> <p>(b) does not entail clients or customers travelling to and from the dwelling; and</p> <p>(c) does not involve the display of a sign on the premises; and</p> <p>(d) does not require any change to the external appearance of the dwelling.”</p>

City of Greater Geraldton Local Planning Strategy and Local Planning Scheme No. 1 – Schedule of Submissions

Number & Date	Submitter	Nature of Submission	Comment	Recommendation
29 continued		Have heritage precincts been deleted from how they existed in Town Planning Scheme No. 3 (Geraldton)?	<p>Yes. The new <i>Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2014</i> requires areas needing special planning control to be designated as 'heritage areas' which are no longer shown on the scheme map and are instead depicted on the Strategy.</p> <p>A local planning policy is also required for 'heritage areas' which is currently being prepared and will be subject to a further consultation and approval process.</p> <p>The Strategy proposes 1 consolidated heritage area which focuses on the area containing high value heritage significance.</p>	Note Submission
		'Brothel' and 'restricted premises' are not defined uses.	<p>Under the <i>Criminal Code</i> (s.190, s.191), a person who manages a premises for the purpose of prostitution, is guilty of an offence. Given this, the City cannot lawfully consider a use class of 'brothel'.</p> <p>While 'restricted premises' is not defined within the Scheme, clause 3.16.4 allows the City to consider a use not referred to in the zoning table.</p> <p>This method is considered more appropriate as the City can instead determine any application, including its location, entirely in response to the specific detail and merits of the proposal.</p>	Dismiss Submission
		Definition of 'frontage' does not pinpoint a 'lot width'.	<p>The definition is as per the <i>Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2014</i>.</p> <p>'Frontage' does not directly relate to 'lot width' as the width of a lot may vary.</p>	Dismiss Submission

City of Greater Geraldton Local Planning Strategy and Local Planning Scheme No. 1 – Schedule of Submissions

Number & Date	Submitter	Nature of Submission	Comment	Recommendation
29 continued		Does the definition of 'plot ratio' when referring to the R-Codes, also includes the R-Code definition for 'Plot Ratio Area'.	<p>Yes. The definition of 'plot ratio' has the meaning given in the R-Codes. The R-Codes definition then includes the term 'plot ratio area' which is then further defined in the R-Codes.</p> <p>The definition is as per the <i>Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2014</i>.</p>	Note Submission
		Refuse new applications for fast food drive through ('Fast Food Outlet') as they promote laziness and excessive vehicular pollution.	<p>Development applications will be assessed in accordance with the relevant planning framework.</p> <p>Worth noting is that the City has signed the 'International Charter for Walking' and adopted this document as a local planning policy.</p>	Note Submission
		<p>The 'Additional Use' list could be enlarged to accommodate numerous other properties in Geraldton whose land use is not reflective of the zoning.</p> <p>The Geraldton Fruit and Vegetable retail and Warehouse and the café/eatery premises just north.</p> <p>Suggest a 'Mixed Use' zone on the west side of Gregory Street from Lester Square and extending up to near Marine Terrace.</p>	<p>Where other additional uses exist on various sites they are protected under the non-conforming use provisions of the Scheme (clause 3.20).</p> <p>There has been no indication from other land owners affected by the suggested rezoning that they have agreed to a zoning change. An amendment could be considered by the City at a future date should the owners wish to pursue such an option.</p>	Dismiss Submission
		Why is the 'Small Bar' use not a 'P' use but 'Tavern' is in the City Centre and Commercial zone?	Noted. After reviewing these uses, it is considered appropriate that they should both be 'P' uses within the City Centre zone and 'D' uses in the Commercial zone.	<p>Uphold Submission</p> <p><u>Local Planning Scheme Text</u></p> <p>Amend the Zoning Table so that 'Small Bar' is a 'P' use in the 'City Centre' zone, and 'Tavern' is a 'D' use in the 'Commercial' zone.</p>

City of Greater Geraldton Local Planning Strategy and Local Planning Scheme No. 1 – Schedule of Submissions

