



WAPC

Western
Australian
Planning
Commission

LEADING A
CONTEMPORARY
PLANNING SYSTEM




January 2026

Metropolitan Region Scheme Amendment 1426 (Complex)

Lyon and Kinley Roads, Banjup

Report on Submissions

City of Cockburn



Contents

Report on Submissions

1.	Introduction	1
2.	The proposed amendment	1
3.	Environmental Protection Authority advice	1
4.	Call for submissions	1
5.	Submissions	1
6.	Main issues raised in submissions	2
7.	Responses and determinations	3
8.	Coordination of local and region planning schemes	3
9.	Conclusion and recommendation	4

Schedule 1	listing of submissions
Schedule 2	summary of submissions and determinations
Schedule 3	amendment figure (as advertised)
Appendix A	list of plans (as advertised)
Appendix B	submissions

Acknowledgement of Country

The Western Australian Planning Commission acknowledges Aboriginal people as the traditional custodians of Western Australia. We pay our respects to the Ancestors and Elders, both past and present, and the ongoing connection between people, land, waters, and community. We acknowledge those who continue to share knowledge, their traditions and culture to support our journey for reconciliation. In particular, we recognise land and cultural heritage as places that hold great significance for Aboriginal people.

Disclaimer

This document has been published by the Western Australian Planning Commission. Any representation, statement, opinion, or advice expressed or implied in this publication is made in good faith and on the basis that the government, its employees, and agents are not liable for any damage or loss whatsoever which may occur as a result of action taken or not taken, as the case may be, in respect of any representation, statement, opinion or advice referred to herein. Professional advice should be obtained before applying the information contained in this document to particular circumstances.

© State of Western Australia

Published by the
Western Australian Planning Commission

Gordon Stephenson House
140 William Street
Perth WA 6000

Locked Bag 2506
Perth WA 6001

Internet: www.dplh.wa.gov.au
Email: info@dplh.wa.gov.au

Phone: (08) 6551 8002
National Relay Service: 13 36 77

Amendment 1426 (Complex)
Report on Submissions & Submissions

File: RLS/1124

Published January 2026

This document is available in alternative formats on application to the
Department of Planning, Lands and Heritage Communications Branch.

1. Introduction

At its May 2024 meeting, the Western Australian Planning Commission (WAPC) resolved to proceed with this amendment to the Metropolitan Region Scheme (MRS), in accordance with the provisions of section 35 of the *Planning and Development Act 2005* and regulation 4 of the Planning and Development (Region Planning Schemes) Regulations 2023.

2. The proposed amendment

The amendment proposal was described in the previously published **Amendment Report**, and a description of the proposal is repeated below.

The purpose of the amendment is to rezone an approximately 57.76 hectares from the Rural - Water Protection zone to the Urban and Urban Deferred zones in the Metropolitan Region Scheme (MRS). The proposed amendment will primarily facilitate future residential development with areas of public open space.

Lifting of Urban Deferment Requirements

A portion of the subject land is being zoned Urban Deferred, as the following requirements are to be addressed prior to being transferred to the Urban zone:

- Confirmation of the Primary Regional Roads (PRR) reservation requirements for the future widening of Rowley Road.

3. Environmental Protection Authority advice

On 31 October 2024, the Environmental Protection Authority (EPA) determined that the amendment did not require assessment under Part IV of the *Environmental Protection Act 1986*, and provided advice on flora and vegetation, terrestrial fauna and inland waters.

A copy of the notice from the EPA is in Appendix A of the **Amendment Report**.

4. Call for submissions

The amendment was advertised for public submissions for a total of 69 days from 24 December 2024 to 03 March 2025.

The amendment was made available for public inspection online at the Department of Planning, Lands and Heritage website.

During the public inspection period, notice of the amendment was published on three occasions in *The West Australian* and two occasions in the *Sunday Times*. The WAPC made reasonable attempts to notify and invite affected landowners, local government/s and other public authorities to comment on the amendment.

5. Submissions

71 submissions were received on the amendment; 43 submissions objected, 9 submissions were of support and 19 were of general comments, non-objection or no comment.

Copies of all written submissions are contained within this report.

6. Main issues raised in submissions

Perth and Peel@3.5million / South Metropolitan Peel Sub-Regional Planning Framework

Submissions advise that the amendment is not identified for urbanisation in the *Perth and Peel@3.5million/South Metropolitan Peel Sub-Regional Planning Framework* (the Framework).

WAPC Response: The *Perth and Peel@3.5million* and associated Sub-Regional Frameworks are the first step in the ongoing process of refining and detailing planning proposals for an area. The Framework states that this refinement will continue through the region and local planning schemes, structure planning, subdivision and/or development.

Notwithstanding the site's designation as Rural Residential in the Framework, the WAPC supports the urbanisation of the site as it is a relatively unique proposal which completes the urbanisation of the south Banjup locality and maximises the use of existing services and infrastructure.

The WAPC advises that this recommendation responds to the individual and particular circumstances of this proposal and is not necessarily a recommendation that may be applicable in other areas or circumstances.

Jandakot Groundwater Mound

Submissions advise that the amendment is inconsistent with the provisions of draft *State Planning Policy 2.9 Planning for Water* (draft SPP 2.9). However, since the conclusion of advertising draft SPP 2.9 has been finalised and adopted as *State Planning Policy 2.9 Water* (SPP 2.9).

WAPC Response: *State Planning Policy 2.9 Water* (SPP 2.9) states that there is a general presumption against new urban or industrial land uses in the Rural - Water Protection zone. However, SPP 2.9 recognises that there are situations where development may be appropriate following a government led strategic planning process which determines an Urban rezoning is the preferred outcome for the land.

The site is designated as Rural Residential in the *South Metropolitan Peel Sub-Regional Planning Framework* and therefore inconsistent with the requirements of SPP 2.9. However, the WAPC does have discretion when considering the merits of a particular case.

SPP 2.9 provides a range of measures which should be considered including approval of a District Water Management Strategy (DWMS), consideration of the *Water Quality Protection Note 25 - Land Use Compatibility Tables for Public Drinking Water Source Areas*, and a connection to reticulated sewerage.

A DWMS has been assessed by the Department of Water and Environmental Regulation (DWER), and should the amendment be finalised, the priority water status of the site would change from Priority 2 (P2) to Priority 3* (P3*). The site will be connected to reticulated sewerage and only compatible land uses would be considered. Therefore, the expansion of the Urban zone at this location is not expected to have a significant detrimental impact on the overall Jandakot Groundwater Protection Area noting the abutting similar land uses to the north and west.

Environmental Matters

The proposal will result in the clearing of vegetation and will negatively impact on flora and fauna.

WAPC Response: The amendment is supported by an Environmental Assessment Report (EAR) which has informed a concept plan which has identified the vegetation worthy of retention, with future public open space areas being positioned to retain the highest quality vegetation.

The EAR was considered by the EPA who determined that the amendment does not require formal assessment under the *Environmental Protection Act 1986*. However, the EPA provided advice on flora and vegetation, terrestrial fauna and inland waters and that these matters were to be given further consideration in subsequent planning stages.

Therefore, the environmental investigations for the site will be further refined through the subsequent local structure planning stage which includes additional survey work, consideration by the City of Cockburn and state government agencies and includes a separate public consultation process.

Traffic and Transport Matters

Submissions have advised of existing traffic issues which will be exacerbated by the amendment.

WAPC Response: Main Roads Western Australia (MRWA) has advised that they are currently designing upgrade works to Rowley Road to the east and west of Kwinana Freeway which include consideration of the Lyon and Kinley Road intersection, which is anticipated to assist in alleviating local traffic concerns.

In terms of connecting Descanso Loop with Kinley Road, the current concept plan and supporting Transport Impact Assessment do not propose a vehicle connection, noting that any connection is outside the scope of the region scheme amendment process and is a matter for consideration by the City of Cockburn. It is noted that further consideration will be given to transport matters during the more detailed planning processes (for example, local structure planning) which include a separate public consultation process.

Future Land Uses

Submissions have requested that a range of future land uses either be considered or not allowed for this site.

WAPC Response: The amendment seeks to zone the site to the Urban and Urban Deferred zones only. The actual designation of land uses occurs in the subsequent, more detailed local structure planning stage which is subject to consideration by the City of Cockburn, state government agencies and includes a separate public consultation period.

It should be acknowledged that certain land uses will not be supported (for example, petrol stations) given the land is located within the Jandakot Groundwater Protection Area and buffer area to existing extraction bores.

7. Responses and determinations

The responses to all submissions are detailed in Schedule 2. It is recommended the amendment be adopted for finalisation as advertised.

8. Coordination of local and region planning schemes

Under section 126(3) of the *Planning and Development Act 2005* (the Act), the WAPC has the option of concurrently rezoning land being zoned Urban under the Metropolitan Region Scheme, to zone which is consistent with the objective of the Urban zone in the corresponding local planning scheme.

In this regard, the local planning scheme zone deemed consistent with the objectives of the Urban zone in the City of Cockburn Town Planning Scheme No. 3 is the Development zone.

Development Zone

The City of Cockburn Town Planning Scheme No. 3 (TPS 3) requires that Development zoned areas are identified in *Table 9 - Development Areas* to indicate that a structure plan is required. However, Schedule 2, Part 4 of the Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015 provides:

“A structure plan in respect of an area of land in the Scheme area may be prepared if —

- a) the area is —
 - (i) all or part of a zone identified in this Scheme as an area suitable for urban or industrial development; and
 - (ii) identified in this Scheme as an area requiring a structure plan to be prepared before any future subdivision or development is undertaken;”

These provisions form part of the Deemed Provisions, which apply automatically to all local planning schemes. As a result, a text amendment to list the subject land in a Development Area is not required for structure planning to proceed when land is zoned Development.

