Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Officer Comment	Applicant Comment
-----------	----	--------------------	-----------------	-------------------

Government Agencies							
ATCO Gas IN24/29874	1	Atco Gas Australia (ATCO) has no objection to the proposed, based on the information and plan provided.  Anyone proposing to carry out construction or excavation works must contact 'Before You Dig Australia' ( <a href="www.byda.com.au">www.byda.com.au</a> ) to determine the location of buried gas infrastructure. Refer to ATCO document AGA-O&M-PR24- Additional Information for Working Around Gas Infrastructure <a href="https://www.atco.com/en-au/for-home/natural-gas/wa-gas-network/working-around-gas.html">https://www.atco.com/en-au/for-home/natural-gas/wa-gas-network/working-around-gas.html</a> Proposed construction and excavation works need to be managed in accordance with the ATCO document Additional Information for Working	Thank you for your submission.	Noted.			
IN24/30783 Department of Health	2	Around Gas Infrastructure - AGA-O&M-PR24 <a href="https://www.atco.com/en-au/for-home/natural-gas/wa-gas-network/working-around-gas.html">https://www.atco.com/en-au/for-home/natural-gas/wa-gas-network/working-around-gas.html</a> The DoH provides the following comments: Water Supply and Wastewater Disposal The DoH has no objection to the proposal subject to connection to drinking	Thank you for your submission. The LSP proposes that residential lots be connected to reticulated sewage and water services. Shire Officers agree that the measures regarding mosquito management should be considered at the subdivision stage.	Noted.			
		water and sewage services provided by a licensed service provider.  Any non-drinking water (i.e., water that is not intended or suitable for drinking) must be managed to ensure it cannot be confused with or contaminate the drinking water supply. This requires satisfactory labelling of non-drinking water taps and, depending on system configuration, suitable backflow prevention arrangements in accordance with Australian/New Zealand Standards AS3500 – Plumbing and Drainage.					

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Officer Comment	Applicant Comment	
		Medical Entomology To protect the health and lifestyle of communities, all land use planning decisions should include consideration of mosquitoes and their management.  Cases of Ross River virus and Barmah Forest virus disease have been notified in this region. Prior to any future developments, the DoH recommends that:  The proponents work with the Shire of Serpentine-Jarrahdale to determine the extent of risk from mosquitoes and mosquito-borne disease for the location.  If that risk is considered medium or high by the Shire, a mosquito management plan should be established and adequately funded.  The Shire of Serpentine-Jarrahdale ensures they have sufficient resources to continue mosquito management for any future development associated with the proposed amendment.			
Department of Water and Environmen tal Regulation IN25/1107	3	The Department has reviewed the Local Structure Plan (LSP) and associated documents and provides the following comments.  LWMS  Urban Water Management  Consistent with Better Urban Water Management (BUWM) (WAPC, 2008) and policy measures outlined in the draft State Planning Policy 2.9, Planning for Water, the proposed Local Structure Plan should be supported by a Local Water Management Strategy (LWMS) prior to final approval of the Structure Plan.	Thank you for your submission. These comments have been considered by Shire Officers and incorporated within the Schedule of Modifications, recommending a revised LWMS.	Comments noted. Modifications will be made as part of the ongoing progression of the structure plan. A response to the matters raised by DWER under separate cover is provided in <b>Attachment 1</b> .	

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Officer Comment	Applicant Comment
		The LVMAC abouted demonstrate bout the cubic et avec will address water	1	Ι
		The LWMS should demonstrate how the subject area will address water use and stormwater management. It should contain a level of information that demonstrates the site constraints and the level of risk to the water resources.		
		The Department reviewed the supporting document, Local Water Management Strategy Mundijong Precinct F6 Structure Plan (LWMS), (Emerge, October 2024), and amendments and additional information are recommended. The Department's comments on the LWMS are provided below as Attachment 1.		
		In the event there are modifications to the proposal that may have implications on aspects of environment and/or water management, the Department should be notified to enable the implications to be assessed.		

lo S	Submi	itter Co	omments		Officer Comment	Applicant Comment
					-	
	<b>No.</b> 1	Page 8	Section Section 3.5.2 – Groundwater Levels	Rev 1 - DWER Comments  Groundwater monitoring data should be included as an appendix in the LWMS.	-	
	2	14	Section 5.1.2 – Groundwater supply	Existing groundwater licences will be utilised to irrigate POS. The LWMS should confirm the expected area (m²) of POS which will require irrigation and the anticipated groundwater requirement. If groundwater requirements exceed the current licence allocations, there is limited additional groundwater available for allocation and groundwater trades, transfers or alternative supply may need to be secured.		
	3	16	Section 5.3 – Waste Management	Written correspondence from the Water Corporation demonstrating that the site can be serviced with reticulated sewerage (and any temporary measures) and an estimated timeline for connection should be included as an appendix.	-	
	4	18	Section 6.1.3.3 – Bio-retention area	Section refers to the provision of a low flow outlet at the base of BRAs. More design detail is required regarding these outlets.  The Department recommends that biofiltration basins should be set offline from the general flood storage area. Biofiltration basins should only contain the first 15 mm of runoff from the impervious catchment, up to a depth of 300mm, then overtop out into the larger POS area. This reduces the area that requires intensive maintenance.	_	

bmitter I	No	No	No	No	No	Subm	Submitter Comments			Officer Comment	Applicant Comment
				Ocation	Don't DWED Comment						
		No.	Page	Section	Rev 1 - DWER Comments						
		5	23	Section 7.1.2 – Subsoil Drains	The development is proposing sub-soil piping. Plans and diagrams indicating location of all sub-soil piping and outlets, including indicative levels throughout proposed development and detail on how the subsoils integrate with the proposed stormwater infrastructure should be presented. Levels can be further refined at the UWMP stage.  A LWMS is required to show 'proof of concept' of stormwater and groundwater management design.						
		6	30	Section 9 - Monitoring	Proposed contingencies actions should the surface or groundwater quality guideline values be exceeded should be provided.						
		7		Appendix B – Landscape concept	Updated landscape concept plans within the body of the LWMS are required. Landscape plans are provided in a separate document within the information provided to the Department but these refer to 'turfed basins' holding the 1:1 year event which is inconsistent with text in the LWMS referring to bioretention basins densely vegetated with species known to uptake nutrients.						
		8		Appendix C – Earthworks and civil designs	Drawings No 6429-00-200 & 201 indicate outflow pipes from the three flood storage areas outletting to the adjacent property. Additional design detail on these outlets should be provided within the LWMS.						
					Indicative cross sections for all infiltration basins and proposed swales should be provided. All critical invert levels in m AHD such as the base level, top water levels for the small, minor and major rainfall events, design of inlets and outlets, depth of amended soils, maximum groundwater level (MGL), and how the subsoils integrate with proposed stormwater infrastructure should be included. These levels can be further refined at the UWMP stage.						