Number & Date	Submitter	Nature of Submission	Comment	Recommendation
29 continued		<p>'Ancillary Dwelling' is a land use which is not permitted in a number of zones.</p> <p>If a single residence already existed in a particular zone, surely the ancillary dwelling could be approved as an 'I' ('incidental') designation or could it be approved as a non-conforming use?</p> <p>Is the designation of 'X' (not permitted) in the Zoning Table overridden by the Non-Conforming uses (part 3.20) clauses, or vice versa?</p>	<p>Under the Scheme an 'ancillary dwelling' is able to be approved in any zone which permits a 'single house'. Given the definition of 'ancillary dwelling' is a 'self-contained dwelling on the same lot as a single house...' it is not possible to expand the permissibility into other zones where a single house is not permitted.</p> <p>There would be no ability for a new ancillary dwelling to be approved on a lot where the use is 'not permitted' ('X') despite a single house existing on the lot. The non-conforming use rights would only be applicable to the existing single house.</p>	Dismiss Submission
		<p>Leave City Centre parking requirements as per the current Town Planning Scheme No. 3 (Geraldton) as the new Scheme parking requirements are too high.</p> <p>These rates will not encourage development.</p>	<p>The car parking rate for the city centre was established having regard to the Council endorsed City Centre Car Parking Management Plan which advocates 1:20m² GFA for ground floor and mezzanine floor uses; and 1:40m² for all other floors OR 1:35m² for all uses.</p> <p>A single flat parking rate is seen as appropriate for the city centre given the high turnover in land uses. This approach considerably simplifies the administration of land use development applications. It also provides certainty for developers knowing that the rate is set regardless of changes in use of the building.</p> <p>A specific action in the Strategy rather to implement the land use planning recommendations from the City Centre Car Parking Management Plan.</p> <p>The rate is considered acceptable and reflective of contemporary requirements, which is reinforced by the latest retail development in the city centre providing 1:25m² and the latest commercial development 1:45m².</p>	Dismiss Submission

City of Greater Geraldton Local Planning Strategy and Local Planning Scheme No. 1 – Schedule of Submissions

Number & Date	Submitter	Nature of Submission	Comment	Recommendation
29 continued		<p>Need to retain Net Lettable Area (NLA) which is currently used in Town Planning Scheme No. 3 (Geraldton) instead of Gross Floor Area (GFA) which is proposed. GFA calculations are an added impost as parking is potentially being allocated for areas occupied by lifts, stairs, plants rooms, amenity rooms and ablutions – areas which in many cases are shared by tenants.</p> <p>In the case of rounding up for bay numbers, it should be round up for NLA but round down for GFA.</p>	<p>By using NLA (instead of GFA) the issue that would undoubtedly arise is where a building undergoes a change in its use and internal fit out that results in areas that were previously NLA being converted to GFA and vice-versa. The GFA approach considerably simplifies the administration of land use development applications. It also provides certainty for developers knowing that the rate is set regardless of changes in use of the building.</p>	Dismiss Submission
		<p>Does the reference to minimum number of motorcycle/scooter (MCS) parking spaces of 2 for every 15 car bays get rounded up to the nearest higher whole number?</p> <p>For example, would you require 4 MCS for 16 car parking bays? This seems excessive.</p>	<p>Noted. The intention is to have 2 MSC bay for every 15 car parking spaces provided, 4 for 30 bays, 6 for 45 bays etc. and for these NOT to be rounded up.</p>	<p>Uphold Submission</p> <p><u>Local Planning Scheme Text</u></p> <p>Add the following wording at the end of the 'Note' in Schedule 5:</p> <p>“(with the exception of motorcycle / scooter parking spaces).”</p>
		<p>Cash in lieu payments for parking should be relaxed by 25% as per the current Town Planning Scheme No. 3 (Geraldton) in the 'City Centre' zone.</p>	<p>A specific action in the Strategy is to implement the land use planning recommendations from the City Centre Car Parking Management Plan which advocates the deletion of the lesser rate for cash-in-lieu payments. This in effect provides an incentive for a developer not to provide sufficient parking which then ultimately becomes the responsibility of the City to pick up the short fall</p>	Dismiss Submission
		<p>A number of recommendations were made to amend the formatting and set out of the Scheme.</p>	<p>The format and set out of the Scheme is dictated by the <i>Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2014</i> and cannot be amended.</p>	Note Submission