Special Control Area (SCA)

The amendment proposes to rezone the land from the Rural - Water Protection zone to the Urban zone under the Metropolitan Region Scheme. Should the amendment be finalised, the Public Drinking Water Source Area (PDWSA) classification for the land will change from Priority 2 (P2) to Priority 3* (P3*). Section 7.5 of *State Planning Policy 2.9 Water* provides:

- "i) identify Priority 3* areas as Special Control Area (or equivalent) in the local planning scheme; and
- "j) include provisions in the local planning scheme for Priority 3 areas.”

As the inclusion of a SCA (or equivalent) for P3* areas is being considered for several locations within the City of Cockburn, the preparation of a SCA (or equivalent) for these P3* areas is to be considered as a separate planning process.

In this respect, the WAPC has resolved to concurrently amend the City of Cockburn Town Planning Scheme No. 3 to transfer the amendment area to the Development zone, as this will allow for more detailed local structure planning to progress which includes further consideration of environmental and water management considerations.

9. Conclusion and recommendation

This report summarises the background to Amendment 1426 (Complex) and examines the various submissions made on it.

The Western Australian Planning Commission (WAPC), after considering the submissions, is satisfied that the amendment as shown generally on the **Amendment Figure - Proposal 1** in Schedule 3, and in detail on the Amending Plan listed in Appendix A should be approved and finalised.

Having regard to the above, the WAPC recommends that the Minister for Planning and Lands presents the amendment to His Excellency the Governor of Western Australia for his consideration and approval and subsequently commend the amendment to both Houses of Parliament.

Schedule 1

listing of submissions

Metropolitan Region Scheme Amendment 1426 (Complex)

Lyon and Kinley Roads, Banjup

Submission Number	Submitter
1	ATCO Australia
2	Name removed at the request of the submitter
3	Name removed at the request of the submitter
4	Name removed at the request of the submitter
5	Name removed at the request of the submitter
6	Name removed at the request of the submitter
7	Name removed at the request of the submitter
8	George Aleksic
9	Jovana Jovanovic
10	Name removed at the request of the submitter
11	Name removed at the request of the submitter
12	Name removed at the request of the submitter
13	Name removed at the request of the submitter
14	Allan O'Connor
15	Public Transport Authority of Western Australia
16	Name removed at the request of the submitter
17	Name removed at the request of the submitter
18	Name removed at the request of the submitter
19	Name removed at the request of the submitter
20	Aska Lang
21	Jelena Jovanovic
22	Name removed at the request of the submitter
23	Name removed at the request of the submitter
24	David Bushell
25	Mina Roberts
26	Name removed at the request of the submitter
27	Department of Energy, Mines, Industry Regulation and Safety
28	Name removed at the request of the submitter
29	Department of Water and Environmental Regulation
30	Water Corporation
31	Department of Transport
32	Department of Fire and Emergency Services
33	Simon Fryer
34	Name removed at the request of the submitter
35	Name removed at the request of the submitter
36	Name removed at the request of the submitter
37	Name removed at the request of the submitter
38	Name removed at the request of the submitter
39	Name removed at the request of the submitter
40	Julie Anne Ellison
41	Name removed at the request of the submitter
42	Name removed at the request of the submitter
43	Banjup Residents Group
44	Timothy Smith
45	Edward Chidlow
46	Gail Christensen
47	Shaun Hack
48	Ian J Teale
49	Name removed at the request of the submitter

Submission Number **Submitter**

50 Jared Scherer
51 Name removed at the request of the submitter
52 Name removed at the request of the submitter
53 Name removed at the request of the submitter
54 Name removed at the request of the submitter
55 Name removed at the request of the submitter
56 Joan and Ian Weston
57 Name removed at the request of the submitter
58 Department of Health
59 City of Kwinana
60 City of Cockburn
61 Main Roads Western Australia
62 Anwen Taplin
63 Denelle Kennedy
64 Pamela Kennedy
65 Name removed at the request of the submitter
66 Name removed at the request of the submitter
67 Name removed at the request of the submitter
68 Owners of Lot 24 Rowley Road & Lot 23 Lyon Road, Banjup
69 Department of Primary Industries and Regional Development
70 QUBE Property Group Pty Ltd

Late Submissions **Submitter**

71 Department of Education

Schedule 2

summary of submissions and determinations

Submission: 1, 15, 27, 31 & 61

Submitter: ATCO, Public Transport Authority, Department of Energy, Mines, Industry Regulation and Safety, Department of Transport, Main Roads Western Australia

Summary of Submission: COMMENT
The above state government agencies and infrastructure organisations raise no objections, no comment or provide general comments that relate to the subsequent more detailed stages of the planning and development process.

Planning Comment: Comments noted.
Where applicable, the proponent has been advised of the above comments.

Determination: Submissions noted.

Submission: 2

Submitter: Name removed at the request of the submitter

Summary of Submission: COMMENT
The submitter supports the amendment subject to all the proposed area being rezoned to Urban with no Urban Deferred. The amendment does not represent why the developers had their access removed from Lot 30. The land in question over the whole lot has areas of the same fauna and flora and makes no sense to zone any part of the land differently to the other.

The amendment report states 57 ha is to be rezoned. However, it also refers to 50 m buffer zones around REW. Where are these located as there are wetland trees on most of the lots. Why is a 50 m buffer required when other parts along Tapper Road do not have this setback from a REW.

Planning Comment: Comments noted.
The Urban Deferred zone is required as further investigation by MRWA will determine the future Rowley Road widening requirements. Once this has occurred this area can be reserved Primary Regional Roads (or zoned Urban if all or part is not required) in the MRS.

The proposed buffer around a Resource Enhancement Wetland is a matter subject to further survey work, assessment and refinement in the subsequent local structure planning stage.

Determination: Submission noted.

Submission: 3, 6, 22 & 34

Submitter: Names removed at the request of the submitters

Summary of Submission: OBJECTION

Planning Comment: No comments were provided.

Determination: Submissions noted.

Submission: 4

Submitter: Name removed at the request of the submitter

Summary of Submission: COMMENT
The submitter opposes the amendment if the land is used for government housing. However, they support using land for residential housing like the rest of the suburb and for parks, shops and pub.

Planning Comment: Comments noted.
Refer to the 'Future Land Uses' section within Part 6 of the **Report on Submissions**.

Determination: Submission noted.

Submission: 5

Submitter: Name removed at the request of the submitter

Summary of Submission: OBJECTION
The submitter advises that the amendment will affect wildlife habitats. Aubin Grove already has little natural bushland that has been conserved. Many other land developments dedicate far more land to protect reserves in comparison to Aubin Grove.

There is a residence on Kinley Road which is a voluntary male drug and alcohol rehabilitation facility. This residence has run inconspicuously due to its surroundings as it is a low traffic area with few private residents. If the amendment is approved, there could be a decline of people accessing the facility due to the increase of visibility (properties, people and traffic).

There could be young children in the direct vicinity of this facility which is unacceptable. This is a suburban area, located close by is Aubin Grove Primary School. The area is relatively closed off from local foot traffic doesn't impact the residential surrounds.

Linking Descanso Loop and Kinley Road is an issue. There was a proposal to open access from Kinley Road to Descanso Loop, enabling it to become a thoroughfare from Rowley Road. Descanso Loop holds a lot of traffic, and it would be unsafe to allow additional traffic.

The submitter and their husband purchased their land 15 years ago, have a young family and enjoy the location due to its location in respect to traffic.

Planning Comment: Comments noted.
Refer to the 'Planning Framework,' 'Traffic and Transport Matters' and 'Future Land Uses' sections within Part 6 of the **Report on Submissions**.

It is noted that matters relating to the voluntary male drug and alcohol rehabilitation facility is outside the scope of the region scheme amendment process. The amendment only seeks to determine whether the site should be zoned Urban and Urban Deferred in the MRS.

Determination: Submission dismissed.

Submission: 7

Submitter: Name removed at the request of the submitter

Summary of Submission: OBJECTION
The submitter opposes the amendment as follows:

Aubin Grove is currently lacking the infrastructure to and will struggle further by the addition of more residential land, as follows:

- No fuel station in Aubin Grove or 4 surrounding suburbs.
- No car wash in Aubin Grove or 4 surrounding suburbs.
- Lack of shopping precincts especially a variety of supermarket options and food outlets.

Oppose to the opening of Descanso Loop to Kinley Road. As follows:

- Influx of traffic.
- Influx of noise.
- Providing a route for escaping the freeway in peak times to reach Rowley Road.
- Influx of traffic during school hours from residential development as there are no other alternative routes aside from Rowley/Camden.

Please consider supporting the current residents that are lacking the infrastructure needed in the area and surroundings before tens of hectares become more residential homes.

Planning Comment: Comments noted.
Refer to the 'Traffic and Transport Matters' and 'Future Land Uses' sections within Part 6 of the **Report on Submissions**.

Determination: Submission dismissed.

Submission: 8

Submitter: G Aleksic

Summary of Submission: OBJECTION
The submitter advises that not to fix freeway traffic with opening Descanso Loop and disturbing Aubin Grove residents as an alternative freeway route.

It is recommended that a petrol station or another shop be built before bringing more residents. We stand united for our kids' future.

Planning Comment: Comments noted.
Refer to the 'Traffic and Transport Matters' and 'Future Land Uses' sections within Part 6 of the **Report on Submissions**.