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Officer Comment	Applicant Comment
Public Transport Authority IN25/1601	4	The Public Transport Authority (PTA) has no objections to this proposal.	Thank you for your submission.	Noted.
Department of Planning Lands and Heritage IN25/1667	5	The proposed Structure Plan has been considered for its potential impact on heritage places within the Structure Plan area and the following advice is given:  1. It is noted that the term European Heritage has been used in Part 2, 3.5.2 of the Structure Plan report to distinguish between Aboriginal and historic heritage. It is recommended that the term 'Historic Heritage' be used for consistency with State Planning Policy 3.5, Historic Heritage Conservation.  2. As there are no heritage-protected places within or abutting the Structure Plan area, there is no objection to the proposal from a historic heritage perspective.  We hope that these comments are of value in the development of the proposed Structure Plan.	Thank you for your submission. These comments have been considered by Shire Officers and incorporated within the Schedule of Modifications.	Comments noted.  Modifications, including to terminology will be made to the reporting as part of the ongoing progression of the structure plan.
Department of Transport IN25/1745	6	Thank you for your letter dated 5 December 2024 inviting the Department of Transport (DoT) to provide comment on the above proposed structure plan. The Urban Mobility (UM) division of DoT has reviewed the submitted documents and advises that DoT believes this proposal to be premature, and provides the following comments:	Thank you for your submission. These comments have been considered by Shire Officers and incorporated within the Schedule of Modifications.	LTCN – All dwellings within the LSP will be within 200 metres to at least one of the local LTCN routes of Richardson St, Adonis St, Cockram St (east) and the future Adams St extension. The general low traffic

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Officer Comment	Applicant Comment
		General Comments  There is limited reference within the Local Structure Plan (LSP) document (part 1 and 2) to pedestrian and cycle networks, or integration of the proposed LSP with the surrounding development. Whilst some of the required information is in the Transport Impact Assessment, the LSP documents should be updated to include this information also rather than simply stating what currently exists.  The proposal is for a residential density of R25, however the draft Mundijong District Structure Plan (DSP) shows this site as being Medium density of R40-100. Furthermore, Mundijong is a District Centre per State Planning Policy 4.2 – Activity Centres.  Section 3.6.2 of the LSP Part 2 details that land to the north, east and south will be developed for 'higher density residential development', whilst land immediately west is subject to the Mundijong Precincts E1 & E2 LSP which is R30-60. The density of this proposal is therefore inconsistent with the surrounding (future) development.  It seems premature to zone this land at a lower density given the intent for higher density across both this site and the surrounding land on all sides, as well as its location within the 800m walkable catchment of the Mundijong Town Centre.  Long Term Cycle Network (LTCN)  The subject site is bounded by Richardson St, Adonis St, and Cockram St which are local routes in the LTCN. These local routes connect to the primary LTCN route along Tonkin Hwy to the West, and to the secondary LTCN route along Mundijong Road to the South.		volumes expected within the LSP would make all roads within the boundary's good riding environments and a path provided on every road will allow for off road corrections to the wider path network.  The future connection to the Tonkin Highway Road would be likely from Mundijong Road, however no off road path currently exists along Mundijong Road and would be subject to future design.  Integration with Surrounding Area – All roads within the LSP boundary are classified as Access Road C and D and most offer very localised connectivity only, providing limited connections for through movements within the LSP – instead concentrating the through movements along the established boundary roads.

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Officer Comment	Applicant Comment
		The design of the LSP area should demonstrate safe, high quality access to these routes, suitable for people of all ages and abilities.  There is scope to extend the local route along Cockram St further west along the southern boundary of the subject site as well as considering the role of Adams Street along the western boundary of the site in the cycling network. The process of determining the LTCN should include collaboration between the LSP applicant, DoT's Active Transport branch and the City to ensure that the LTCN within this LSP area aligns with the City's aspirations and provides integration with the wider LTCN.  The procedure for amending the LTCN can be found here: Long-term cycle network  Integration with Surrounding Area  Per the DSP the subject site is located within the 800m walkable catchment of the Mundijong train station and District Centre to the East and a Primary School Site to the West. As such DoT recommends that all internal roads provide footpaths on both sides of the road, per Liveable Neighbourhoods recommendation.  Adams St and Richardson St are both noted as District Distributors on the DSP, and as such will carry higher volumes of traffic, and are potential public transport (bus) routes. Access for non-car modes and appropriately spaced and designed crossing facilities should be planned for.  The DSP sets strong objectives to encourage walking and cycling. Consideration should be given to the provision of safe, high-quality footpaths and well located pedestrian crossings particularly across the district distributors, to encourage active modes of transport for people of all		that provide east — west connections between Adams St and Adonis St and there may be value to provide paths on both sides of one of these streets — likely to be selected once the western Primary school site location is settled. There is very little value in any other roads within the LSP having paths on both sides due to the very low volume of vehicular traffic expected. Instead, the provision of unnecessary paths within the narrow road reserves would have a significantly detrimental impact on the visual street scape amenity, limiting the ability to establish sizeable street trees and verge landscaping. This position is supported within LN where "footpaths may be omitted from one side of lower order access streets unless the

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Officer Comment	Applicant Comment
Submitter	No	ages and abilities from the LSP area to the local centre, train station, bus stops, parks and schools within the broader DSP area.  The active transport network should be designed to connect with the adjacent LSP areas.  Safe walk/cycle to school assessment  The Transport Impact Assessment (TIA) should be updated to include a safe walk/cycle to school assessment per the TIA Guidelines Volume 2.  Main Roads WA and the Public Transport Authority  We understand Main Roads WA and the Public Transport Authority are sending their responses directly.  DoT would welcome the opportunity to comment on an amended proposal, and at further planning stages, with particular regard to access and infrastructure for non-car modes of transport.		street forms an important pedestrian link."  The Mundijong / Whitby District Structure plan notes that the likely site for a station for the higher frequency passenger train extension (Armadale line) is to be in Whitby and as such, would be outside the 800m walkable catchment.  Given the location of the school site to the west is still variable and none of the road links likely to be used
		infrastructure for non-car modes of transport.		by residents within the LSP currently exist, it is difficult to undertake a safe route to school assessment with any level of accuracy. During detailed subdivision stage, more certainly is likely and suitable, safe connections can be included within this LSP to align with those planned within the adjoining
				LSP. Links to Mundijong Primary School from the

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Officer Comment	Applicant Comment
				LSP will likely to be via good quality concrete paths along Adonis Street, Richardson Street and Butcher Street. It is noted that these established streets currently have paths on only one side, including all of the frontage roads around the primary school. There are currently no guarded school crossings along the available routes to the existing school and as such, the volume of students walking to school should be monitored and applications made if warranted.
IN25/1796 Department of Fire and Emergency Services	7	I refer to your email dated 5 December 2024 regarding the submission of a Bushfire Management Plan (BMP) (revision 1), prepared by Envision and dated November 2024, for the above Structure Plan.  The new State Planning Policy 3.7 Bushfire and associated Planning for Bushfire Guidelines were published on 24 September 2024 and became operational for applications lodged with decision makers from 18 November 2024. Notwithstanding, as this application was submitted to the decision maker prior to 18 November 2024, this advice relates only to the 2015 State Planning Policy 3.7: Planning in Bushfire Prone Areas (SPP)	Thank you for your submission. Shire Officers agree that clarification and/or modifications are required regarding vegetation classifications of road reserves and POS, particularly regarding tree retention. DFES comments	Noted. Responses as follows.  Responses to Table 1:  1. Vegetation Exclusion