City of Greater Geraldton Local Planning Strategy and Local Planning Scheme No. 1 – Schedule of Submissions

Number & Date	Submitter	Nature of Submission	Comment	Recommendation
30 (04-05-15)	<p>RobertsDay (on behalf of)</p> <p>Wandina Pty Ltd (estates Development Company) Area known as 'Old Acres' – Lots 1, 22 – 24 and 82 – 91 Rudds Gully Road. Lots 21, 132 and 731 Scott Road. Lot 800 Moloney Road and Lot 202</p>	<p><u>Geraldton North-South Transport Corridor</u></p> <p>Appropriate that the road reserve be identified on the zoning map for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The City's Geraldton North-South Transport Corridor Position Statement states that the City's position regarding any north-south transport corridor is: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>The north-South Highway Inner Bypass (in particular the northern section from Horwood Road to North West Coastal Highway) should be prioritised over all other alternatives.</i> • Council resolved at its 21 December 2010 meeting: <p>The City initiate an amendment for reserving the land required for the North-South Highway requiring the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Formal amendment documentation, ○ Suitable wording that provides a compensation mechanism and agreement that all costs of the amendment will be borne by Main Roads WA. • There is a 1.5km stretch of the proposed road reservation wholly within the pending Lots 23 and 800 Karloo structure plan area and as it is not zoned is results in uncertainty for the owner in respect to progressing with future subdivision and development of the land. • The Transport Planning Report appended to the Local Planning Strategy recommends the alignment be included in the Strategy. 	<p>MRWA has not initiated any scheme amendment process for the alignment nor submitted any formal amendment documentation.</p> <p>Should the alignment be reserved in the Scheme this would then open the City up for claims of compensation which MRWA has not committed to.</p>	Dismiss Submission

City of Greater Geraldton Local Planning Strategy and Local Planning Scheme No. 1 – Schedule of Submissions

Number & Date	Submitter	Nature of Submission	Comment	Recommendation
30 continued		<p><u>Retention of Approved Structure Plans</u></p> <p>Requested that clause 8.12.1(b) be amended to allow for structure plans approved under current schemes to have the same status under the new Scheme.</p>	<p>The clause referred to is a 'deemed provisions for local planning schemes' under the <i>Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2014</i> and therefore cannot be altered.</p>	Dismiss Submission
		<p><u>Duration of Local Structure Plan Approval</u></p> <p>Please clarify what the process is for re-adopting structure plans under clause 8.12.</p>	<p>The clause referred to is a 'deemed provisions for local planning schemes' under the <i>Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2014</i> and therefore cannot be altered.</p> <p>The process is clear. The wording states that the process is the same as described in Part 8 and may be altered to not require advertising.</p>	Note Submission
31 (06-05-15)	Department of State Development – (DSD)	<p>The WA Government remains committed to the delivery of the Oakajee Port project and is currently progressing land planning for the Oakajee Narngulu Infrastructure Corridor (ONIC).</p> <p>The City's documents should be updated to reflect that the ONIC project is part of the overall State Government's Oakajee Mid-West Development Project being managed by DSD through the lead agency framework. The ONIC project will be jointly project managed and delivered by Department of Planning and DSD.</p>	<p>The wording within the Strategy reflects that the ONIC is a state government driven project.</p>	Note Submission
		<p>Section 3.4.7 of the Local Planning Strategy should be amended to clarify that container shipping is not currently proposed for the Oakajee Port nor does it underpin the justification for the project.</p>	<p>This statement within the Strategy simply indicates a <u>potential</u> for further development of other commodities such as container shipping.</p>	Dismiss Submission
32 (06-05-15)	Water Corporation	<p>The Corporation has no objections in principle to the proposed strategy and scheme.</p>		Note Submission
		<p>Servicing advice was provided regarding:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Water and Wastewater Planning, • Water Zones and Key Assets; and • Infrastructure and Public Utilities. 	<p>The Water Corporation provided detailed servicing advice with regard to the future development of the Greater Geraldton area.</p>	Note Submission