Determination: Submission dismissed.

Submission: 9

Submitter: J Jovanovic

Summary of Submission: OBJECTION
The submitter lives in the neighbouring suburb. There is a need for more fuel stations, shops like Coles, Aldi or another IGA and more green space.

The submitter and their sister live on Descanso Loop and are opposed to its opening. The submitter lives next to Lyon Road and many use it in lieu of the freeway causing chaos on suburban roads. They like this happening to another local street.

Planning Comment: Comments noted.
Refer to the 'Traffic and Transport Matters' and 'Future Land Uses' sections within Part 6 of the **Report on Submissions**.

Determination: Submission dismissed.

Submission: 10

Submitter: Name removed at the request of the submitter

Summary of Submission: OBJECTION
The submitter opposes the amendment for additional housing. The roads and infrastructure on the southern part of Aubin Grove struggles with the current traffic and destruction of the bushland. Future developments need to start going up and not continuing on this destructive urban sprawl.

Planning Comment: Comments noted.
Refer to the 'Planning Framework,' 'Environmental Matters,' 'Traffic and Transport Matters' and 'Future Land Uses' sections within Part 6 of the **Report on Submissions**.

Determination: Submission dismissed.

Submission: 11

Submitter: Name removed at the request of the submitter

Summary of Submission: OBJECTION
The submitter knows how many animals and birds live in the bushland behind their property. Kangaroos, quenda, lizards and black cockatoos are frequently

seen in the trees and bush. Don't want these birds and animals to no longer have a safe space to live.

Planning Comment: Comments noted.
Refer to the 'Planning Framework' and 'Environmental Matters' sections within Part 6 of the **Report on Submissions**.

Determination: Submission dismissed.

Submission: 12

Submitter: Name removed at the request of the submitter

Summary of Submission: OBJECTION
The submitter opposes the loss of beautiful bush and native wildlife and privacy. There are worsening traffic conditions in the area.

Planning Comment: Comments noted.
Refer to the 'Planning Framework,' 'Traffic and Transport Matters' and 'Environmental Matters' sections within Part 6 of the **Report on Submissions**.

Determination: Submission dismissed.

Submission: 13

Submitter: Name removed at the request of the submitter

Summary of Submission: OBJECTION
Wildlife concerns.

Planning Comment: Comments noted.
Refer to the 'Planning Framework' and 'Environmental Matters' sections within Part 6 of the **Report on Submissions**.

Determination: Submission dismissed.

Submission: 14

Submitter: A O'Connor

Summary of Submission: SUPPORT
The submitter owns Lot 29 Kinley Road, Banjup support the amendment and have never understood why this area was excluded from the original amendment which zoned Aubin Grove in 1990. This appears to have been a planning anomaly at the time.

Like Aubin Grove, the land is close to the freeway, public transport, shops, schools and is a logical extension of the urban front.

The groundwater extraction would be minimal in light of new desalination water sources and several studies have shown that water protection after development can be adequately managed.

Planning Comment: Support noted.

Determination: Submission noted.

Submission: 16

Submitter: Name removed at the request of the submitter

Summary of Submission: COMMENT

The submitter advises that Triandra Court will back onto the new Urban area. What is being done to prevent people going into the buffer area and will new fencing be installed? The existing fences along Triandra Court will need upgrading.

Rowley Road is busy and this proposal exacerbates the problem as it will be difficult turning right out of the estate. Are roundabouts proposed?

The proposed commercial area shouldn't disturb the local area with noise. There should be no petrol stations due to the Jandakot Mound.

Extending the sporting field should be included as it needs more grassed area for pitches. It will not be a good idea to have housing backing onto the grassed area.

Planning Comment: Comments noted.

Refer to the 'Planning Framework,' 'Jandakot Groundwater Mound,' 'Environmental Matters,' 'Traffic and Transport Matters' and 'Future Land Uses' sections within Part 6 of the **Report on Submissions**.

Determination: Submission noted.

Submission: 17

Submitter: Name removed at the request of the submitter

Summary of Submission: SUPPORT

The submitter supports the amendment as it should have been included in original Aubin Grove amendment in the 1990s. It doesn't make sense that this area is excluded given the desperate need for more housing.

This area has all the appropriate surrounding facilities i.e. school, medical centre, shopping centre, train station etc. It also has access to all the service infrastructure that is currently in place.

The argument that it will impact on the groundwater is irrelevant with the introduction of the desalination plant and housing will have little impact on the ground water supply.

The City of Cockburn has already identified the land as future urban.

Planning Comment: Support noted.

Determination: Submission noted.

Submission: 18

Submitter: Name removed at the request of the submitter

Summary of Submission: OBJECTION
The submitter objects to the amendment as this region is overpopulated with too many micro blocks. There is too many traffic and too many people.

Planning Comment: Comments noted.

Refer to the 'Planning Framework' and 'Traffic and Transport Matters' sections within Part 6 of the **Report on Submissions**.

Determination: Submission dismissed.

Submission: 19

Submitter: Name removed at the request of the submitter

Summary of Submission: OBJECTION
The submitter objects to the amendment as it has little regard for the native flora and fauna. There are endangered animals that rely on this vegetation for their survival.

Our city is already the longest in the world, we don't need more space for single dwellings, we should be looking to infill in already cleared areas with higher density homes to preserve the banksia woodlands and remaining natural spaces on the Swan Coastal Plain.

Planning Comment: Comments noted.

Refer to the 'Planning Framework' and 'Environmental Matters' sections within Part 6 of the **Report on Submissions**.

Determination: Submission dismissed.

Submission: 20

Submitter: A Lang

Summary of Submission: OBJECTION
The submitter objects to the amendment and as a resident of Lyon Road they have noticed an increase in traffic as more drivers bypass the Kwinana Freeway. This increased traffic has disrupted their family's life with noise, congestion, and safety concerns becoming a part of our daily routine. This

situation is unacceptable and will worsen with the proposed urban development. The following points have also been made:

Environmental Concerns:

The Banjup area is zoned as Rural - Water Protection for a valid reason. It plays a critical role in protecting groundwater quality and preserving sensitive ecosystems. Rezoning this area for urban development would likely lead to increased surface runoff, pollution, and habitat destruction, which would severely impact local flora and fauna.

Water Resource Management:

The proposed rezoning conflicts with draft *State Planning Policy 2.9 Planning for Water*, which prioritises the conservation of water resources in areas like Banjup. The amendment would place further pressure on already fragile water supplies and is inconsistent with long-term water management strategies.

Incompatibility with South Metropolitan Peel Sub-Regional Planning Framework:

This proposal is inconsistent with the Framework and approving such a change would undermine the planning principles that guide sustainable development in the region.

Community Impact:

The proposed urban development threatens the semi-rural lifestyle that residents highly value. In addition to the existing traffic issues, increased traffic volume, noise, and urban sprawl would further deteriorate our quality of life and negatively impact the community.

Lack of Justification:

This amendment does not demonstrate a compelling need for additional residential development in this area, especially when other, more suitable sites could meet this demand without compromising environmental and water protection objectives.

Planning Comment: Comments noted.
Refer to the 'Planning Framework,' 'Jandakot Groundwater Mound,' 'Environmental Matters,' 'Traffic and Transport Matters' and 'Future Land Uses' sections within Part 6 of the **Report on Submissions**.

Determination: Submission dismissed.

Submission: 21

Submitter: J Jovanovic

Summary of Submission: OBJECTION

The submitter objects to the amendment as during school hours it is hard getting through Camden Boulevard and Lyon Road. Adding the additional housing, and connection from Rowley Road to Descanso Loop, will worsen the congestion/traffic. It is already dangerous for children walking to and from school, and with the additional traffic it is going to make it even more so.

There is a need for more amenities such as a petrol station, car wash, a larger grocery store and other business spaces.

Planning Comment: Comments noted.
Refer to the 'Planning Framework,' 'Traffic and Transport Matters' and 'Future Land Uses' sections within Part 6 of the **Report on Submissions**.

Determination: Submission dismissed.

Submission: 23

Submitter: Name removed at the request of the submitter

Summary of Submission: SUPPORT
The submitter supports the amendment and are long-term rate payers in the City of Cockburn.

There advises that this land was omitted from the Directions 2031 and beyond by mistake. With the growing infrastructure in the area, including schools, shops, power, sewerage, public transport, this is a significantly underutilised parcel of land.

If the aim of the government is transport oriented development this parcel fits this requirement. There is no detrimental impact.

Planning Comment: Support noted.

Determination: Submission noted.

Submission: 24

Submitter: David Bushell

Summary of Submission: SUPPORT
The submitter supports the amendment and consider the exclusion of the Lyon and Kinley Road lots from the original Urban zoning to be a planning anomaly.

This precinct is close to the Kwinana Freeway, public transport, shops and schools with access to essential service infrastructure and would round off the urban zoned area.

Planning Comment: Support noted.

Determination: Submission noted.

Submission: 25

Submitter: Mina Roberts

Summary of Submission: OBJECTION

The submitter objects to the amendment as all areas of remnant bush in the Perth area are highly valuable wildlife habitat given how extensive clearing is.

The previous endangered black cockatoos are currently starving due to a lack of food trees, which this area includes. Further clearing of mature cockatoo food trees and habitat is short-sighted and unacceptable.

Planning Comment: Comments noted.
Refer to the 'Planning Framework' and 'Environmental Matters' sections within Part 6 of the **Report on Submissions**.

Determination: Submission dismissed.