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments			Officer Comment	Applicant Comment	
		1.4) (Guidelin It is the responsition with relevant exempt the approposal inclured by a Assessment	I Guidelines for Planning in Bushfire Prone es).  Insibility of the proponent to ensure the propolar planning and building requirements. This acoplicant/proponent from obtaining approvals uding planning, building, health or any other relevant authority under written laws.  In equation exclusions – not demonstrated assessment  Vegetation exclusions – not demonstrated  The BMP assumes the areas of vegetation plot 2 including the verges of Cockram Street will be excluded post development, however these areas fall outside of the control of the developer. DFES notes that the road verges may be required to retain existing trees, and as discussed below, there are additional areas of trees present that do not appear to have been considered as part of the vegetation assessment. DFES considers that the decision maker should be satisfied that any trees retained in the road reserve will not be classifiable should the exclusion be supported.  Vegetation plots 3 and 4 cannot be substantiated as Class B Woodland with the limited information and photographic evidence provided. There is insufficient	posal complies dvice does not s that apply to the approvals	have been incorporated within the Schedule of Modifications.	delivered as part of or as a condition of subdivision, likely undertaken by the proponent. These alignments will be constructed to achieve non-vegetated or low-threat classifications where applicable. On this basis the future road alignment classification as excluded vegetation should remain.  2. Veg Classification – Class B Woodland The application of 'woodland' classification rather than forest, was based on considering the vegetation structure (a relevant consideration for the application of forest, particularly when considering the fuel load assumptions in Table	

Submitter	No	Submitter	Comments		Officer Comment	Applicant Comment
		Vegetation Classification	evidence to support the change between areas classified as class A Forest adjoining some areas, with foliage cover appearing greater than 30% in some areas.  The BMP should detail specifically how the Class B Woodland classification was derived as opposed to Class A Forest.  If unsubstantiated, the vegetation classification should be revised to consider the vegetation at maturity as per AS3959, or the resultant BAL ratings may be inaccurate.  Vegetation plots 7 and 8 cannot be substantiated as Class G Grassland for their entirety with the limited information and photographic evidence provided. The crown canopy cover appears to exceed 10% in several areas to the north, south and east of the site, including areas directly abutting Woodland/Forest plots (discussed above). A review of aerial imagery/Streetview confirms the number of trees in these areas which have not been considered. It is unclear why the BMP has not included photographs of the trees.  The BMP should detail specifically how the Class G Grassland classification was derived as opposed to Class A Forest/Class B Woodland.  If unsubstantiated, the vegetation classification should be revised to consider the vegetation at maturity as per AS3959, or the resultant BAL ratings may be inaccurate.  Evidence to support the exclusion of Public Open Space (POS) as managed to low threat in accordance with AS3959 is required.  Specifically, vegetation plot 10 - the POS is proposed to be used for areas of water management and retention of existing vegetation (as discussed in the submitted environmental assessment and management strategy, prepared by Emerge and dated October 2024). It is unclear how these can be excluded as managed to low threat given the number of trees present in the area, and the difficulty present in managing drainage areas to low threat given the number of trees present in the area and the difficulty present in managing drainage areas to low threat in perpetuity. The BMP/Structure Plan does not provide certainty that management to low threat ca	Modification to the BMP is required.  Clarification required.  The decision maker to be satisfied with the vegetation exclusions and vegetation management proposed.		B3 of Appendix B in AS 3959 (which is what informs the Method 1 setback calculations)) and foliage cover. The areas identified as 'woodland' have different vegetation structure and foliage cover compared to what you would apply to forest vegetation. Under Table B3 of Appendix B, when 'understorey fuel' is removed from the fuel load values, forest and woodland have the same 'total fuel load'. This indicates understorey is a key driver for the difference between the two classifications.  The areas in plots 3 and 4 have no understorey or mid-storey that would be driving fire behaviour (and fuel load). On this Basis the Woodland

Submitter	No	Submitter Com	nments		Officer Comment	Applicant Comment
		2. Policy Me	easure 6.3 c) Compliance with the bushfire protection cri	teria		classification should remain
		Issue Location and	Assessment A1.1 and A2.1 – not demonstrated	Action Modification to the		
		Siting & Design	The BAL ratings cannot be validated, as the vegetation classification inputs require modification as per the above table.	BMP is required.		3. Veg Classification – Class G Grassland The application of
		Vehicular Access	A3.2a, A3.3 and A3.4a – not demonstrated The structure plan relies on the construction of additional roads outside of the development site (and outside of the control of the proponent) to ensure that access is provided to all lots, and to two destinations in two directions. This assumption is confirmed on page 22 of the BMP. The decision maker should be satisfied that mechanisms are in place to ensure that the additional roads will be constructed.	Modification required. Further information should be provided to demonstrate compliance; or to justify a performance principle-based solution.		'Grassland' classification rather the forest or Woodland as identified, was based of considering the vegetation structure, particularly the foliage cover. Foliage cover is difference
		Vehicular Access	A3.5 – comment only It is unclear why the BMP discusses the potential for battleaxe lots when the BMP has not identified any site constraints to require them at this stage. These comments should be removed from the BMP, and the proponent should confirm that no battleaxe lots are proposed.	Comment only		to canopy cover, and 3959 requires the consideration of foliage cover. Generally, a 10 20% canopy cover would equate to a
			tion – Compliance with Acceptable Solutions – modifications required	s not		roughly <10% foliage cover when looking at eucalypts (as they have
		and the Guide	s not adequately address the policy requirer lines. There are several issues that need to rt of the proposal (refer to the tables above).	be addressed		about 40-50% foliage cover). A way to think about this is that foliage cover is the space between leaves when

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Officer Comment	Applicant Comment
				you look up through the canopy, whereas canopy cover doesn't consider the space between leaves.  The areas in plots 7 and 8 identified as grassland where designated so due to the foliage cover in areas with trees falling below 10%, allowing the area to be classified as per the dominant vegetation type for the area (grassland).
				4. Veg Classification – Exclusion of POS POS areas associated with Plot 10 have been excluded under clause 2.2.3.2(f) of AS3959 on the basis that at subdivision these areas will be managed by the proponent to meet the low threat classification (for 2 years) with the

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Officer Comment	Applicant Comment
				areas to be transferred to the Shire to continue management as low threat in perpetuity.  Responses to Table 2:
				1. Location and Siting & Design The vegetation classifications and management assumptions do not require revision based on the responses to the vegetation classification queries above. Therefore, the determined BAL ratings are valid and have been relied upon to determine the suitability of the location and siting of lots, both of which are compliant.  2. Vehicular Access
				2. Vehicular Access The external road alignments identified in the BMP will be delivered as part of or

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Officer Comment	Applicant Comment
				as a condition of subdivision, likely undertaken by the proponent. Any future access issues will be addressed at the subdivision stage as part of staged development considerations. Temporary EAWs could be part of this consideration, depending on the timing for the delivery of external roads yet to be constructed.
				3. Vehicular Access – Battle Axe The text relating to battle axe lots is a remnant from previous design responses and can be removed from the BMP to avoid confusion.