City of Greater Geraldton Local Planning Strategy and Local Planning Scheme No. 1 – Schedule of Submissions

Number & Date	Submitter	Nature of Submission	Comment	Recommendation
32 continued		<p><u>Buffers</u></p> <p>The Corporation considers that the inclusions of Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP) buffers as Special Control Areas (SCA's) in the Scheme is the most effective tool to clearly recognize and protect WWTP buffers, and identify opportunity for compatible land uses in the surrounding area.</p> <p><i>State Planning Policy 4.1 – State Industrial Buffers</i> specifies the need to protect essential infrastructure such as WWTPs. The SPP states that 'strategic resource precincts area secured around WWTP's to facilitate efficient and beneficial use of land, water and other resources'.</p> <p>A SCA has already been applied to the Narngulu WWTP however the Geraldton No. 2 WWTP, the Glenfield WWTP and the Greenough-on-Sea WWTP are not reflected by SCA's in the draft Scheme.</p>	<p>Whilst it is acknowledged that the best way to protect WWTP buffers is to reflect them in as SCA's in the Scheme, it is not considered appropriate to place restrictions on land based on 'generic' buffer distances.</p> <p>Only the 'Narngulu' and 'Geraldton North' (located in Glenfield) WWTP buffers have been scientifically modelled and the buffer impacts 'proven'.</p> <p>The 'Geraldton No. 2' (Wonthella) and 'Greenough-on-Sea' (Cape Burney) WWTP buffers have not been modelled and are only 'generic'.</p> <p>The Strategy maps do indicated all the WWTP buffers.</p>	<p>Uphold (in part) Submission</p> <p><u>Local Planning Strategy Part One</u></p> <p>Replace action 1a, section 4.9 (page 26) with the following:</p> <p>“Modelled wastewater treatment plant buffers;”</p> <p><u>Local Planning Scheme Text</u></p> <p>Rename clause 5.3 to:</p> <p>“Wastewater treatment plants”</p> <p><u>Local Planning Scheme Map</u></p> <p>Amend the legend to read as follows:</p> <p>“Wastewater Treatment Plants – Special Control Area 2”.</p> <p>Include the modelled buffer for the Geraldton North WWTP as Special Control Area 2.</p>

City of Greater Geraldton Local Planning Strategy and Local Planning Scheme No. 1 – Schedule of Submissions

Number & Date	Submitter	Nature of Submission	Comment	Recommendation
33 (04-05-15)	Australian Square Kilometre Array Office, Department of Industry and Science – ASKAO	The ASKAO is supportive of the Scheme and Strategy and encouraged that the Murchison Radio Astronomy Observatory SKA Coordination Zones have been marked on the Rural Land Strategy Plan. For consistency we suggest renaming the zones to align them with the Australian Communications and Media Authority’s spectrum policy and legislation – Radiocommunications Assignment and Licensing Instructions MS32 Coordination Zones.	Noted. The Strategy should correctly refer to the Australian Radio Quiet Zone Coordination Zones.	Uphold Submission <u>Local Planning Strategy Part One</u> Replace action 2d, section 4.10 (page 27) with the following: “Australian Radio Quiet Zone Coordination Zones;” <u>Local Planning Strategy Rural Land Strategy Plan</u> Amend the legend to “Australian Radio Quiet Zone Coordination Zones” .
34 (01-05-15)	Department of Health	<p>Servicing advice was provided regarding:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Water Supply and Wastewater Disposal; • Non-Scheme Water Supply and On-site Wastewater Disposal; and • Public Health Impacts. <p><u>Land Use Planning for Natural Disasters</u></p> <p>Land use planning can guide the use of land to effectively reduce risk and enhance sustainability for areas prone to hazards such as flooding (including storm surge), fire, landslide, earthquake, strong wind and coastal erosion. The Strategy should take account of these issues.</p>	<p>The Department provided generic comments regarding servicing requirements for developments. These comments are applicable to the actual development of land and are assessed at the development stage.</p> <p>The Strategy includes strategies and actions for flood mapping and coasts.</p>	<p>Note Submission</p> <p>Note Submission</p>