Submission: 26

Submitter: Name removed at the request of the submitter

Summary of Submission: OBJECTION
The submitter objects to the amendment as it will degrade the suburb. It will create a thoroughfare and reduce safety for our community, specifically children.

Planning Comment: Comments noted.
Refer to the 'Planning Framework,' 'Environmental Matters,' 'Traffic and Transport Matters' and 'Future Land Uses' sections within Part 6 of the **Report on Submissions**.

Determination: Submission dismissed.

Submission: 28

Submitter: Name removed at the request of the submitter

Summary of Submission: OBJECTION
The submitter objects to the amendment as there is vast and very unique bushland supporting a large amount of wildlife and scenario for the community.

Aubin Grove and surrounding Hammond Park has recently been built up and it is important that these areas are kept for future generations. If further housing is needed, then perhaps the land which runs next to Lyon Road could support more housing.

These properties are listed as Lots 92,191,100,101, 211, 212, 22 and 23 on the amendment figure. That would leave the bushland around Kinley Road untouched and maintain the natural environment for some wild life.

The suburb does also not need any commercial land for use of a Petrol Station. Aubin Grove has access to a petrol station 5 km to the north in Cockburn and 5 km to the south in Anketell, these are accessible for the community.

The submitter is opposed to the plans and suggests if land must be used then the above blocks be used as they are cleared. The land from Kinley Road towards the east should be preserved for the future.

Planning Comment: Comments noted.
Refer to the 'Planning Framework,' 'Jandakot Groundwater Mound,' 'Environmental Matters,' 'Traffic and Transport Matters' and 'Future Land Uses' sections within Part 6 of the **Report on Submissions**.

Determination: Submission dismissed.

Submission: 29

Submitter: Department of Water and Environmental Regulation

Summary of Submission: OBJECTION
The Department of Water and Environmental Regulation (DWER) does not support the amendment as it contravenes relevant state planning policies, is inconsistent with *Perth and Peel@3.5million* and has the potential to impact Perth's Integrated Water Supply Scheme (IWSS).

Jandakot Underground Water Pollution Catchment Area (UWPCA):

The land subject to this proposal is located within the Jandakot UWPCA which is a constituted Public Drinking Water Source Area (PDWSA) under the *Metropolitan Water Supply, Sewerage, and Drainage Act 1909* which supplies drinking water into the IWSS. The land has been classified as a Priority 2 (P2) area and is managed to maintain or improve the quality of the drinking water source with the objective of risk minimisation.

The Jandakot UWPCA is managed in accordance with the Western Australian Planning Commission's (WAPC's) *State Planning Policy 2.3 Jandakot Groundwater Protection Policy* (SPP 2.3) and draft *State Planning Policy 2.9 Planning for Water* (draft SPP 2.9), which state:

"In order to protect the quality of the public drinking water source, there is a presumption against new urban or industrial land uses in the Water Catchment reservation and the Rural - Water Protection zone of the Metropolitan Region Scheme."

Consistent with the aforementioned State Planning Policies and the Department's *Strategic Policy - Protecting Public Drinking Water Source Areas in WA* (DoW, 2016), the intensification of land uses within public drinking water source areas (PDWSAs) is not recommended due to the increased risk to drinking water quality and public health.

"Increased development in a PDWSA will increase the risk to water quality and public health. For example, urban areas pose a greater risk of water quality contamination than rural areas, and rural areas pose a greater risk of contamination than naturally forested areas. This is an inevitable consequence of more chemical, biological and physical hazards being introduced due to more people, buildings, vehicles and rubbish associated with land use intensification."

There are no urban building or engineering methods that can effectively manage risks to drinking water resources in perpetuity and as such, the State's policy framework has a presumption against intensified land uses in P1 and P2 PDWSAs.

Notwithstanding this policy position, SPP 2.3 and draft SPP 2.9 recognises that there are situations where development may be appropriate, following a government led strategic planning process that determines an urban rezoning is the preferred outcome for the land. The policy stipulates that an MRS amendment will only be supported where the land has been identified for development through a strategic planning document, such as the *Perth and Peel@3.5million* planning frameworks. The *South Metropolitan Peel Sub-Regional Planning Framework* identifies this site as a Rural Residential land use, the existing land use.

In addition, SPP 2.3 and draft SPP 2.9 also states that upon consideration of such future rezonings through strategic planning instruments, subject land should also be large landholdings that were already substantially cleared at the time this policy was published. The intent for retained vegetated areas, such as this site, is also reiterated in the objectives of the policies as “to maintain or increase natural vegetation cover over the policy area”.

The subsequent decision to rezone and subsequently reclassify to Priority 3* (P3*), acknowledges the supply from this area will likely be subject to higher water quality treatment costs, used less frequently as part of the IWSS, and eventually may be abandoned.

The subject site has not been identified within the framework as future urban or in a planning investigation area (PIA) and as such would contravene SPP 2.3 and draft SPP 2.9 and would not be supported by the Department.

Jandakot - Treeby Planning Investigation Area:

The State's policy framework, through SPP 2.3 and draft SPP 2.9, supports the consideration of issues such as the economy, housing supply, urban consolidation, transport, societal benefit, infrastructure provision, environment, risks to current water supply and future supply options through Government led processes to determine strategic planning outcomes of greatest benefit to the State and community.

The DPLH previously led strategic investigations into land and water values and was consistent with the above scope for the Jandakot - Treeby PIA, located north of this site. In August 2023, Government resolved to designate this 600 ha site as urban expansion to meet the needs of future land supply. This decision determines the government's preferred strategic planning outcome as urban development and acknowledges the likely impacts to supply costs, reliability and potential loss from Perth's IWSS.

The Jandakot - Treeby urban expansion area is located approximately 6km from the subject site, and consolidates the urban footprint north of Armadale Road, to the Jandakot Airport. As such, the site subject to this proposed MRS amendment does not appear to represent a planning outcome consistent with the aforementioned principles of strategic planning in PDWSAs, nor necessary to meet future housing needs of the Perth - Peel Region.

District Water Management Strategy:

A draft DWMS was reviewed during preliminary comment period consistent with *Better Urban Water Management* (WAPC, 2008). However, a DWMS is not the mechanism to determine whether a rezoning within a PDWSA. It is to be a strategic decision by Government considering land supply factors and resultant impact and costs to water supply. This is consistent with the approach for the previous limited urban rezonings on the Jandakot UWPCA, and relevant DWMS's were prepared in the context of recognition of the strategic decision making, rather than attempting to demonstrate the urban development will not impact the PDWSA.

As previously identified, the DWMS and associated reports (including the scheme amendment report), are based on inaccurate assumptions and information regarding water resource protection and relevant science, policy and planning process. The DWER has not undertaken a full assessment of the report, however responses were provided to the key principles proposed to justify the urban rezoning as follows:

- Urban subdivision is a lower risk than rural residential.
- Water quality typically improves post development when WSUD principles for drainage management are used.
- Strategic importance of Jandakot UWPCA.

The proposal significantly departs from the intent of SPP 2.3 and draft SPP 2.9 regarding drinking water protection principles and Governments need to strategically balance urban expansion and water supply for the Perth - Peel Region, and as such would not be supported by the DWER. The issue of precedent should also be considered for this proposal.

Additional Information:

The DWER has since assessed a DWMS for the site. However, DWER notes that a decision to urbanise the site should not be based on the approval of a DWMS.

Planning Comment:

Comments noted.

Refer to the 'Planning Framework,' 'Jandakot Groundwater Mound,' 'Environmental Matters' and 'Future Land Uses' sections within Part 6 of the ***Report on Submissions***.

The WAPC notes that DWER has since assessed the DWMS for the subject land.

Determination:

Submission noted.

Submission:

30

Submitter:

Water Corporation

Summary of Submission:

OBJECTION

The Water Corporation advises that the amendment is located within the Jandakot Underground Water Pollution Control Area and is classified as P2 within which urban development is not permitted. P2 areas carry a high priority for public drinking water supply and are managed to ensure low risk and

intensity land uses are permitted to ensure no increased risk of groundwater contamination.

As the Corporation is a major licensed abstractor of groundwater as part of the IWSS, the Corporation remains opposed to any loss of groundwater resources due to the increased groundwater contamination risks.

The WAPC is advised to liaise with the DWER regarding the acceptability of urban development within the context of strategic metropolitan water resource planning and regarding the process to change the classification from P2 to P3* prior to the amendment being advertised.

Water Corporation has provided the following comments regarding the servicing of the site:

Water:

Part of the amendment is in the Thomsons Gravity Water zone, based on the existing infrastructure in the area, the only requirements are likely to be reticulation to service the area, this will need to be further investigated once developer's intentions have been received.

Wastewater:

The subject area is outside the Thomsons Lake Sewer District. However, due to the levels for this area, the development will need to be its own catchment and will require a type 10 pump station and associated gravity sewers. The adjacent wastewater pump station Durango Bend is a type 10 pump station and is currently unable to accept any additional flow. This downstream pump station and gravity sewers will require upgrades to accept the additional flow.

Water Corporation will need to investigate this further once developer's intentions have been received to identify the extent of the scheme upgrades.

General Comments:

Water Corporation has reiterated their above comments.

Planning Comment:

Comments noted.
Refer to the 'Planning Framework' and 'Jandakot Groundwater Mound' sections within Part 6 of the **Report on Submissions**.

Determination:

Submission noted.

Submission:

32

Submitter:

Department of Fire and Emergency Services

Summary of Submission:

COMMENT
The Department of Fire and Emergency Services (DFES) has requested changes to the existing Bushfire Management Plan (BMP) be undertaken prior to a final decision being made on the amendment.

