Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Applicant Response	Officer Comment													
Department of Planning, Lands and Heritages		Thank you for referring Shire of Serpentine-Jarrahdale Development Approval application PA24/106 for Lot 350 Abernethy Road, Oakford.	No response.	Noted.													
		The monopole proposed is adjacent to Bush Forever area 65 – Abernethy Road, Bushland. It abuts Lot 351 to the south and Lot 96 to the east, these Lots contain areas mapped as regionally significant bushland (within Bush Forever area 65) in accordance with State Planning Policy 2.8 Bushland Policy for the Perth Metropolitan Region. Lot 350 no longer occurs within the boundaries of Bush Forever area 65 as it was removed from Bush Forever as part of the Metropolitan Region Scheme Amendment 1335/57.															
		It is understood based on the drawings provided showing the location of the proposed monopole, no vegetation clearing will be required to support the development, as the location is already cleared and void of vegetation. Lot 350 and adjoining land form part of the Armadale Palusplain wetland and Lot 350 is within 55-60m of Conservation category wetland (Abernethy Road, Bushland) occurring within Bush Forever area 65 on adjacent Lot 96. It is also understood the Oaklands Main Drain abuts Lot 350 to the west and no modifications to drainage are proposed as part of this development.															
															The following conditions are recommended should development approval be granted.		
		No regionally significant bushland within Bush Forever area 65 is to be removed or disturbed.															
		No building materials, rubbish or any other deleterious matter shall be deposited in Bush Forever area 65.															
		The development, including construction, access and ongoing maintenance, shall not result in disturbance of existing native vegetation within Bush Forever area 65.															
		Any adverse impacts during construction such as interference with pre- development hydrology, weed infestations, spread of dieback and dust															

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Applicant Response	Officer Comment
		to bushland associated with Bush Forever area 65 should be avoided and/or adequately managed.		
Water Corporation	B.	Thank you for your letter dated 11th March 2024 requesting comment on the proposed development at 445 Abernethy Road, Oakford. The proposal does not affect any Water Corporation Assets. Water Corporation has no objection.	Noted.	Noted.
		The information provided above is subject to review and may change. If the proposal has not proceeded within the next six months, please contact us to confirm that this information is still valid.		
DBCA	C.	The Department of Biodiversity Conservation and Attractions - Swan Region Office has no comments on the application.	No response.	Noted.
	1	As the location of said tower is close to our home, I strongly oppose the location of the tower. I have chronic health (Rest of the submission was unable to be read)	No address provided to comment. Please refer to general comments on perceived health impacts in attached letter.	Noted – refer to Safety and Visual amenity sections of the report.
	2	Myself and my wife are totally opposed to the "tower" being erected on Lot 350 Abernethy Road. The cancer council states at least ¼ of a mile from homes and not next to a "bush forever" and native wildlife due to the "radiation".	Please refer to general comments on perceived health impacts in attached letter.	Noted – refer to Safety section of the report.
	3	Why was a submission form for the mobile tower sent only to a few people? These towers will affect people including children for a good distance and are too close to housing to be safe The Cancer Council states that these towers should be at least ¼ of a mile from housing, and could be further depending on the number of antennas and this tower looks to have more than 10. The Government and the telcos say there is no short term effect but the long term effect especially on children is debatable.	We cannot comment on who has directly provided a submission form as Council undertook this process.	Application was advertised in accordance with LPP1.4 - Consultation for Planning Matters. Also refer to Safety section of the report.

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Applicant Response	Officer Comment
		In areas that have had mobile towers for some time doctors are reporting increases in headaches, nausea, and cancer etc. it can only increase the problem in people that suffer from these during normal life.		
		As early as 2011, the World Health Organization and the International Agency for research on Cancer declared that Radiofrequency radiation to be cancer causing, I would think that these people have done their research well and would believe them before our mobile phone operators. Data from Spain in 2003 listed discomforts of people living within 50 to 300 meters from these towers.		
		Within 300 meters, fatigue, migraines, dizziness, trouble remembering, skin infections and cardio vascular problems.		
		Within 50 to 150 meters, extreme discomfort, increased irritability, sleep disorders, headaches, dizziness, nausea.		
		A German study also showed a significant increased likelihood 3x higher of developing cancer at a young age for people living within 400 meters of these towers.		
		In addition, current studies suggest both short term and long term health risks for households within 300-400 meters of a tower. Thus great precautions should be taken to build towers away from the more vulnerable population such as children.		
		There is a tower already being built in Charolais Court and grouping these towers close together can only increase the problems stated above.		
		There is plenty of open land down Abernethy Road past Kargotich Road were the towers can be built without effecting people.		
	4	Totally object to the proposed telecommunication tower. 1. Cancer Risk – Towers have not been around long enough to prove a cancer risk to humans and my family do not wish to be subject to any EXTRA risk associated from the tower.	No address provided to comment on proximity of monopole. Please refer to general comments on perceived	Noted – refer to the Colocation, Visual amenity and Safety section of the report.