City of Greater Geraldton Local Planning Strategy and Local Planning Scheme No. 1 – Schedule of Submissions

Number & Date	Submitter	Nature of Submission	Comment	Recommendation
34 continued		<p><u>Disaster Preparedness and Emergency Management</u></p> <p>The City should consider incorporating or integrating the City's Disaster Management and Emergency Response Plan (DMERP) with the proposed Scheme to maximise common infrastructure requirements.</p> <p>The DMERP and scheme and strategy should address the potential public health impacts and recovery management strategies of applicable incidents identified in the <i>Critical Infrastructure Emergency Risk Management and Assurance Handbook</i>.</p>	<p>The matters which may be addressed in Schemes are set out in the <i>Planning and Development Act 2005</i>.</p> <p>The Department has not provided any specific clauses or suggestions for inclusion in the Scheme.</p>	Note Submission
35 (11-05-15)	Department of Parks and Wildlife – DPAW	<p><u>Conservation Estate</u></p> <p>Section 11.6 of the Local Planning Strategy – Part 2 (page 65) lists conservation reserves within the City, however there are additional conservation areas managed by DPAW that are not included.</p>	Noted. The Strategy should reflect all conservation areas managed by the DPAW. Details of these have been provided by the Department in their submission.	<p>Uphold Submission</p> <p><u>Local Planning Strategy Part Two Local Profile and Context Report</u></p> <p>Add a new section “11.6.6 Other Reserves” and list the details of all Department of Parks and Wildlife managed conservation areas.</p>

City of Greater Geraldton Local Planning Strategy and Local Planning Scheme No. 1 – Schedule of Submissions

Number & Date	Submitter	Nature of Submission	Comment	Recommendation
35 continued		<p><u>Native Vegetation</u></p> <p>The inclusions of actions within the Strategy to implement the land use planning recommendations of the Local Biodiversity Strategy is supported.</p> <p>Native vegetation is protected throughout the State by the <i>Environmental Protection Act 1986</i> (EP Act) and the Environmental Protection (Clearing of Native Vegetation) Regulations 2004 (regulations).</p> <p>DPAW recommend the Scheme and Strategy identify the requirements for protection of native vegetation under EP Act and regulations.</p>	<p>The Strategy (section 4.7, action 1) contains the following action:</p> <p>“Implement, where possible and appropriate, the land use planning recommendations of the Local Biodiversity Strategy with guidance provided in a local planning policy.”</p> <p>The Local Biodiversity Strategy specifically details the legislative framework which governs conservation significance.</p> <p>The matters which may be addressed in Schemes are set out in the <i>Planning and Development Act 2005</i>.</p> <p>It is not appropriate for the Scheme to repeat other legislative requirements.</p>	Dismiss Submission
		<p><u>Bushfire Protection Requirements</u></p> <p>DPAW supports inclusion within the Scheme for bushfire management requirements to be addressed in local development plans for subdivisions within the Rural Living Zone.</p> <p>In order to allow the City to appropriately assess impacts of developments on native vegetation, it is suggested that local development plans be required to clearly show areas of native vegetation that may need to be cleared or modified in order for developments to comply with bushfire protection requirements. DPAW further recommends that this apply throughout the Scheme area regardless of zoning where developments are proposed adjacent to areas of remnant vegetation.</p> <p>Proponents should ensure all bushfire protection requirements do not place impositions or reliance upon the management of adjoining properties.</p>	<p>Bushfire management is covered by the <i>Planning and Development (Bushfire Risk Management) Regulations 2014</i>.</p>	Note Submission