Additional Information:

DFES has since advised that it raises no objections to the progression of the amendment, given the minor nature of changes to the BMP. These changes are to be undertaken to the BMP in the subsequent more detailed planning stages.

Planning Comment: Comments noted.
The proponent has confirmed that they will be making the required changes to the BMP in the subsequent planning stages.

Determination: Submission noted.

Submission: 33

Submitter: S Fryer

Summary of Submission: SUPPORT
The submitter supports the amendment, but the traffic at the nearby roundabout is busy in the morning.

Trucks are barely slowing for the roundabout, so their concern is that further subdivision will add more traffic onto that road and given the poorly designed road layout they have only one option being the roundabout.

Requests that the road and intersection is upgraded, including the Wandri District Centre Precinct so that Honeywood traffic has other options for exiting the estate.

Planning Comment: Comments noted.
Refer to the 'Planning Framework' and 'Traffic and Transport Matters' sections within Part 6 of the **Report on Submissions**.

Determination: Submission noted.

Submission: 35

Submitter: Name removed at the request of the submitter

Summary of Submission: OBJECTION
The submitter objects to the amendment as the Kwinana Freeway does not have more capacity to support growth in this area. The Freeway is overloaded most days and nights.

This land is living place for many wild animals and local vegetation, therefore from environmental point of view is not acceptable.

Planning Comment: Comments noted.
Refer to the 'Planning Framework,' 'Environmental Matters,' 'Traffic and Transport Matters' and 'Future Land Uses' sections within Part 6 of the **Report on Submissions**.

Determination: Submission dismissed.

Submission: 36

Submitter: Name removed at the request of the submitter

Summary of Submission: COMMENT
The submitter supports the amendment as it is a fabulous extension of the suburb. Having lived here for 18 years the submitter has seen a number of developments. There are terrific schools, shops and train stations nearby.

The only concern is the traffic flow through Lyon Road and the roundabout at Lyon Road and Rowley Road.

The submitter suggests that traffic management measures will be considered. As long as they fix the traffic, it will be a logical extension of the suburb and those lucky enough to live in the suburb.

Planning Comment: Comments noted.
Refer to the 'Traffic and Transport Matters' and 'Future Land Uses' sections within Part 6 of the **Report on Submissions**.

Determination: Submission noted.

Submission: 37

Submitter: Name removed at the request of the submitter

Summary of Submission: OBJECTION
The submitter objects to the amendment as the existing intersection is at capacity every day. The submitter uses these roundabout multiple times a day and there are always traffic jams in every direction.

The addition of more housing will exacerbate the problem. They can't even leave Honeywood Estate between 7-8am for up to 20 mins waiting on traffic at the existing roundabout.

Planning Comment: Comments noted.
Refer to the 'Planning Framework' and 'Traffic and Transport Matters' sections within Part 6 of the **Report on Submissions**.

Determination: Submission dismissed.

Submission: 38

Submitter: Name removed at the request of the submitter

Summary of Submission: OBJECTION
The submitter objects to the amendment as there are existing traffic problems in the neighbourhood and adding additional homes will cause chaos.

If there is a fire emergency there would be so many people trying to escape and trying to pick up their children with all the daycare centres. The submitter opposes the amendment for safety reasons.

Planning Comment: Comments noted.
Refer to the 'Traffic and Transport Matters' section within Part 6 of the **Report on Submissions**.

Determination: Submission dismissed.

Submission: 39

Submitter: Name removed at the request of the submitter

Summary of Submission: SUPPORT
The submitter supports the amendment.

Planning Comment: Support noted.

Determination: Submission noted.

Submission: 40

Submitter: J A Ellison

Summary of Submission: OBJECTION
The submitter objects to the amendment as it should be left alone as it was zoned for a reason. Isn't this zoning to protect our water sources.

The submitter wishes to stop trying to change things to build more housing. There will be nothing left as all the land down the freeway is being developed. The freeway should be sorted before adding more housing. The wildlife should not be forgotten either. No one cares if money is involved.

Planning Comment: Comments noted.
Refer to the 'Planning Framework,' 'Jandakot Groundwater Mound,' 'Environmental Matters,' 'Traffic and Transport Matters' and 'Future Land Uses' sections within Part 6 of the **Report on Submissions**.

Determination: Submission dismissed.

Submission: 41

Submitter: Name removed at the request of the submitter

Summary of Submission: OBJECTION
The submitter objects to the amendment as you cannot change the water protection area. What is the point of having any area designated for water protection if you're just going to treat it as any other area.

Planning Comment: Comments noted.
Refer to the 'Planning Framework' and 'Jandakot Groundwater Mound' sections within Part 6 of the **Report on Submissions**.

Determination: Submission dismissed.

Submission: 42

Submitter: Name removed at the request of the submitter

Summary of Submission: OBJECTION
The submitter advises that we should be conserving precious resources and let it remain as it is. Have consideration and think about the wildlife and animals, flora and fauna.

Planning Comment: Comments noted.
Refer to the 'Planning Framework,' 'Jandakot Groundwater Mound' and 'Environmental Matters' sections within Part 6 of the **Report on Submissions**.

Determination: Submission dismissed.

Submission: 43

Submitter: Banjup Residents Group

Summary of Submission: SUPPORT
The submitter advises that at several AGMs of the Banjup Residents Group (BRG) this planning anomaly has been discussed at length.

When the Aubin Grove subdivision was first proposed by the WAPC in the 1990s the south-west corner of Banjup was not included for reasons that remain obscure.

The rural landowners have been here 30+ years and have campaigned to have the land included in the Urban zone. The City of Cockburn has recognised that the corner is a planning anomaly and for 20 years has lobbied WAPC to resolve it.

The rural landowners are surrounded by urban development and, like rural Jandakot and Treeby, their rural amenity is lost. Their once treasured lifestyle has gone.

All landowners are supportive of the proposed rezoning of the south-west corner. The BRG has long campaigned to have this planning anomaly resolved.

The BRG have had Cockburn council support in October 2022 for the Banjup Preservation Principles that included at Point 4: The City will earnestly seek to resolve the zoning anomaly in the south west corner of Banjup. This was restated in the BRG submission to Cockburn on the Local Planning Strategy that was put to members and to those on Facebook on 1 November 2022.

The LPS submission was strongly supported by residents with no dissenting views. Banjup residents lament the loss of rural residential lands, just as we lament the loss of rural residential lands in Jandakot and Treeby. However, the residents in the south-west corner of Banjup are not the unpaid curators of a museum surrounded by suburbia.

All residents of the south-west corner have lived here for decades. As they get older, they will consider their ability to maintain their 2 hectares. We cannot expect them to hang on to protect the rural amenity for the rest of us.

When their time comes to sell, it would likely be to speculators who will have little interest in the rural amenity. Rather, the speculators would campaign even more vigorously for rezoning.

The draft structure plan for the urbanisation shows an undeveloped buffer zone on the western side of Triandra. To clearly define and separate the urban development from the rural living areas, Banjup Residents urge DPLH to ensure that this is realised.

The Banjup Residents Group is committed to preserve the integrity of Banjup as a safe green haven of peace and tranquillity.

Planning Comment: Support noted.

Determination: Submission noted.

Submission: 44

Submitter: T Smith

Summary of Submission: OBJECTION
The submitter opposes the clearing of the land, there is very little bush left and at the rate we are clearing there will be no bush left. The black cockatoos are going to go extinct as all their habitat is cleared. We need to say stop clearing more bushland for tiny houses. There will be no bush left in the area in a few years with the land developers clearing everything. There is a need to protect the bush that remains.

Planning Comment: Comments noted.
Refer to the 'Planning Framework' and 'Environmental Matters' sections within Part 6 of the **Report on Submissions**.

Determination: Submission dismissed.

Submission: 45

Submitter: E Chidlow

Summary of Submission: SUPPORT
As a young parent with kids at Aubin Grove Primary School, the submitter thinks this is a great decision, as they currently rent in this exorbitant climate, they feel this decision will increase affordable housing in the Aubin Grove area.

Planning Comment: Support noted.

Determination: Submission noted.

Submission: 46

Submitter: Gail Christensen

Summary of Submission: OBJECTION
The submitter advises that the environment is already under stress. Many of the banksia trees are dying and there are fewer red- and white-tailed cockatoos in the area.

The submitter has lived here for over 20 years and the impact of current development in this area has increased rapidly resulting in traffic congestion on the freeway and Lyon Road. We need to retain our open spaces.

Planning Comment: Comments noted.
Refer to the 'Planning Framework,' 'Environmental Matters,' 'Traffic and Transport Matters' and 'Future Land Uses' sections within Part 6 of the **Report on Submissions**.

Determination: Submission dismissed.

Submission: 47

Submitter: S Hack

Summary of Submission: OBJECTION
The submitter advises to leave the region rural and stop developing the area. The roads also need updating prior to this anyway.

Planning Comment: Comments noted.
Refer to the 'Planning Framework,' 'Environmental Matters,' 'Traffic and Transport Matters' and 'Future Land Uses' sections within Part 6 of the **Report on Submissions**.

Determination: Submission dismissed.

Submission: 48

Submitter: I J Teale

Summary of Submission: OBJECTION
The submitter advises that they have lived on their land since 1981. They have a house, granny flat, two large sheds on the site.

The amendment area was part of a larger amendment in Banjup which was rezoned residential development.

The submitter objects to the amendment as it will create the situation whether other MRS amendments occur, such as in Treeby which was part of Banjup and has been subdivided into small lots.

Land developers will try to develop the remainder of the water protection area (2.5 average to 10 acres) into smaller residential lots.