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Officer Comment	Applicant Comment	
Department of Biodiversity Conservatio n and Attractions IN25/2086	8	In reference to your correspondence dated 5 December 2024, the Parks and Wildlife Service of the Department of Biodiversity, Conservation and Attractions (DBCA) provides the following comments.  Vegetation  The Emerge Environmental Assessment and Management Strategy Report (EAMS) - Section 2.3.4 mapped the majority of the vegetation within the survey area as completely degraded, with 0.09 ha mapped as degraded, and a 0.03 ha remnant of vegetation within the Cockram Street road reserve which adjoins the structure plan area mapped in good condition. This remnant was identified by Emerge as a potential Threatened Ecological Community (TEC) 'Corymbia calophylla – Kingia australis woodlands on heavy soils of the Swan Coastal Plain'. The EAMS outlined that further survey during the main flowering time (spring) and quadrat sampling and floristic analysis would be required to confirm if the vegetation represents this TEC (Section 2.3.5)  Given that Cockram St will need be upgraded to provide access to the Structure Plan area, it is recommended that the further survey recommended in the EAMS be undertaken to guide the planning of the road upgrade.	Thank you for your submission. These comments have been considered by Shire Officers and incorporated within the Schedule of Modifications. Shire Officers note that there are many large trees present within the site and adjacent road reserves which should be retained where possible. Modifications have been recommended in regard to a Fauna Management Plan requirement for subdivisions, and various provisions relating to tree retention within POS and road reserves.	Noted. Responses as follows.  Vegetation  This can be addressed in the amended EAMS by clarifying that the road reserve is the responsibility of the Shire given it is an existing road reserve and further survey will be required to confirm if the vegetation represents this TEC to finalise any road upgrade design, any impact avoidance opportunities, and any associated statutory approval considerations if avoidance cannot be fully achieved.	
			Threatened Black Cockatoo habitat.		Threatened Black Cockatoo habitat
		Section 2.4.of the EAMS outlines that Emerge Associates (2024) undertook a basic fauna and targeted black cockatoo survey which found the site includes a total of 0.25 ha, 0.20 ha and 0.06 ha of 'high' quality foraging habitat for Carnaby's Black Cockatoo, Baudin's Black Cockatoo and the Forest Red-tailed Black Cockatoo (FRTBC), respectively and a total of 0.04 ha of 'exotic' foraging habitat for FRTBC is present within the		The targeted black cockatoo survey did not identify black cockatoo habitat trees containing hollows based on visual inspection from ground	

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Officer Comment	Applicant Comment
		site, and that eight black cockatoo habitat trees were recorded within the survey area (including 4 within the site).  If trees with suitable hollows are identified and are proposed to be cleared within the breeding period, they must first be inspected by a suitably experienced fauna specialist to ensure that nesting is not occurring. If the inspection identifies nesting birds, a section 40 authorisation under the WA 2016 (BC Act) will be required. Where nesting is occurring, trees are to be demarcated and avoided, until after the cockatoos have naturally completed nesting (i.e. chick has fledged and dispersed from the hollow).  Native Vegetation Clearing  It is noted that a portion of the structure plan area and adjacent Cockram St road reserve are mapped as an environmentally sensitive area by DWER, and that no exemptions under the Environmental Protection (Clearing of Native Vegetation) Regulations 2004 apply in this area. This includes the 0.03 ha remnant identified by Emerge as a potential TEC.  Any proposed clearing of native vegetation associated with the development should be undertaken in accordance with the Environmental Protection Act 1986 (EP Act) and Environmental Protection (Clearing of Native Vegetation) Regulations 2004 and should be discussed with the Department of Water and Environmental Regulation.  Matters of National Environmental Significance  Please be aware that proponent(s) may have notification responsibilities under the Environmental Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act (EPBC Act) in relation to potential impacts on habitat for threatened black cockatoo species and should contact the Commonwealth Department of		level. The EAMS can be updated to include a recommendation for future management that if hollows are present, trees will be inspected by an experienced fauna specialist to confirm use by black cockatoos for nesting.  Native Vegetation Clearing  This is addressed in Section 3.3.2 of the EAMS.  Matters of National Environmental Significance  Noted and no update to the EAMS required.

No	Submitter Comments	Officer Comment	Applicant Comment
	Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water for further information on these responsibilities.		
9	The Department has reviewed the proposal and provides the following comments:  Primary schools  The subject LSP falls within the local intake area of Mundijong Primary School. Based on the Department's analysis of the anticipated 150 dwellings, resulting student demand and dwelling yield within the broader locality, Mundijong Primary School is expected to experience accommodation pressure in the medium term. Ultimately, to provide enrolment relief, additional accommodation capacity will be required in the long term and a new public primary school will be required.  There is a future public primary school site, Mundijong Precinct E2 Primary School (planning name) located immediately west of the subject LSP area. Therefore, the Western Australian Planning Commission's Operational Policy 2.4 – Planning for school sites (OP 2.4) must be taken into account. Movement network  The Transport Impact Assessment (TIA) report accompanying the LSP states the proposal includes the internal movement network, and the pedestrian/cycling network will be determined as part of the detail design phase and subdivision process. However, considering the direct access to Adams Street from the subject LSP, the existing primary school less than 350m east, and the planned future primary school site less than 800m to	Thank you for your submission. Comments relating to requirements for school sites, and provisions for cycle and pedestrian networks have been incorporated within the Schedule of Modifications.	Comments on the indicative primary school location is noted. We note that the location has been amended a number of times, in accordance with the progression of the neighbouring local structure plan. Based on the advice from the Shire, it is likely the school will be located west of the subject site, in accordance with the District Structure Plan.  Notwithstanding, given the location of the school site to the west is still variable and none of the road links likely to be used by residents within the LSP currently exist, it is difficult to undertake a safe route to school assessment with any level of accuracy. During
		Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water for further information on these responsibilities.  The Department has reviewed the proposal and provides the following comments:  Primary schools  The subject LSP falls within the local intake area of Mundijong Primary School. Based on the Department's analysis of the anticipated 150 dwellings, resulting student demand and dwelling yield within the broader locality, Mundijong Primary School is expected to experience accommodation pressure in the medium term. Ultimately, to provide enrolment relief, additional accommodation capacity will be required in the long term and a new public primary school will be required.  There is a future public primary school site, Mundijong Precinct E2 Primary School (planning name) located immediately west of the subject LSP area. Therefore, the Western Australian Planning Commission's Operational Policy 2.4 – Planning for school sites (OP 2.4) must be taken into account. Movement network  The Transport Impact Assessment (TIA) report accompanying the LSP states the proposal includes the internal movement network, and the pedestrian/cycling network will be determined as part of the detail design phase and subdivision process. However, considering the direct access to Adams Street from the subject LSP, the existing primary school less than	Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water for further information on these responsibilities.  9 The Department has reviewed the proposal and provides the following comments: Primary schools The subject LSP falls within the local intake area of Mundijong Primary School. Based on the Department's analysis of the anticipated 150 dwellings, resulting student demand and dwelling yield within the broader locality, Mundijong Primary School is expected to experience accommodation pressure in the medium term. Ultimately, to provide enrolment relief, additional accommodation capacity will be required in the long term and a new public primary school will be required.  There is a future public primary school site, Mundijong Precinct E2 Primary School (planning name) located immediately west of the subject LSP area. Therefore, the Western Australian Planning Commission's Operational Policy 2.4 – Planning for school sites (OP 2.4) must be taken into account. Movement network  The Transport Impact Assessment (TIA) report accompanying the LSP states the proposal includes the internal movement network, and the pedestrian/cycling network will be determined as part of the detail design phase and subdivision process. However, considering the direct access to Adams Street from the subject LSP, the existing primary school less than 350m east, and the planned future primary school sites less than 800m to