City of Greater Geraldton Local Planning Strategy and Local Planning Scheme No. 1 – Schedule of Submissions

Number & Date	Submitter	Nature of Submission	Comment	Recommendation
35 continued		<p><u>Threatened Species and Communities</u></p> <p>There are no threaten ecological communities listed as threatened within the City however there are occurrences of three priority listed ecological communities. There are 21 Declared Rare Flora and 138 priority flora species that have been recorded in the City. 51 fauna species specifically protected under the <i>Wildlife Conservation Act 195</i> have been recorded within the City, including 13 threatened species.</p> <p>It is recommended that the Strategy be amended to recognise the presence of threatened flora, fauna and communities within the City. In addition, the need to protect individuals of these species as well as their critical habitat should be identified.</p>	<p>Noted. The Environmental Profile of the Strategy (section 2.2.2) contains information regarding protected flora, fauna and communities which should be updated.</p>	<p>Uphold Submission</p> <p><u>Local Planning Strategy Part Two Local Profile and Context Report (Supplementary Information) Environmental Profile</u></p> <p>Update section 2.2.2 with the information from the Department of Parks and Wildlife.</p>
		<p><u>EPA Advice</u></p> <p>Where proposals are likely to have significant environmental impacts, field surveys should be undertaken to enable relevant authorities to appropriately assess impacts. DPAW recommend that the Strategy and Scheme be amended to include provisions for flora, fauna and vegetation surveys to be undertaken by proponents where significant environmental impacts area likely.</p>	<p>The Scheme (clause 11.3) details the accompanying material that is required for an application for development approval which includes any specialist studies (such as environmental studies) that the local government considers necessary.</p>	<p>Dismiss Submission</p>

City of Greater Geraldton Local Planning Strategy and Local Planning Scheme No. 1 – Schedule of Submissions

Number & Date	Submitter	Nature of Submission	Comment	Recommendation
36 (12-05-15)	Department of Water – DoW	<p>DoW supports the development of a single scheme for the entire local government area. In particular the DoW supports the following components and recommendations regarding water resources management:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strategies and actions of the Strategy section 4.8 Water. • Links to the Better Urban Water Management framework. • Adoption of the Urban Growth Boundary in response to conserving vegetation and water resources. • Ongoing negotiation and investigation to secure river reserves. • Recognition of climate change, its land use planning issues/needs. • Increased in use of stormwater capture and reuse. • Ongoing consultation and coordination between the City, development industry and service agencies. • Structure plans and scheme amendments being supported by a local water management strategy. • Ongoing implementation of the Greater Geraldton Water Planning and Management Strategy. 		Note Submission
		<p><u>Local and District Water and River Management Strategies</u></p> <p>DoW recommends the development of a local planning policy (or equivalent) for total water cycle management and development of a District Water Management Strategy for the City. DoW is very keen to support the City in developing these documents and the implementation of priority recommendations in the Water Planning and Management Strategy.</p>	Noted. A local planning policy to support the City’s adopted Greater Geraldton Water Planning and Management Strategy is currently being considered by staff.	Note Submission

City of Greater Geraldton Local Planning Strategy and Local Planning Scheme No. 1 – Schedule of Submissions

Number & Date	Submitter	Nature of Submission	Comment	Recommendation
36 continued		<p><u>Water Resources Legislation Reference</u></p> <p>It is recommended that provisions be included for all land use zones requiring developers to obtain all relevant permits and approvals (including for commercial use of groundwater) from the appropriate agencies prior to Council approval.</p>	<p>Previous legal advice has confirmed that conditions that merely state the requirements of other laws are not appropriate.</p>	<p>Dismiss Submission</p>
		<p><u>Definitions</u></p> <p>It is noted that the scheme does not specifically provide definitions for key terms such a 'waterway' or 'aquifer'. DoW recommends the inclusion of specific definitions, in accordance with Schedule 1 of <i>State Planning Policy 2.9 Water Resources</i>.</p>	<p>Noted. The definitions are actually sourced from the 'Water and Rivers Commission (1998), Water Facts 1: Water Words, Perth Western Australia' and should be included in the Scheme.</p>	<p>Uphold Submission</p> <p><u>Local Planning Scheme Text</u></p> <p>Insert a definition of 'aquifer and 'waterway' in Schedule 1 (Terms used) as follows:</p> <p>“Aquifer means a geological formation or group of formations capable of receiving, storing and transmitting significant quantities of water.</p> <p>Waterway means all streams, creeks, rivers, estuaries, coastal lagoons, inlets and harbours.”</p>

