

Objections and Comments

Proposed Scheme Amendment to Rezone 32 Gavour Road, Wattle Grove from Special Rural to Special Use

Some points of note (in no particular order of priority) are:

Objections

- 1) The proposed rezoning and resultant land use (particularly as detailed in the concept document viewed at the Shire offices) will destroy the amenity and aesthetics of the area.
- 2) This proposed re-zoning will result in a development which conflicts sharply with the rural character of the surroundings.
- 3) Wattle Grove is now home to endangered white tailed and red tailed black cockatoos due to the loss and destruction of natural habitat in the Perth Metropolitan area. In addition, many other bird species, bandicoots and reptiles live in this area. It is important that we protect these creatures natural habitat so future generations can experience these animals.
- 4) The density being proposed in the concept document is effectively equivalent to a subdivision with an R code equivalent of R20 which conflicts sharply with the R1 zoning all around it.
- 5) The proposal intends to fit an equivalent number of properties into about 10 hectares as currently exist in the surrounding **700 hectares**. The proposed development is an increase in density of about 6500% over the current development density.
- 6) The land use conflicts directly with the shires own recently introduced Town Planning Scheme No 3.
- 7) The rezoning is an Urban use and therefore conflicts directly with the Rural zoning under the Metropolitan Region Scheme.
- 8) In June 2007 the Western Australian Planning Commission wrote to the Shire of Kalamunda expressly recommending that they **don't** go ahead with this proposal. The shire ignored this recommendation.
- 9) The Western Australian Planning Commission recommended on 9th October 2009 that the Minister for Planning not allow the Shire of Kalamunda to advertise Amendment No 18 to the Shire of Kalamunda Local Planning Scheme No 3 and that they did not support the rezoning.

- 10) There is absolutely no guarantee or even a requirement for the proponent under the Shire of Kalamunda recommendation in initiating the rezoning of 32 Gavour Road that this proposal would provide any hostel (high care) nursing facilities.
- 11) The rezoning and resulting development would isolate the residents in a field in the middle of nowhere, 6 or 7 km from shops, health and medical amenity, hemmed in by fast moving traffic.
- 12) The Kalamunda Shire cite that the land is on a bus route as a reason for supporting the proposal, ignoring the fact that it would require the residents to cross 4 lanes of 80km traffic.
- 13) There will be a significant increase in vehicle traffic within the Wattle Grove area. The projection for vehicle movement directly associated with the proposed development would be in the vicinity of 690 per day according to the proponents own research. The proponent claims that the extra 690 vehicles per day would only be permitted to access the development via Welshpool Road. It would only be a matter of time until there were traffic fatalities on Welshpool Road. When the fatalities inevitably occurred pressure would be exerted on MRD, Local government and local residents to facilitate access to the development via Gavour or Ridley Road destroying the rural lifestyle.
- 14) Everybody needs the guarantee of sunshine, fresh air and close proximity to the beauty of nature. Wattle Grove is filled with such beauty and it is important that its rural characteristics are preserved for not only local residents but also for all the residents of the Perth Metropolitan area.
- 15) The current proposal at council does not incorporate the two Special Rural zoned blocks on Gavour Road as per the 2007 application It would only be a matter of time until there was an accident on Welshpool Road and pressure would be applied by the operator of the Facility /residents/general public for access to be approved from Gavour Road.
- 16) According to advice received in writing from the Water Corporation 32 Gavour Road does not have access to reticulated mains sewerage.
- 17) This is the thin edge of the wedge, minuted admission by a “supporter” of the proposal who owns a larger property in Wattle Grove stating he will do the same thing once the precedent is set. It’ll be R20 disguised as over 55 accommodation for any large landholder but the rest of the residents or Wattle Grove will just have to put up with the destruction of our rural amenity and lifestyle.

- 18) The Shires planning department branded this proposal as “innocuous! If any one wants to see just how noxious the development will be they only have to drive down Crystal Brook Road from Kalamunda and look down at the polo field on 32 Gavour Road and imagine an area at 300% bigger covered in roofs.
- 19) As landowners of land zoned “Special Rural” I will be disenfranchised by the high density of residents occupying the proposed development. As 50% of the total residents of the 700ha of Special Rural in the locality will occupy the proposed development they will have a disproportionate influence via local government to apply pressure on local government to curtail the activities currently carried out routinely by occupants on the Special Rural zoned land, i.e. operating machinery, burning fallen tree branches, etc.

Comments

- 1) The Shire of Kalamunda voted to allow Donovan Village in Lewis Road to demolish a 40 bed hostel facility (of which 1 million was paid for by federal government funds) and allowed the owners of Donovan Village to replace the 40 bed hostel with a 15 bed hostel, 9 over 55 units and a 5 bedroom day care centre (A net loss of 25 hostel places). This makes a mockery of Shire Presidents Mckechnie claim that the desperate need for Hostel accommodation justifies the inappropriate rezoning of 32 Gavour Road. Zoning for aged care on Hale road has been altered to high density housing zoning.
- 2) In November 2006 Shire President Mckechnie, the most vocal supporter; of Ross Leighton’s proposal voted against a proposal for a retirement village comprising of 120 dwellings on land which was located much closer to amenities and in an Urban location on the corner of Hale/Arthur Roads in Forrestfield
- 3) In this current 2009 application the Shire's planning department has simply cut and pasted and quoted the proponents own representations and research and present them as their own considered justification for supporting the proposal , just as they did in 2004 and 2007. The council has not undertaken all the research they agreed to do in 2004 and 2007. In addition, the research that was conducted into the opinions of the residents of the South Ward in the Shires “Land Vision Workshops” has, by the Shires own admission, been ignored. The shire has also failed to follow their own recommendations as outlined in the "aged accommodation strategy" document.
- 4) The proposal has been rejected twice by council, once in 2004 and once in 2007, and the proposal remains virtually unchanged since its last rejection.

In 2004 the proposal for the scheme amendment was submitted to 27 landowners. At the end of the submission period there were 115 submissions from landowners of which 101 were objections, 10 were non objections and four were conditional non objections. In 2007 the proposal was submitted to only 15 landowners. The 15 Landowners notified were given merely 17 days notice to provide their comments. At the end of the submission period there were 76 submissions from landowners of which 72 were objections, 3 were non objections and 1 was a comment only. In 2009 the affected Landowners were not given the opportunity to provide their formal comment at all. The minutes of the Planning Services Committee meeting for Monday 11th May 2009 were posted on the Shires website on the afternoon of Friday 8th May 2009. The website was inaccessible on Saturday 9th May 2009 and part of Sunday 10th May 2009. However the level of opposition to the development was again illustrated when, on Mothers Day Sunday 10th May 2009, 146 signatures from local residents opposing the rezoning of 32 Gavour Road Wattle Grove and calling for a Special Electors meeting were collected. Not one person who was approached to sign the petition refused.

- 5) The shire actually advertised for "expressions of interest" to develop one of the suitable alternative sites, yet now stonewall an interested developer wanting to build aged care.