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Officer Comment	Applicant Comment
	<u> </u>	be updated to include:		suitable, safe connections
		an analysis of existing pedestrian/cycling networks, including connection to any new facilities as it is evident section 6.2 Proposed Changes to Land Uses within 800m excludes reference to the future primary school site earmarked immediately across from the subject site		can be included within this LSP to align with those planned within the adjoining LSP. Links to Mundijong Primary School from the
		a safe walk/cycle to school assessment in accordance with section 10.10.9		LSP will likely to be via good
		upgrades/improvements of Adams Street to ensure a suitable road width is designed in accordance with Liveable Neighbourhoods and OP 2.4 including, but not limited to:		quality concrete paths along Adonis Street, Richardson Street and Butcher Street. It is noted that these
		a pedestrian path to be constructed on both sides of the road reserve		established streets currently
		inclusion of street carparking embayments		have paths on only one side,
		confirmation of Adams Street road width to the satisfaction of the Department and the Department of Transport (Transport).		including all of the frontage roads around the primary school. There are currently
		The TIA also states an aspirational future cycling network has been produced by the Transport with preference along Sparkman Road and Richardson Street. The Department is supportive of this cycling network as it encourages active transport.		no guarded school crossings along the available routes to the existing school and as such, the volume of students
		Surveillance		walking to school should be monitored and applications
		It is evident the LSP states: 'It is noted that the structure plan area does not rely on Adams Street being constructed (with no lots fronting Adams Street).' As per OP 2.4, it is crucial that surrounding land uses be designed to enable incidental surveillance of school sites and prevent crime as per the WAPC's Safer Places by Design guidelines. The Department requires further clarification on this element.		made if warranted.  With regard to the construction of the Adams Street extension, the LSP fronts only a short portion of the future extension and does not rely on this

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Officer Comment	Applicant Comment
Submitter	No	Local Development Plans  There are three Local Development Plan designated areas on the LSP map. It is unclear if this portion of land will remain Residential or if future land use changes are proposed. Please be mindful that as per OP 2.4, careful consideration is required to ensure school sites are located nearby compatible land uses to support the health and wellbeing outcomes of students. The Department does not support land uses including taverns, service stations and fast food outlets in close proximity to school site.  In view of the above, the Department has no in principle objection to the proposed LSP, subject to providing further information/amendments to the LSP to demonstrate compliance with Liveable Neighbourhood and OP 2.4 requirements.		extension for LSP access. As such, the design and construction of the extension is likely to be driven by the development of the LSP located within precincts E1 and E2 (West of Adams Street and contains the proposed primary school site). Given Adams Street is designated as a District Distributor class road, it is expected to be constructed to a boulevard standard which
			will provide a central median / pedestrian refuge. Paths of at least 2.0m width would be provided on both sides of the carriageway. Embayed parking for school related traffic within Adams Street adjacent to the LSP is not recommended on safety grounds and it would potentially encourage parents demanding their children cross the busy road	

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Officer Comment	Applicant Comment
				vehicle. This type of behaviour also tends to encourage random mid block crossing of roads rather than use of designated crossing points.
IN25/2274 Water Corporation	10	We offer the following comments regarding this proposal.  Water  The Mundijong Precinct F6 development area is within the Mundijong PRV Water Zone and is within our long-term planning area. This area is planned to be served by a proposed DN250 along Cockram St, which is to be connected into the DN610 Steel main on the corner of Cockram and Peterson St. Attached is a diagram which shows the current water reticulation planning for this area.  As this is reticulation main is not a headworks main, the extension of the DN250 will be at the cost of the proponent, the Water Corporation advises that the developer of this area liaise with neighboring developers to share the cost of the construction in an orderly fashion.  Wastewater  The subject land is situated in the Water Corporation's Byford Sewer District. The wastewater flows that will arise from the proposed land uses and dwelling yields indicated in the structure plan have been conceptually allowed for in the Corporation's wastewater infrastructure planning.  Subdivision and development of the subject land is dependent on the prior construction and commissioning of the Scott Road Interim Wastewater pump station. Capital funding for the interim pump station is currently	Thank you for your submission. The Shire acknowledges Water Corporation's long-term water supply planning for the Mundijong Urban Area, and that the LSP's proposal to establish a water supply to the site is accounted for within the Water Corporation's planning for the area.	Regarding the timing of the reticulation sewer. As mentioned in the service report one option is to use a tankering point. The tankering option does impose a temporary 100m buffer central to the tankering point over the site and will escalate in costs as lots are built and occupied. The wastewater pump station in Scott Road and most likely part of the main sewers would need to be constructed to allow a temporary tankering point. The wastewater pump station is on the Water Corporation 5 year capital investment programme. The

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Officer Comment	Applicant Comment
		within the Corporation's 5-year Capital Investment Program. The Corporation is currently liaising with one of the land developers in the structure plan regarding the detailed scoping and delivery of the pump station.  The subject area also requires a DN450 gravity sewer as well as a DN300 gravity sewer which are not part of the scope of works for Scott Rd Interim Wastewater Pump Station. These gravity sewer pipes are currently out of the Water Corporation's 5-year Capital Investment Program. Attached is an excerpt of the wastewater planning which shows these sewers.  Drainage  The subject area falls within the Mundijong Drainage District, a rural drainage system. Developments within this catchment are required to contain the flows from a must be compensated to pre-development levels. The developer of this land should be advised to liaise with Water Corporation at the preliminary planning stage to determine detailed planning requirements as this area could be prone to future flooding. At the time of development (if type of development is known specify) the developer may be required to provide calculations from a consulting engineer to demonstrate, to our satisfaction that the runoff from the development has been restricted to predevelopment levels. To determine the flood level the developer should contact the Department of Water and Environmental Regulations regarding the Drainage and Water Management Plan which includes the subject area.  Rural drains are not designed to always give flood protection and some inundation of land can be expected. Water Corporation maintains its existing drains to ensure they are capable of clearing water from adjacent		other option is to work collectively with the adjoining developers to extend the main sewer up to the site. This also needs the wastewater pump station in Scott Road to be constructed.  The servicing report provides drainage storage volumes for the 1 year and 1% AEP event basins. Modifications made at the subdivision stage can incorporate a earthworks model to provide an offline basin for the overflow of events exceeding the 15mm 1 year. Regarding the storage of the 15mm 1 year event in the bioretention basin this needs some additional discussion as we have an outlet drain at the base of the retention basin and no soakage/infiltration.  The servicing report
				provides a preliminary layout

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Officer Comment	Applicant Comment
		rural properties within three days of a storm event, where contours and internal drainage make this physically possible.  Developments within this catchment are required to contain the flows from a one in one-hundred-year storm event on site. Discharge to Water Corporation drains must be compensated to pre-development levels. The developer of this land should be advised to liaise with Water Corporation at the preliminary planning stage to determine detailed planning requirements as this area could be prone to future flooding. At the time of development, the developer may be required to provide calculations from a consulting engineer to demonstrate, to the satisfaction of Water Corporation, that the runoff from the development has been restricted to pre development levels. To determine the flood level the developer should contact the Department of Water and Environmental Regulations regarding the Drainage and Water Management Plan which includes the subject area.  General Comments  The developer is expected to provide all water and sewerage reticulation if required. A contribution for Water, Sewerage and Drainage headworks may also be required. In addition, the developer may be required to fund new works or the upgrading of existing works and protection of all works. Water Corporation may also require land being provided for works.  The information provided above is subject to review and may change. If the proposal has not proceeded within the next 12 months, please contact us to confirm that this information is still valid.  Please provide the above comments to the landowner, developer and/or their representative.		of the subsoil drainage, nominally 1.2m blow the finished verge levels. Some invert levels can be added to confirm the system drains out to the basins correctly and are above the existing regional groundwater levels.  The approach taken in the LWMS is to maintain predevelopment hydrological conditions, and this is demonstrated in the LWMS, the civil design concepts and the landscape concepts.