City of Greater Geraldton Local Planning Strategy and Local Planning Scheme No. 1 – Schedule of Submissions

Number & Date	Submitter	Nature of Submission	Comment	Recommendation
37 (12-05-15)	State Heritage Office	<p>It is encouraging to see a strong consideration of heritage within the draft Strategy, it is noted however that the City has not referred to the relevant State Planning Policy within the Strategy. It is therefore recommended that reference should be made to <i>State Planning Policy 3.5 – Historic Heritage Conservation</i> in the Strategy.</p>	<p>The State Planning Policy 3.5 is specifically referred to as a reference material in Part Two of the Strategy – Local Profile and Context Report, section 8.7.</p>	Dismiss Submission
		<p>The draft Strategy identifies as an action, the review and continual update of the City's Municipal Heritage Inventory (MHI) which is also to be used as the Heritage List.</p> <p>The City should consider whether it is appropriate to apply the same level of planning controls to all places in the MHI. An alternative approach would be to include in the heritage list only those places of high and moderate heritage significance, based on the management category nominated in the MHI.</p>	<p>Section 45 of the <i>Heritage of Western Australian Act 1990</i> requires the compilation and maintaining of an inventory of heritage places in its district which, in its opinion are, or may become of cultural heritage significance.</p> <p>The City considers that all of its places that are listed in the MHI warrant protection under the Scheme provisions (not just the higher category places).</p>	Dismiss Submission
		<p>The City has an active program of heritage incentives and it would appear relevant to note these, and the opportunity for further provisions, within the Strategy. This will ensure the development of a planning scheme with appropriate mechanisms for incentives that support heritage conservation, and assist in securing ongoing support from council and community.</p>	<p>Part One (section 4.6) of the Strategy outlines a general strategy and a number of actions to regarding heritage and culture.</p> <p>The City has an adopted Heritage Conservation local planning policy which has a specific section 5.2 dealing with incentives.</p> <p>A further clause in the Scheme is therefore not considered necessary.</p>	Dismiss Submission
		<p>We note that the heritage provisions in Part 7 of the Scheme are in accordance with the <i>Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2014</i>. We would expect that future Schemes will be consistent with the version that is finally approved, given that a number of changes may yet be made.</p>	<p>The part referred to is a 'deemed provisions for local planning schemes' under the <i>Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2014</i> and will therefore be automatically updated upon gazettal of the Regulations.</p>	Note Submission

City of Greater Geraldton Local Planning Strategy and Local Planning Scheme No. 1 – Schedule of Submissions

Number & Date	Submitter	Nature of Submission	Comment	Recommendation
38	City of Greater Geraldton	Local Planning Strategy Plan 1 – Geraldton Urban Area Strategy Plan	Remove the 'Neighbourhood Centre' classification over the Spading site as it is shown as a 'Local Centre' in the City's Commercial Activity Centres Strategy.	Uphold Submission <u>Local Planning Strategy – Plan 1 Geraldton Urban Area Strategy Plan</u> Remove the ' Neighbourhood Centre ' classification over the Spading site.
		Local Planning Strategy Plan 1 – Geraldton Urban Area Strategy Plan	Extend the eastern boundary of the Geraldton/Beachlands Heritage Area to include the road reserves of Augustus, Holland and Milford Streets as the road reserves do form part of the streetscape for the heritage area.	Uphold Submission <u>Local Planning Strategy – Plan 1 Geraldton Urban Area Strategy Plan</u> Amend the eastern boundary of Geraldton/Beachlands Heritage Area to include the road reserves of Augustus, Holland and Milford Streets.
		Local Planning Scheme Section 3.15 – Zoning table	Recreation private is defined as premises that are used for indoor and outdoor leisure, recreation or sport and not usually open to the public without charge. This use class could include developments such as fun parks and mini golf which are uses that may be considered suitable in the 'Tourism' and 'Rural' zones.	Uphold Submission <u>Local Planning Scheme Text</u> Amend the Zoning Table so that ' Recreation Private ' is a ' D ' use in the ' Tourism ' zone and an ' A ' use in the ' Rural ' zone.