There is a large area of land for sale north of Gun Club Cr, Armadale Road and Warton Road west and is within the City of Cockburn. There is a lot of development on the eastern side of Warton Road within the City of Armadale. All the developers will be seeking to capitalise on this.

Planning Comment: Comments noted.
Refer to the 'Planning Framework,' 'Jandakot Groundwater Mound,' 'Environmental Matters,' 'Traffic and Transport Matters' and 'Future Land Uses' sections within Part 6 of the **Report on Submissions**.

Determination: Submission dismissed.

Submission: 49

Submitter: Name removed at the request of the submitter

Summary of Submission: SUPPORT
The submitter advises of the need to release more land to construct houses to support population growth that helps Perth grow beyond Sydney.

Planning Comment: Support noted.

Determination: Submission noted.

Submission: 50

Submitter: J Scherer

Summary of Submission: OBJECTION
The submitter advises to keep protecting waterways as they are. Cramming extra housing instead of improving the existing zones is backwards thinking. Improve our greenery and make Kwinana a leader in carbon reduction as well as social justice and support.

Planning Comment: Comments noted.
Refer to the 'Planning Framework,' 'Jandakot Groundwater Mound,' 'Environmental Matters' and 'Future Land Uses' sections within Part 6 of the **Report on Submissions**.

Determination: Submission dismissed.

Submission: 51

Submitter: Name removed at the request of the submitter

Summary of Submission: OBJECTION
The submitter objects given the removal of bushland, overcrowding, traffic being an issue as there is only one way in and out on Lyon Road.

Planning Comment: Comments noted.
Refer to the 'Planning Framework,' 'Jandakot Groundwater Mound,' 'Environmental Matters' and 'Traffic and Transport Matters' sections within Part 6 of the **Report on Submissions**.

Determination: Submission dismissed.

Submission: 52

Submitter: Name removed at the request of the submitter

Summary of Submission: OBJECTION
The submitter advises of no more residential development until the Kwinana Freeway has been widened to allow for traffic. As the existing situation is currently dangerous and contributing more greenhouse gases than a coalmine.

Prior to COVID the road widening was a priority but how will Baldivis residents get Ambulance services to Fiona Stanley? How many babies will be born on the side of the freeway and will you be placing birthing suites along the breakdown lane?

Planning Comment: Comments noted.
Refer to the 'Planning Framework,' 'Jandakot Groundwater Mound,' 'Environmental Matters,' 'Traffic and Transport Matters' and 'Future Land Uses' sections within Part 6 of the **Report on Submissions**.

Determination: Submission dismissed.

Submission: 53

Submitter: Name removed at the request of the submitter

Summary of Submission: OBJECTION
The submitter advises that this site is a Rural - Water Protection zone. There will be more traffic on Rowley Road and Lyon Road. These roads cannot cope with the existing volume of traffic. What about the black cockatoos, trees removed. Loss of habitat for wildlife.

Aubin Grove reserve needs to be extended to cope with school and club requirements. Need to sort out the roads first not take down trees. The Government seem to do what they like anyway. So, the submitter is wasting their time.

Planning Comment: Comments noted.
Refer to the 'Planning Framework,' 'Jandakot Groundwater Mound,' 'Environmental Matters,' 'Traffic and Transport Matters' and 'Future Land Uses' sections within Part 6 of the **Report on Submissions**.

Determination: Submission dismissed.

Submission: 54

Submitter: Name removed at the request of the submitter

Summary of Submission: OBJECTION
The submitter advises there are so many new developments being built at the expense of native wildlife. This area should be kept as rural and not be rezoned.

The bushland is already fragmented, and this proposal would see the clearing of more land. Such a change should not happen here or anywhere else in Banjup and surrounding suburbs. Our native wildlife can coexist on acreage properties. They cannot survive in tiny, subdivided blocks with not a single tree.

Planning Comment: Comments noted.
Refer to the 'Planning Framework' and 'Environmental Matters' sections within Part 6 of the *Report on Submissions*.

Determination: Submission dismissed.

Submission: 55

Submitter: Name removed at the request of the submitter

Summary of Submission: SUPPORT
No comments were provided.

Planning Comment: Support noted.

Determination: Submission noted.

Submission: 56

Submitter: J & I Weston

Summary of Submission: SUPPORT
The submitters support the amendment as this area is a planning oversight (and has been identified as such by the City of Cockburn). This small area should always have been included in the Urban zoning as Aubin Grove. The landowners in this area are identified as the Lyon Kinley Land Owners Collaborative.

This MRS Amendment is well overdue in addressing the original Amendment of 1998/9 when this area of land was included, then removed from, the rezoning of the area. The result is that the land is bounded by urban development both to the north and west along Lyon Road.

Our property at 315 Lyon Road, Banjup is part of the Lyon Kinley Land Owners Collaborative - a group of 17 landowners who are united in their quest to achieve Urban status for their land. We have a proposed innovative and sustainable design concept which demonstrates how it could connect and provide

community betterment.

On the northern boundary of these properties, separated by a wire fence is Aubin Grove Primary School - which has a current enrolment of in excess of 1000 students - and the Aubin Grove Sport and Community Facility, which operates 7 days per week, including evenings. The area has now lost its rural feel. While the residents of Aubin Grove feel they are a valued community within the City of Cockburn the landowners in the south west corner of Banjup are left to feel excluded.

These landholdings are within easy access of taxpayer Government funded existing community facilities and infrastructure:

- Bus stops - on our driveway (heading south) and directly over the road heading north including to the Harvest Lakes Shopping precinct and the Aubin Grove train station.
- Aubin Grove Primary School is on our side boundary to the north with only a wire fence dividing us - currently has 1024 students - trending downwards - and has been facilitated for in excess of this enrolment number.
- Aubin Grove Recreation and Community Centre on our side boundary to the north with only a dividing wire fence which is constantly scaled and damaged by users of the Centre. We have an ongoing problem removing rubbish and drug paraphernalia.
- Aubin Grove shopping centre - 850 m - provides shopping, personal and medical services.
- Child minding services - 850 m.
- Honeywood pharmacy, medical services and cafe - 800 m
- Aubin Grove Train Station - 2 kms
- Kwinana Freeway - less than 1 km
- Harvest Lakes shopping precinct which includes several types of medical services - 2 kms.
- Hammond Park Secondary School - ever growing feeder school from Aubin Grove Primary School
- Newly developed and well patronised Frankland Park Sports and Community Centre
- Gateway Shopping Centre in Cockburn
- The Arc in Cockburn
- Cockburn Central and East Cockburn precincts including the newly proposed Wave Park

All of the above amenities provide employment, support the local economy to residents and address the principles which are derived from the State Planning Strategy 2050.

Both Rowley and Lyon Roads provide first choice access to all of the aforementioned amenities.

Services such as water, gas, power and NBN all pass our doorstep. Underground power is also installed

along Lyon Road to our boundary with the school, and on the western side of the road to Rowley Road.

If the land bounded by Lyon, Rowley and Kinley roads was rezoned (and even renamed) to connect directly as part of Aubin Grove, then the residents would in the main be young, provide students to local schools, shop, play and use already established facilities in the local areas.

This Amendment would be a rounding off of the urban zoned area of Aubin Grove and an ideal infill site. In the report from the City of Cockburn community workshops held in 2018, this specific area was identified and desired by attendees as being an area which needed to be brought into the urban development of Aubin Grove.

This proposed Amendment has full support of the City of Cockburn as demonstrated in the Minutes of the OCM 09/07/2015 City of Cockburn Council Meeting (pages 29-31) that:

“there is an area shown in previous planning studies (bound by Kwinana Freeway, Rowley Road and properties on the eastern side of Kinley Road) that has not been identified in this document (The draft Perth and Peel@3.5million Plan). This seems to have been an oversight in leaving this area out of the urban expansion area.

The background to this area is that the land was identified as Future Urban within the Urban Expansion Policy Statement (1990) (proposals 36 and 37). This was a (then) Department of Planning and Urban Development document. Following this, DPUD released the Draft Jandakot Land Use and Water Management Strategy (1992) which also identified the land as Urban (existing or proposed). However, the final (1995) version of the JLUWMS omitted the land, replacing it instead with the following text:

The following land may have the potential for urban development in the future if the development constraints can be overcome:

- (i) Land located on the north side of Rowley Road abutting both sides of Kinley Road and extending west to Lyon Road, Banjup.*

Possible urban development of this land should be assessed in light of the findings of the Select Committee on Development over Groundwater area in the metropolitan region and an assessment of environmental and drainage management issues.

Referring back to the Urban Expansion Policy Statement (1990), proposals 36 and 37 were subject to district planning by virtue of the South Jandakot/Mandogalup District Planning Strategy (1993). The subject land was included in the district structure plan, with the following notes:

The Structure Plan report states, “There is nothing in the physical nature of the land or environmental constraints which differentiates it from the future urban land to the north or west.”

While it is acknowledged and support the desire for most of Banjup to retain its Rural and protected status, there is also strong support from other Banjup

landowners for the WAPC and Council to address the anomaly of the future zoning of the land held by the Lyon Kinley Landowners Collaborative.

In 2022, the Banjup Residents' Group developed a document (Banjup Preservation Principles) which the City of Cockburn has fully supported. Principle 4 states: The City will earnestly seek to resolve the zoning anomaly in the south west corner of Banjup.

The development by the State Government of new desalination water sources and production, has resulted in the groundwater extraction being minimal in comparison resulting in groundwater extraction becoming largely redundant. Previous developments including the area from Atwell to Aubin Grove have proven that with good planning, contemporary water sensitive urban design can coexist with water protection.