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Officer Comment	Applicant Comment
		Retic Excerpt:		1
		Relic Excerpt:		



Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Officer Comment	Applicant Comment
MRWA	11	In response to correspondence received on 5 December 2024, Main Roads supports the proposal and provides the following comments for the Shires consideration:  The Mundijong Precinct E1/E2 Local Structure Plan, located east of this proposal, is subject to ongoing discussions regarding vehicular access to Mundijong Road. Under the proposed changes, Adams Street/Mundijong Road will feature a three-way roundabout, while Adonis Street, a key access point for this proposal, will be closed off as a cul-de-sac with no connection to Mundijong Road.  These modifications may increase pressure on alternative access points within the structure plan area, potentially impacting traffic flow, congestion, and safety. Higher traffic volumes on surrounding roads could necessitate further assessment of intersection capacity and potential upgrades to ensure network efficiency. Additionally, changes in traffic distribution could affect connectivity and travel times for local residents and businesses, influencing accessibility and overall precinct functionality.  Given these implications, the Shire should consider the broader impact of these access changes and implement appropriate mitigation measures to maintain safe and efficient vehicular movement throughout the precinct.	Thank you for your submission. Comments regarding Adams Street and Adonis Street have been incorporated within the Shire's assessment and Schedule of Modifications.	We note Main Roads comments and will consider any modifications as the structure plan progresses.
Landowners	/Reside	nts		
IN24/29757	12	No objections from our side as we knew this was happening when we moved into the area. The main issue would be to ensure that the train station remains where it is to service the increased number of commuters		Comment of support noted.

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Officer Comment	Applicant Comment
		that will need to get into Byford/Armadale etc. All the best in reviewing and approving the Structure Plan.		
IN24/29877	13	I recently received notification of Proposed Local Structure Plan - Mundijong Precinct F6 (PA24/754: OC24/22954).  My question relates to the provision of reticulated sewerage on this proposed subdivision and the new 'Mundi' subdivision on Adams and Taylor Rd.  Can you please provide me with details of the minimum, maximum and average lot size for both this proposed subdivision and the Mundi project. Can you also please confirm the provision of reticulated underground sewerage to both projects.  I would also appreciate confirmation that water and electricity supply infrastructure has been confirmed as either having capacity if already in place or that there are plans to bring both service infrastructures to capacity prior to the commencement of building.	Thank you for your submission.  The approved 'Mundijong Precinct E1 Taylor Road/Adams Street Local Structure Plan' prescribes densities of R25-R40 throughout the LSP area. (R25 has a minimum lot size of 300m² and an average of 350m², and R40 has a minimum lot size of 180m² and an average of 220m²). However, exact lot sizes are determined at the subdivision stage.  The proposed Mundijong Precinct F6 Local Structure Plan proposes an R25 density, which is a minimum lot size of 300m², and an average of 350m².  All new residential lots within the Mundijong District Structure Plan urban area are	The proposed LSP has been supported by a suite of technical reporting, including a Local Water Management Strategy and a civil report (including electricity and wastewater provision).  Further detail is confirmed during the subdivision stage.  Final density will be confirmed during the subdivision stage. Howeve the structure plan assigns a prospective density code of R20.

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Officer Comment	Applicant Comment
			required to establish a connection to reticulated water and sewer services, as well as other services such as power. The proposed Mundijong Precinct F6 Local Structure Plan addresses servicing connections and capacity.	
IN25/1778	14	I am writing to express my concern/objection to the proposed development of 150 dwellings. The block sizes are too small and do not reflect the rural nature of the area. It will create a massive heat island.  The developer should not be allowed to bulldoze the existing bush, mature trees, and sustainable design and planning principles should be applied. So much of our flora and tree canopy cover is being destroyed.  1.37ha of public open space is paltry.  The shire need to educate developers on sustainable design, planning and practices.  This Shire is known as having a rural feel with access to bush for trails, etc. Yet, we are losing it at a rate of knots.	The LSP proposes a residential density of R25. The future subdivision of the existing Mundijong urban area has been identified within the State and Local Planning Frameworks, being zoned Urban under the Metropolitan Region Scheme, and Urban Development under Local Planning Scheme No.3. The Mundijong District Structure Plan identifies the site as 'Low (Suburban) R20-35'. Therefore, the proposed R25 density is consistent with this framework and is supported by Officers.	The proposed LSP has been prepared in accordance with the strategic and statutory framework, including the Mundijong District Structure Plan and Shire of Serpentine Jarrahdale Loca Planning Strategy.  The proposed density (and subsequent lot size) has been made in accordance with the density range provided by the Mundijong District Structure Plan.

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Officer Comment	Applicant Comment
			Shire Officers support tree retention within POS and road verges where possible. Shire Officers note that there are many large trees present within the site and adjacent road reserves which should be retained where possible. Modifications have been recommended in regard to a Fauna Management Plan requirement for subdivisions, and various provisions relating to tree retention within POS and road reserves.	
			Liveable Neighbourhoods prescribes a minimum 10% POS provision, which must be achieved through the proposed LSP. Modifications have been recommended regarding POS provisions, to demonstrate compliance with Liveable Neighbourhoods.	
IN25/1848	15	After some discussion with other residents, there are some thoughts I would like to share.	The LSP proposes a residential density of R25. The future subdivision of the	The proposed LSP has been prepared in accordance with the

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Officer Comment	Applicant Comment
		Residences should be able to rely on their local council to advocate for them and to take into account their feelings and wishes with regards to new developments. Council should show that it cares even if it has no power to affect changes.  Residents like the community feel of Mundijong now. They like the environment with its flora and fauna and the safety that comes from a community where people know each other.  Many like the larger blocks where children can still play in their backyards and are not on the streets (and sometimes getting into mischief). They like the trees and space where gardens can grow.  Residents appreciate the peace and quiet. They have managed without infrastructure and amenities, and they are reluctant to sacrifice this lifestyle.  Residents feel powerless in the face of the changes that are coming.  Comments:  Land to the east of this structure plan area is already mostly developed with homes on existing larger blocks (several 2000m2). Although this now has different zoning, a gradual transition from these blocks would be preferred, with the blocks fronting Adonis Street being larger. The same could apply to blocks on Richardson. It is not logical to go from these big blocks to 350/400m2 blocks. Density of R25 in reality provides for little flexibility and adaptability when you are comparing these new blocks with those in the townsite. R20 is marginally better.  The small block sizes proposed clearly do not reflect/preserve historical settlement patterns or preserve the character and heritage of Mundijong. We can only hope to preserve the original townsite as much as possible.	existing Mundijong urban area has been identified within the State and Local Planning Frameworks, being zoned Urban under the Metropolitan Region Scheme, and Urban Development under Local Planning Scheme No.3. The Mundijong District Structure Plan identifies the site as 'Low (Suburban) R20-35'. Therefore, the proposed R25 density is consistent with this framework and is supported by Officers. An R25 density is viewed as more appropriate than an R20 density for the site, given its close proximity to the Mundijong Town Centre, which is identified as a future District Activity Centre. The R25 density will integrate with the intended future densities of its surroundings, as prescribed by the DSP.  Shire Officers support tree retention within POS and	strategic and statutory framework, including the Mundijong District Structure Plan and Shire of Serpentine Jarrahdale Local Planning Strategy.  The proposed density (and subsequent lot size) as well as broader movement network and interface to adjoining land has been made in accordance with the density range provided by the Mundijong District Structure Plan.  The proposed LSP has been supported by a suite of technical reporting, including a civil report (including electricity, water, and telecommunication provision) and environment report.  The comment on crime is unsubstantiated.