City of Greater Geraldton Local Planning Strategy and Local Planning Scheme No. 1 – Schedule of Submissions

Number & Date	Submitter	Nature of Submission	Comment	Recommendation
38 continued		Local Planning Scheme Schedule 3 – R2	In the 'Description of Land' column amend the suburb to Meru as the land is in the locality of Meru, not Narngulu.	Uphold Submission <u>Local Planning Scheme Text</u> Amend Schedule 3 R2 – 'Description of Land' to ' Meru '.
		Local Planning Scheme Map	Lot 2970 (No. 215) Place Road (cnr Cassin Place), Webberton is currently zoned 'Industry – Light and Service'. The Commercial Activity Centres Strategy shows the land as 'Service Commercial'.	Uphold Submission <u>Local Planning Scheme Map</u> Amend zoning of Lot 2970 (No. 215) Place Road, Webberton to 'Service Commercial'.
		Local Planning Scheme Map	The zoning of Lot 3 (No. 204) Place Road and Lots 59 and 60 (No's. 205 and 203) First Street, Wonthella should be amended to 'Residential' with a residential density coding of R30 to reflect the recently approved Scheme Amendment No. 72.	Uphold Submission <u>Local Planning Scheme Map</u> Amend the zoning of Lot 3 (No. 204) Place Road and Lots 59 and 60 (No's. 205 and 203) First Street, Wonthella to 'Residential' with an R-Code of 'R30'.

City of Greater Geraldton Local Planning Strategy and Local Planning Scheme No. 1 – Schedule of Submissions

Number & Date	Submitter	Nature of Submission	Comment	Recommendation
38 continued		Local Planning Scheme Map	The zoning of Lot 30 (No. 7) Duke Street (corner NWCH), Wonthella should be amended to 'Service Commercial' to reflect the recently approved Scheme Amendment No. 73.	Uphold Submission <u>Local Planning Scheme Map</u> Amend the zoning of Lot 30 (No. 7) Duke Street, Wonthella to 'Service Commercial'.
		Local Planning Scheme Map	Lot 348 Columbus Boulevard, Wandina currently contains the Seacrest estate telecommunications site.	Uphold Submission <u>Local Planning Scheme Map</u> Amend the zoning of Lot 348 Columbus Boulevard, Wandina to 'Community and Public Purpose'.
		Local Planning Scheme Map	As the City is no longer progressing with the 'Olive Street' residential development it is appropriate that the reserve be zoned back to its original status of 'Parks and Recreation'.	Uphold Submission <u>Local Planning Scheme Map</u> Amend the zoning of Reserve 30043 to 'Parks and Recreation'.

City of Greater Geraldton Local Planning Strategy and Local Planning Scheme No. 1 – Schedule of Submissions

Number & Date	Submitter	Nature of Submission	Comment	Recommendation
38 continued		Local Planning Strategy Plan 4 – Rural Land Strategy Plan	Lot 7 (No. 1853) Geraldton – Mt. Magnet Road, Bringoo is shown as 'Non Agricultural Area (Including Conservation Area)'. This is an error as the land is freehold farming land.	Uphold Submission <u>Local Planning Strategy – Plan 4 Rural Land Strategy Plan</u> Amend the classification of Lot 7 (No. 1853) Geraldton – Mt. Magnet Road, Bringoo to 'Other Rural Land'.