Planning Comment: Support noted.

Determination: Submission noted.

Submission: 57

Submitter: Name removed at the request of the submitter

Summary of Submission: COMMENT
The submitter supports the amendment but urge that any development takes the advice of the EPA and retains pockets of banksia woodland.

Planning Comment: Comments noted.
The EPA has determined that the amendment does not require assessment under the *Environmental Protection Act 1986*, however it has provided advice regarding the protection of environmental values which is to be undertaken at structure planning and subdivision stages.

Determination: Submission noted.

Submission: 58

Submitter: Department of Health

Summary of Submission: COMMENT
The Department of Health (DoH) advises as follows:

Water Supply:

It is noted the proposal is located within a P2 PDWSA and areas of the proposal are located within Wellhead Protection zones.

The DoH does not support the proposal until the proponent has approval from the DWER. This is to ensure Perth's drinking water aquifers and water sources are preserved long term, prevent contamination and protect public health safety.

Contaminated Sites:

The site has not been classified on DWER's contaminated sites database (*Contaminated Sites Act 2003*). However, it may be subject to other important classifications not recorded on that database. The proponent should obtain a Basic Summary of Records relating to the land and its surroundings to complete their assessment of the site's suitability for a rezoning to a more sensitive land use.

Storage and use of agricultural chemicals, fuels and wastes are often associated with contaminated sites. Other hazardous materials including asbestos should be safely removed from buildings prior to demolition and clearance to avoid the creation of new contaminated sites. Under section 11 of the *Contaminated Sites Act 2003*, if a site is 'known or suspected' of being a contaminated site it should be reported to DWER.

Planning Comment:

Comments noted.

Refer to the 'Planning Framework' and 'Jandakot Groundwater Mound' sections within Part 6 of the ***Report on Submissions***.

The DWER has since assessed a DWMS for the site.

It is noted that while none of the lots are registered as a contaminated site, further testing will occur as part of the subsequent Local Water Management Strategy. If any contamination is present then a management response would be provided including consideration of the *Contaminated Sites Act 2003*.

Determination:

Submission noted.

Submission:

59

Submitter:

City of Kwinana

Summary of Submission:

COMMENT

The City of Kwinana raises no objections, and advises as follows:

Traffic Planning:

The Rowley Road / Lyon Road intersection is operating beyond its design capacity and is heavily congested on a regular basis. Rowley Road currently carries a high number of vehicles per day (17,500 annual average daily traffic) include a high volume of truck traffic (9% of overall traffic). The truck traffic contribute to the safety and congestion issues at the Rowley Road / Lyon Road intersection.

As stated in the Transport Impact Assessment Guidelines it is important to understand potential transport impacts during the early stages of the planning framework, prior to the more detailed subsequent stages of structure planning and subdivision.

It is particularly important that wider transport impacts are considered as part of the Amendment because future consideration of traffic issues will be limited to resolution through the local structure planning process.

The City recommends that the proponents and/or their appointed traffic engineers should discuss the specific transport requirements with the City of Kwinana prior to the preparation of a local structure plan(s) for the subject area.

Environmental Values, Concept Plan and Implementation:

The EPA highlights the draft concept plan (which depicts retention areas containing significant environmental values) as a 'fundamental consideration for the EPA', in concluding that the scheme amendment is unlikely to have a significant effect on the environment and in deciding that a Part IV assessment is not required.

Local structure planning is limited in setting aside land for both public open space and environmental conservation, usually only through identified wetlands and the minimum 10% POS contribution. The City requests that the WAPC consider what statutory mechanisms maybe required to ensure future development is consistent with the draft concept plan, so as to ensure that development does not have a significant impact on the environment, therefore being consistent with the EPA's consideration of the proposal.

Planning Comment:

Comments noted.

Refer to the 'Planning Framework,' 'Jandakot Groundwater Mound,' 'Environmental Matters,' 'Traffic and Transport Matters' and 'Future Land Uses' sections within Part 6 of the **Report on Submissions**.

The proponent has been advised of the need to liaise with the City of Kwinana as part of local structure planning to get a comprehensive understanding of the broader locality.

It is noted that the EPA has determined that the environmental significance of the land can be managed and has included advice on the environmental values to be protected based on the supporting concept plan.

In the subsequent local structure planning stage detailed consideration is given to the extension and location of areas to be considered for conservation in consultation with DWER and DBCA and the associated planning mechanisms.

Determination:

Submission noted.

Submission:

60

Submitter:

City of Cockburn

Summary of Submission:

COMMENT

The City of Cockburn advises as follows:

It is recognised that the boundary of the Rural - Water Protection zone south of Armadale Road has a spatially regular western interface with the City of Cockburn Urban zone, except for the subject area, which since the 1990s has formed the subject of planning investigations foreshadowing potential urbanisation of the area.

The advertised draft of *Perth and Peel@3.5million* defined urban expansion as “land that has been identified for potential urban development in preceding planning studies or represents the logical expansion of an existing urban area”. It is on this basis that the City’s 2015 submission on *Perth and Peel@3.5million* advocated for this area to be identified for urban expansion.

Despite the land ultimately not being identified in *Perth and Peel @3.5million* as an urban expansion or planning investigation area, Council has continued to see merit in a potential Urban zoning for the land. As recently as in April 2023, in response to feedback received during advertising of the City’s Local Planning Strategy, Council recommended the area’s identification as a ‘Planning Area’ to provide a framework to consider future MRS Amendment requests for intensification.

Whilst the WAPC did not include the proposed ‘Planning Area’ in the endorsed Local Planning Strategy (which shows the area remaining ‘rural water protection’), given it then initiated the MRS Amendment, and Council’s longstanding support through various formal resolutions, the City assessed the proposal against the principles previously endorsed by Council for proposed Planning Area K. Key matters are below:

Environmental Values:

The subject area contains significant environmental values, and the concept plan (included in the pre-referral MRS Amendment) and the EPA referral show areas of “retained bushland”, including Lot 30 Kinley Road annotated as “remaining undeveloped”, and Lot 23 Lyon Road annotated as “retained bushland”.

However, this provides no certainty regarding the future tenure and potential land use or development of the land. This is of particular concern where there is no identified developable portion of the land, such as for Lot 30 Kinley Road and Lot 23 Lyon Road.

- i. Lot 30 Kinley Road: It is noted the EPA’s assessment, and the WAPC report assume the vegetation on Lot 30 will be retained, including a 50m buffer to the REW, however there is no certainty this will occur. The EPA have noted the vegetation on Lot 30 may be of regional significance, and the REW may have conservation values more akin to a CCW, however insufficient information has been provided regarding the environmental values of Lot 30.

Given Lot 30 has not been included in the Environmental Assessment report, addressed by the concept plan (which does not show a future zoning for the land) and is not proposed to be part of a future structure plan, there is no advantage from an orderly and proper planning perspective to rezoning the site to Urban at this point in time. Should the rest of the precinct be rezoned to Urban, future structure planning of that area would still be required to achieve an appropriate interface to the lot.

As insufficient justification has been provided to demonstrate the appropriateness of Lot 30 being rezoned to Urban, the City is of the view Lot 30 should remain in the Rural - Water Protection zone.

In the future, an MRS Amendment could be lodged for Lot 30 with appropriate justification and supporting environmental studies. This

would be referred to the EPA, enabling a thorough environmental assessment which has not occurred via this Amendment proposal.

- ii. Lot 23 Lyon Road: Is an undeveloped vegetated lot that was included in the Environmental Assessment Report. It contains closed Banksia Woodland in good condition, and the EPA's assessment assumes this bushland will be retained. Whilst the concept plan annotates this entire lot as 'retained bushland' with no development potential, there is no indication of the future tenure or zoning of the land demonstrating how this will be achieved.

Rezoning the lot to Urban will set an expectation of some level of urban development, and it would not be appropriate or reasonable for a future structure plan to designate the entire lot as unrestricted POS.

Unless there are appropriate arrangements to secure the transfer and long-term management of this bushland (beyond the standard requirement for at least 8% unrestricted POS), it is the City's recommendation that Lot 23 also remain in the Rural - Water Protection zone. It is recognised the proponent may have an intended arrangement to achieve this outcome.

Groundwater Protection Area:

The site is currently identified as a P2 area under SPP 2.3 and draft SPP 2.9. The City notes there is a potential impact of incremental urbanisation of the area on the groundwater mound that goes beyond the site-specific impact on groundwater quality. This includes an impact on the wetland chain, given the interrelationship with the groundwater mound, and a risk to the drinking water resource, which at a point may be irreversible.

In accordance with the Actions of the Local Planning Strategy, the City continues to advocate for the State Government to undertake a comprehensive groundwater and hydrological technical study and assessment of the Jandakot Groundwater Protection Area to better understand the hydrogeological processes.

Future Structure Plan:

Given the range of environmental values and the EPA referral being premised on a concept plan showing areas of bushland to be retained, the City is of the view a structure plan should be prepared for the entirety of any future Urban area to ensure this occurs.

This will also ensure orderly and proper planning of the precinct, including provision of POS to meet the recreational needs of the community, and appropriate staging of any subdivision and development.

Future of the Rural - Water Protection Zone:

Support for the potential rezoning of the subject land (excluding Lot 30) is based on Council's longstanding support through various formal Council resolutions relating to this specific area.

However, the City is concerned ad-hoc and incremental urbanisation of the rural water protection area will make forward planning difficult, hindering capacity for coordination between government agencies to efficiently deliver

infrastructure and services. This will create a cost burden for future taxpayers and ratepayers.