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Applicant Response	Officer Comment
	5	 Another tower is only 1km away (New one on Hopkinson Road). Living on our property for 24 years and did not move to semi-rural property to look out over ugly tower. We will be able to see the tower from our kitchen / living area and back veranda above the now lovely tree line in our back yard. Due to the population growth in Byford and technology's continuous growth, extra towers maybe needed. However put them on open fields along Kargotich Road where some are located already or maybe put them in the middle of Byford as they are the people that require the tower. However, you cannot put it near too many humans so why is it going near my family??? Why wasn't I informed? The same as most of the street? I OBJECT TO THIS PROPOSAL. Don't need, there are 7 x towers in less than 3km radius, proven to effect wildlife. Absolutely no safe level to exposure to radiation level. Enormous health and safety risks. 	health impacts, visual impacts to neighbours and colocation on existing facilities/alternative sites in attached letter. Please also refer to the submitted planning report for comment on other sites in the area that were assessed. We cannot comment on who was directly provided a submission form as Council undertook this process. Please refer to general comments on perceived health impacts and colocation in the attached letter.	Application was advertised in accordance with LPP1.4 - Consultation for Planning Matters. Also refer to Safety section of the report.
	6	Hurry up and build the f*** cell tower. Sick off trying to run a business and can't even get mobile reception in the estate.	Support for proposal is noted.	Noted.
	7	Health risk associated with RF emission from the tower. It should not be in close proximity to the residential area.	Please refer to general comments on perceived health impacts and colocation in the attached letter.	Refer to the Safety section of the report

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Applicant Response	Officer Comment
	8	Likely to get better mobile reception in the area. After 6 years of living with 1 bar reception and inaction by LGA & others, we need better mobile reception in the area.	Support for proposal is noted.	Noted.
	9	I look forward to the benefits of improved telecommunication in the area.	Support for proposal is noted.	Noted.
	10	I found out about this tower proposal during my attendance to the March Council meeting for the objection to the school the council had recommended be passed on the corner of Kargotich and Abernethy Road that will impact traffic on my primary fence line greatly. Upon further research, this phone/communications tower is directly behind our house also, of which will be in plain view of our alfresco. This will further impact our investment greatly at which I am at a loss as to why these approvals are being done so on the doorsteps of these rural investments of which I stand to lose significant equity. I ask if any of the Shire members would be happy to hand over great value of their properties due to these decisions of others which sit well outside of the norm for rural zoning amenities. Especially considering the large spaces and 100's of acres only an extra kilometre or so down the road.	No address provided to comment on proximity of monopole. Please see general comments on property values and visual impacts to neighbours in the attached letter.	Application was advertised in accordance with LPP1.4 - Consultation for Planning Matters. Also refer to the Visual amenity and Safety section of the report. Further, property prices are not considerations for development applications in accordance with the Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015.
	11	Too close to residential houses. I have chronic health issues so certainly don't need radiation to add to this.	Please refer to general comments on perceived health impacts and colocation/alternative sites in the attached letter.	Noted – refer to Safety and Visual amenity sections of the report.