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Officer Comment	Applicant Comment
		The applicant mentions that the plan makes provision for some existing	road verges where possible.	
		dwellings to be retained. Which dwellings are these?	Shire Officers note that there	
		Not all owners currently wish to develop. What happens to them?	are many large trees present within the subject site and the	
		The applicant states that this subdivision can be serviced by existing services after suitable extension. Western power has limited capacity for	adjacent road reserves which	
		extension at present and existing residents should not have to suffer	should be retained where possible. Modifications have	
		supply failures if the system cannot cope. Water being extended from the Paterson Road pipe may have problems due to the narrow section of the	been recommended in regard to a Fauna Management Plan	
		pipe that comes from Summerfield Road in Serpentine.	requirement for subdivisions,	
		Telecommunication must be addressed. Many existing residents have on going issues with this. Mundijong is still a 'black spot' in this regard.	and various provisions relating to tree retention	
		Residents are very concerned about a possible increase in crime as a result of the Government's Perth and Pell @ 3.5 million plan. They are	within POS and road reserves.	
		scared and overwhelmed at the prospect of new developments and the population changes this will bring. Can the applicant share their intentions re how the crime will be minimised with design principles, if at all.	The local structure plan does not force landowners to subdivide or develop their	
		All trees should be retained unless their removal is unavoidable.	properties. The LSP is a guide for future subdivision, if	
		Threatened and endangered flora/fauna to be protected and an environmental management plan required.	landowners choose to do so.  As the LSP is a guiding	
		There should be areas with deep planting zones to allow for trees that can provide shading and habitat with planting of natives beneath this canopy.	document for future subdivision, the retention or	
		Green linkages through the development could support the quenda that have been surviving locally on this land.	removal of dwellings is subject to the subdivision stage.	
		Similarly native planning in POS.	Section 4.2.4 of the LSP	
		Is a local development plan relevant to this application.	prescribes Local	

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Officer Comment	Applicant Comment
			Development Plan requirements in certain circumstances. Shire Officers have also recommended additional LDP elements for built form and tree retention.	
			New residential lots within the Mundijong District Structure Plan urban area are required to establish a connection to reticulated water and sewer, and such as power. The proposed LSP addresses servicing connections.	
			The design of the Structure Plan must be in accordance with principles of crime prevention through environmental design (CPTED). A modification has been recommended for the LSP to include these considerations.	
IN25/1927	16	Against Proposal.  Mundijong not big enough for an extra 300+ people. Not enough facilities, school not capable. Leave Mundijong as is. Not every country town needs to be developed by greedy investors.	Thank you for your submission. Although no activity centres or schools are proposed within this F6	The proposed LSP has been prepared in accordance with the strategic and statutory

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Officer Comment	Applicant Comment
		Mundijong Primary School is stretched as. Only one Doctors Surgery with only 3 Doctors. One pharmacy. All these important places will have added pressure and funding. The Doctors are already trying to get funding for more Doctors. The IGA is only small and can't handle another 150 residence. Why can't Mundijong just be left as a nice little town. Sick of investors coming in and making them all cities. I moved to Mundijong 12 months ago for the quietness. Less people and now its going to be ruined. Just because its more money for Council, doesn't mean it's the right decision. Our rates are expensive enough for less services.	Precinct, the Mundijong District Structure Plan ensures that a network of schools and activity centres are identified throughout Mundijong, to support the projected population increases.	framework, including the Mundijong District Structure Plan and Shire of Serpentine Jarrahdale Local Planning Strategy.
Survey respondent	17	Support.	Thank you for your submission.	Comment of support noted.
Survey respondent 2	18	I don't believe this development should be passed as the blocks are too small and takes away from rural lifestyle.	The LSP proposes a residential density of R25. The future subdivision of the existing Mundijong urban area has been identified within the State and Local Planning Frameworks, being zoned Urban under the Metropolitan Region Scheme, and Urban Development under Local Planning Scheme No.3. The Mundijong District Structure Plan identifies the site as 'Low (Suburban) R20-35'.	The proposed density (and subsequent lot size) has been made in accordance with the density range provided by the Mundijong District Structure Plan.

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Officer Comment	Applicant Comment
			Therefore, the proposed R25 density is consistent with this framework and is supported by Officers.	
Survey respondent 3	19	I am not against the development however I feel the block sizes are far too small for this area. It is historically a farming community and new developments should reflect this. I feel blocks should be no less than 750ms. My property is nearby and is 17 acres and I am not allowed to subdivide into 2 equal parcels. If this development gets the go ahead I will be appealing to the SAT to my lot as a precedence has been set.	The LSP proposes a residential density of R25. The future subdivision of the existing Mundijong urban area has been identified within the State and Local Planning Frameworks, being zoned Urban under the Metropolitan Region Scheme, and Urban Development under Local Planning Scheme No.3. The Mundijong District Structure Plan identifies the site as 'Low (Suburban) R20-35'. Therefore, the proposed R25 density is consistent with this framework and is supported by Officers.	Comment of support noted.  The proposed density (and subsequent lot size) has been made in accordance with the density range provided by the Mundijong District Structure Plan.
Survey respondent 4	20	This infrastructure is not about Community it's about Council wanting more income from Rates . I DO NOT agree with the whole idea of small blocks and land sales . This will create Crime in our Small community It will create carnage on our streets due to under privileged and low social	The design of the Structure Plan must be in accordance with principles of crime prevention through	The proposed density (and subsequent lot size) has been made in accordance with the density range

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Officer Comment	Applicant Comment
		economic class it has been proven many times in history and communities. But I know already what I say will not prevent this from happening Thank you council for lowering our property prices due to your greed and inexperience in this matter.	environmental design (CPTED). A modification has been recommended for the LSP to include these considerations.	provided by the Mundijong District Structure Plan. The comment on crime is unsubstantiated.
Survey respondent 5	21	No, no, no, to government housing, will make Mundijong s*&%, and they haven't even finished Whitby.	Thank you for your submission. The Local Structure Plan is an overarching document simply identifying the land use as 'Residential', to guide future detailed design at subdivision and development stages.	This is not a valid consideration.
Survey respondent 6	22	Smaller blocks with smaller houses only creates a ghetto area. Just like Byford. Already being done on Taylor Road. at the moment. This will require:  1. Deep sewerage (no infrastructure in this area except a single HP pipe leaving Whitby.  2. Where is the extra water coming from?  3.Where is the deep sewerage coming from. Used to be the shire stipulated half acre blocks because of septic systems.!!!!  4. Mundijong used to be a beautiful country town. Yes there has to be progress but not in such a big way. It has gone from one extreme to the other. Trees have been lost by the thousands, animals have lost their habitat. Yet we can't trim a trim in our own back yard without permission.	Thank you for your submission.  The LSP requires all new urban lots to establish a connection to reticulated sewerage and water services. Water supply will be achieved via an extension of existing water mains along Paterson Street. There is currently no reticulated sewerage connection to Mundijong. Sewerage infrastructure is to be	The proposed density (and subsequent lot size) has been made in accordance with the density range provided by the Mundijong District Structure Plan.  The LSP has been supported by a suite of technical reporting, including an environmental assessment, Local Water Management Plan, and civil