Submitter No	Submitter Comments	Applicant Response	Officer Comment
12	As a nearby land owner, I will have direct line of site from my property, the proposed height of the tower will have visual impact. The amenity and rural character of the area will be further impacted as where we used to see trees, we will now see telecommunication towers. While the chosen location may have the required 200m setback with the Bush Forever site to the East, it does not have this setback from the rural residential area directly to the West. All nearby residents and those passing through the area will be impacted by the visual disturbance a tower of this height will create and this application should be refused.	No address provided to comment on proximity of monopole. Please refer to general comments on visual impacts to neighbours and colocation/alternative sites in the attached letter.	Noted – refer to Visual amenity sections of the report.
13	 "1. Average cell tower coverage is 40 km and up to 72 km. What is the reason for wanting so many towers all in the same vicinity and near homes? 2. Scientific documented research include increased CANCER risk, CELLULAR risk, stress HEADACHES, SLEEPLESSNESS, GENETIC damage, changes to the REPRODUCTIVE system, MEMORY deficits, impacts to the NERVOUS system, FATIGUE, NAUSEA, IRRITABILITY, LOSS OF APPETITE, TINNUTIS. The TOTAL impact on human health is still being seriously investigated, therefore prevention is much safer than people losing their lives because of the ignorance and selfish wants of a few. 3. RF waves can interfere with MEDICAL devices including PACEMAKERS and INSULIN PUMPS. 4. A cell damaged by ionising radiation can lose it's ability to control the rate at which it reproduces - this is CANCER. RADIATION at low doses can have this effect, the most COMMON RADIATION induced cancers are LEUKAEMIA, SKIN TUMOURS, THYROID CANCER, TUMOURS in various other organs also occur. Unborn children exposed to ionising RADIATION are at greater risk of developing LEUKAEMIA, mutations of cells can lead to miscarriages and birth defects. CATARACTS, effects on BONE MARROW resulting in a 	telecommunication facility coverage is incorrect. Generalising, existing facilities only cover a radius between 1.5km and 2.0km. This proposed facility is addressing a lack of service in the Oakford/Byford area. No address provided to comment on proximity of monopole. Please refer to	Application was advertised in accordance with LPP1.4 - Consultation for Planning Matters. Also refer to Colocation, Visual Amenity and Safety sections of the report.

Submitter N	No	Submitter Comments	Applicant Response	Officer Comment
Submitter		reduction of white blood cells = less effective immunity system to fight infections. What consideration has been given to the employees building and working on these towers? THERE IS ABSOLUTELY NO SAFE LEVEL OF EXPOSURE TO IONISING RADIATION. 5. AFFECTS ON WILDLIFE AND ANIMALS. This tower has an application to set it up next to our precious BUSH FOREVER SITE. As we now have SEVEN TOWERS all within a close radius of the intended one at 445 Abernethy Rd Oakford and the service is obviously being manipulated to get a favourable result for the Telco's. 6. EMR can cause physical and physiological changes in people due to thermal effects generated from absorption of microwave RADIATIONS. These electro magnetic power RADIATIONS AFFECTS BIRDS AND BEES. Birds have larger body to weight ratio in comparison to people so they ABSORB more RADIATION in comparison to people. The fluid content of the bird is lesser so it heats up very fast. The MAGNETIC field from the tower DISTORTS the birds NAVIGATION skills and they become DISORIENTATED and fly into the towers. A LARGE NO OF BIRDS DIE EACH YEAR FROM COLLISIONS WITH THESE TOWERS. ANIMAL MUTATIONS occur when the DNA CAN'T BE REPAIRED, this can result in TUMOURS and effect an animals ability to reproduce, along with physical deformities from generation to generation. Besides the abundance of wildlife living in this Bush Forever Site the BLACK COCKY'S have been staying longer and more frequently due to loss of habitat elsewhere in the Shire. The young birds can be heard being fed by the parents.		Officer Comment
		7. Conveniently, the Shire only chose about a few people to request submissions from regarding this tower. EVERYONE HAS A RIGHT TO KNOW THE CONSEQUENCES AND BE ABLE TO OBJECT TO THIS HEALTH RISK. I am NOT the only one in the area that has a very valid		

Submitter	No	Submitter Comments	Applicant Response	Officer Comment
		MEDICAL reason to be very concerned for my health because of this RADIATION THREAT. AS STATED AT THE BEGINNING OF THIS SUBMISSION THERE ARE SEVEN TOWERS ALL MUCH LESS THAN 40 KM APART AND STILL OUR SERVICES FROM THESE TELCO'S IS DEPLORABLE."		
	14	"The enhanced 'rural amenity' of the rural residential areas of Oakford are being rapidly eroded by applications such as this. I object to the amenity impact this will have, as I will be able to see this monopole above the tree line when I look to the hills from my house. Perhaps the fee being paid to the landholder in this application could be divided up amongst those who will be able to see if from their house?"	Please refer to general comments on visual impacts to neighbours in the attached letter.	
	15	We the owners are not keen on a tower that could potentially cause, illness or cancer from the voltage in the future. We also didn't purchase our 5 acres in Oakford many years ago to have this type of structure around us. We thought we had moved to the country away from these possible infrastructures that could potentially harm our health."	Please refer to general comments on visual impacts to neighbours in the attached letter.	Noted – refer to Safety section of the report.
	16	With the horrible signal in Byford for Vodafone and Optus users, we definitely need this addition in Byford.	Support for the proposal is noted.	Noted.
	17	Better reception.	Support for the proposal is noted.	Noted.