	Officer Comment	Applicant Comment
100mm) is at the intersection of Bishop and Soldiers Rd, already taking 350 houses at Whitby plus Court Grammar.  6. Unfortunately on the new Mundi Estate, currently under construction, because of the agreement more than 10 years ago between the shire and the developers all the large mature tree were annihilated, causing the flow on effect of possums and many other species of animals to have to relocate to Baskerville Rd to where fortunately people have taken the initiative to plant trees etc years ago. The result of this stupidity and selfishness (money) will only exacerbate the problem. Leaving nothing for future generations.  7. High density housing brings crime. Youths have nothing to do except be bored, therefor look for trouble. At the moment there is nowhere near enough police to patrol the area and the population.  8. In certain parts of the shire people on 1 acre blocks are not allowed to sub divide the block in half and yet these postage stamp blocks are being allowed.	delivered to Mundijong by Water Corporation, and has been incorporated within their long-term planning.  Shire Officers support tree retention within POS and road verges where possible. Shire Officers note that there are many large trees present within the subject site and the adjacent road reserves which should be retained where possible. Modifications have been recommended in regard to a Fauna Management Plan requirement for subdivisions, and various provisions relating to tree retention within POS and road reserves.  The design of the Structure Plan must be in accordance with principles of crime prevention through environmental design (CPTED). A modification has	drawings (including wastewater). The comment on crime is unsubstantiated.

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Officer Comment	Applicant Comment
			LSP to include these considerations.	
			Certain areas within the Shire are allocated different zonings and densities under the planning framework. The subject site is zoned 'Urban Development' under Local Planning Scheme No.3, and the Mundijong District Structure Plan identifies it as 'Low (Suburban) R20-35'. Therefore, the proposed R25 density is consistent with this framework and is supported by Officers.	
Survey respondent 7	23	I understand many aspects of development, reasons for it, environmental, water table considerations, deep sewerage etc etc I favour the growth of our town however strongly oppose the small sizes of the housing blocks. Rural no more.	Thank you for your submission. The LSP proposes a residential density of R25. The future subdivision of the existing Mundijong urban area has been identified within the State and Local Planning Frameworks, being zoned Urban under the Metropolitan Region Scheme, and Urban Development under Local	The proposed density (and subsequent lot size) has been made in accordance with the density range provided by the Mundijong District Structure Plan.  The LSP has been supported by a suite of technical reporting, including an environmental assessment, Local Water

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Officer Comment	Applicant Comment
			Planning Scheme No.3. The Mundijong District Structure Plan identifies the site as 'Low (Suburban) R20-35'. Therefore, the proposed R25 density is consistent with this framework and is supported by Officers.	Management Plan, and civil drawings (including wastewater).
Survey respondent 8	24	The small block size isn't in keeping with the rural area, I don't agree with the density of the proposed housing.	The LSP proposes a residential density of R25. The future subdivision of the existing Mundijong urban area has been identified within the State and Local Planning Frameworks, being zoned Urban under the Metropolitan Region Scheme, and Urban Development under Local Planning Scheme No.3. The Mundijong District Structure Plan identifies the site as 'Low (Suburban) R20-35'. Therefore, the proposed R25 density is consistent with this framework and is supported by Officers.	The proposed density (and subsequent lot size) has been made in accordance with the density range provided by the Mundijong District Structure Plan.

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Officer Comment	Applicant Comment
Survey respondent 9	25	I feel the block sizes are too small. Why can't you keep the small country town feel. Min size half and acre There is not enough services in Mundijong to support such a development What about the sewage, power and public transport I don't think blocks that size should be in Mundijong and what about the environment, trees, animals etc Just seems to be a money making development without keeping with the Country theme.	The LSP proposes a residential density of R25. The future subdivision of the existing Mundijong urban area has been identified within the State and Local Planning Frameworks, being zoned Urban under the Metropolitan Region Scheme, and Urban Development under Local Planning Scheme No.3. The Mundijong District Structure Plan identifies the site as 'Low (Suburban) R20-35'. Therefore, the proposed R25 density is consistent with this framework and is supported by Officers.	The proposed density (and subsequent lot size) has been made in accordance with the density range provided by the Mundijong District Structure Plan.
Survey respondent 10	26	I have lived and raised my children in this wonderful community, over 20 years I have been here and I have serious concerns about the latest developments, the blocks are incredibly small, this is completely detrimental to our "rural community" and looks only like a mares money grab to developers and extra rates to the council IT CERTAINLY ISNT what's best for our community or the residents that would preside there. the result of small blocks are people Crammed in, no space for kids so they pour onto streets, everyone in each others pockets, discontent residents AND what about the sewage for so many in such a small area, I	The LSP proposes a residential density of R25. The future subdivision of the existing Mundijong urban area has been identified within the State and Local Planning Frameworks, being zoned Urban under the Metropolitan Region Scheme,	The proposed LSP has been prepared in accordance with the strategic and statutory framework, including the Mundijong District Structure Plan and Shire of

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Officer Comment	Applicant Comment
		am 100% against this development. When I voted for [redacted] I was warned I would regret it, whoever's warned me it seems they were correct	and Urban Development under Local Planning Scheme No.3. The Mundijong District Structure Plan identifies the site as 'Low (Suburban) R20-35'. Therefore, the proposed R25 density is consistent with this framework and is supported by Officers.	Serpentine Jarrahdale Loca Planning Strategy.  The LSP has been supported by a site of technical reporting, including an open space strategy and wastewater.
Survey respondent 11	27	I am fully against this proposal, the blocks are WAYYYYY too small for not only a rural area but for the residents and cramming so many into such a small space causes a lot of community problems also. This in not in the best interest of the community it only serves to benefit the developers and council \$	The LSP proposes a residential density of R25. The future subdivision of the existing Mundijong urban area has been identified within the State and Local Planning Frameworks, being zoned Urban under the Metropolitan Region Scheme, and Urban Development under Local Planning Scheme No.3. The Mundijong District Structure Plan identifies the site as 'Low (Suburban) R20-35'. Therefore, the proposed R25 density is consistent with this	The proposed density (and subsequent lot size) has been made in accordance with the density range provided by the Mundijong District Structure Plan.

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Officer Comment	Applicant Comment
			framework and is supported by Officers.	
Survey respondent 12	28	I disagree with this development and don't support it. We are supposed to be a farming/rural community and these houses will take that away. There is nowhere to ride horses and these small houses will create more problems with crime. The roads and traffic now can't cope with the influx of new and more people.	The LSP proposes a residential density of R25. The future subdivision of the existing Mundijong urban area has been identified within the State and Local Planning Frameworks, being zoned Urban under the Metropolitan Region Scheme, and Urban Development under Local Planning Scheme No.3. The Mundijong District Structure Plan identifies the site as 'Low (Suburban) R20-35'. Therefore, the proposed R25 density is consistent with this framework and is supported by Officers.	The proposed LSP has been prepared in accordance with the strategic and statutory framework, including the Mundijong District Structur Plan and Shire of Serpentine Jarrahdale Loc Planning Strategy.  The LSP has been supported by a suite of technical reporting, including a Transport Impact Assessment, demonstrating it is satisfactory from a transporplanning perspective.
			Transport Impact Assessments have been undertaken in association with the Mundijong DSP and the proposed LSP, demonstrating that traffic volumes are able to be	The comment on crime is unsubstantiated.

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Officer Comment	Applicant Comment
			managed through upgrades to the movement network.  The design of the Structure Plan must be in accordance with principles of crime prevention through environmental design (CPTED). A modification has been recommended for the LSP to include these considerations.	