Such an approach may also create a legacy of poorly planned, disconnected and underserved communities. The consequence of this will be reduced liveability and increased costs-of-living for future residents.

It is noted the housing targets in Perth and Peel @3.5million may no longer be sufficient to meet demand, and the City recommends the DPLH review the dwelling targets to determine if this is the case.

It is noted the underlying Sub-Regional Frameworks (SRFs) are not static documents, intended to be monitored continuously and reviewed to ensure they remain contemporary and responsive to Government priorities and community need. Therefore, if the housing targets are determined to no longer be appropriate it is recommended the WAPC prepare an update report as an addendum to *Perth and Peel @3.5million* (such the 2022 'Planning Investigations Area Update') as a priority.

At a minimum this should set out guidance/criteria to assess proposed MRS Amendments that vary from the SRFs. It is recommended this include specific criteria for the Rural - Water Protection zone, taking into consideration water supply planning, environmental impacts, infrastructure planning and the role of the Jandakot groundwater resource into the future.

This will provide a framework to balance timely delivery of housing with orderly and proper planning in manner that is cost effective, equitable and transparent.

Rowley Road:

Rowley Road is identified as a future Primary Regional Roads reserve in *Perth and Peel @3.5million*. It is critical MRWA and the DPLH work together to define the needs of the Rowley Road corridor and provide clarity to all parties concerned, in particular potentially affected landowners. It is noted the proposals shows an area along Rowley Road as Urban Deferred, and the future road reservation will force a number of alternative access points to the existing lots along Rowley Road as it becomes a controlled access road.

Local Planning Scheme Provisions:

Please be advised if the proposed MRS rezoning is supported by the WAPC the City does not support a concurrent rezoning under the local planning scheme to Development or any other zone, given there would need to be complementary text modifications. This includes matters raised by the EPA to ensure the retention of environmental values through the future stages of planning.

It should be noted Developer Contribution Area 13 for Community Infrastructure have been prepared with infrastructure and catchments that did not include planning for further urban development within the Rural - Water Protection zone. This matter requires resolution.

Active Playing Field:

The City has identified the projected population from this scale of potential development would result in the need for a second active playing field (multi-

purpose) in Aubin Grove. This could either be an expansion of the existing playing fields along the northern boundary of the subject area (with upgrades/additional embellishments to the existing building), or a second active playing field. A second active playing field would be a satellite facility, needing to accommodate a building of approximately 550m² for toilets, changerooms, storage, kiosk etc. rather than full clubrooms.

To ensure such a facility can be facilitated, the proponent is encouraged to pursue a private landowner arrangement to ensure an equitable distribution of POS.

Concept Plan:

The City previously reviewed the concept plan submitted with the preliminary MRS request and reiterates the previous comments, outlined below:

- Vehicle access arrangements to Rowley Road require further discussion, as the additional access point is unlikely to be acceptable given current issues on this section of Rowley Road.
- There are functionality issues with the proposed local road network, which include numerous four-way intersections.
- The extent of the proposed R60 coded areas are considered unjustified in this location.
- Any proposed local centre would require justification and an appropriate design and interface with the residential area and Rowley Road.
- While no land areas are indicated, a number of proposed POS areas appear too small to be functional.
- The zoning and tenure of land areas shown as “retained bushland” requires clarification.
- Figure 3 (Post Development BAL Contour Plan) is missing from the Bush Fire Management Plan.
- There is no evidence of consultation with the Department of Education in accordance OP 2.4 - Planning for School Sites, and there is insufficient evidence of the existing projected catchments of nearby schools.

Planning Comment:

Comments noted.

Refer to the ‘Planning Framework,’ ‘Jandakot Groundwater Mound,’ ‘Environmental Matters,’ ‘Traffic and Transport Matters’ and ‘Future Land Uses’ sections within Part 6 of the **Report on Submissions**.

The comments on Lots 23 and 30 are noted however it is acknowledged that the existing environmental investigations will be further refined through the local structure planning stage, including further detailed survey work. The EPA has also determined that the amendment can be managed through subsequent planning stages.

In relation to active playing field the amendment only seeks to zone the land Urban, with land uses being determined in the subsequent structure planning stage which includes a separate public consultation period.

Determination:

Submission noted.

Submission:	62
Submitter:	A Taplin
Summary of Submission:	<p>OBJECTION</p> <p>The submitter advises that the Rowley/Lyon Road roundabout cannot handle the current traffic from the new Honeywood Estate and Aubin Grove. Major road works need to be completed so that the traffic doesn't back up from 6.30 to 8.00 am in the mornings.</p> <p>As a daily commuter who takes public transport from Aubin Grove station but lives over 2 km from the nearest bus stop, it takes on average 20 minutes to get through this intersection in the mornings.</p> <p>This subdivision will only add more cars trying to get through this intersection during peak hours. It would be completely irresponsible to even consider this development without improving the bus network to Aubin Grove station or improving the Rowley/Lyon Roads intersection.</p> <p>Species like the black cockatoos are incredibly vulnerable at the moment with the amount of banksia woodland clearing that is occurring across the state. If this clearing occurs then they lose another connecting section of woodland and will be forced out of their habitat.</p> <p>The species is declining and the submitter has personally noticed a reduction in the populations that visit since the Honeywood Estate was built going from large flocks to groups of 4 or 5 cockatoos only. This development simply cannot be allowed to proceed if we are aiming to protect black cockatoos and other endangered species.</p> <p>There is a reason this land was originally designated as a water protection zone. We should not overlook the importance of protecting our water sources in WA while we are in the midst of a drought (which will only be made worse by climate change). If the development proceeds then it will be obvious that the City of Cockburn council cares only about profits and not about supporting its constituents into the future.</p>
Planning Comment:	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Refer to the 'Planning Framework,' 'Jandakot Groundwater Mound,' 'Environmental Matters,' 'Traffic and Transport Matters' and 'Future Land Uses' sections within Part 6 of the Report on Submissions.</p>
Determination:	Submission dismissed.

Submission:	63
Submitter:	D Kennedy
Summary of Submission:	<p>OBJECTION</p> <p>The submitter drives past this site every day and knows how much of a wildlife haven it is. The proposed area is crucial habitat for many wildlife species, including critically and endangered species. It also has Banksia Woodlands</p>

which are threatened ecological communities on the Swan Coastal Plain with only a very few percentage left. Further destruction should not occur.

The submitter sees endangered and critically endangered species of Black Cockatoos consistently use this area, it is a safe feeding habitat and used by them as a safe corridor. The undulation and hydrology of the land is also vital for water supplies and dumping a heap of housing on this is ludicrous.

Planning Comment: Comments noted.
Refer to the 'Planning Framework,' 'Jandakot Groundwater Mound' and 'Environmental Matters' sections within Part 6 of the **Report on Submissions**.

Determination: Submission dismissed.

Submission: 64

Submitter: P Kennedy

Summary of Submission: OBJECTION
The submitter advises that this area is used by a myriad of wildlife and it is criminal to turn it into housing. The endless destruction of critical urban habitat needs to stop. Perth's Urban Tree Canopy is less than 16% and this amendment would add to the reduced tree cover.

Planning Comment: Comments noted.
Refer to the 'Planning Framework' and 'Environmental Matters' sections within Part 6 of the **Report on Submissions**.

Determination: Submission dismissed.

Submission: 65

Submitter: Name removed at the request of the submitter

Summary of Submission: OBJECTION
The submitter lives opposite the proposed development. They are concerned for the wildlife on a daily basis, looking at kangaroos, quenda and numerous species and with their natural habitat being destroyed, they will possibly reduce in numbers.

Their main concern is the black cockatoos that they watch nest, roost and use this area, and their ability to survive should their natural habitat be destroyed.

They are also concerned about road congestion. Aubin Grove has one road in and out. They used to live on Lyon Road and you could not get out of the driveway in peak periods.

Lyon Road is currently used as a rat run from the freeway and with further development would increase. Especially, with a recent death on Lyon Road, multiple accidents on Lyon Road intersecting Rowley Road, increased traffic will only cause further issues.

Planning Comment: Comments noted.
Refer to the 'Planning Framework' and 'Traffic and Transport Matters' sections within Part 6 of the **Report on Submissions**.

Determination: Submission dismissed.

Submission: 66

Submitter: Name removed at the request of the submitter

Summary of Submission: OBJECTION
The submitter is concerned about impacts to groundwater, species of black cockatoos use the area daily and would be impacted.

Increased traffic flow on Lyon Road, which is dangerously busy and with more cars, population would make it even more dangerous, especially Lyon/Rowley intersection.

Planning Comment: Comments noted.
Refer to the 'Planning Framework,' 'Jandakot Groundwater Mound,' 'Environmental Matters' and 'Traffic and Transport Matters' sections within Part 6 of the **Report on Submissions**.

Determination: Submission dismissed.

Submission: 67

Submitter: Name removed at the request of the submitter

Summary of Submission: OBJECTION
The submitter objects to the amendment and advises as follows:

- The proposal will result in the loss of a large area of Black Cockatoo habitat and significant areas of Banksia Woodland Threatened Ecological Community. It is incorrect of the reports to state that impacts 'may' occur, when rezoning the land to urban will allow for clearing to occur (up to 90% of the area to be developed and noting that a 10% POS requirement does not require the developers of the land to retain native vegetation in situ). Any amendments proposed should consider upfront, offset requirements, or provide a thorough assessment of the areas impacted to determine the extent of damage the proposal will cause from the development of areas of native vegetation.
- Unsuitable infrastructure and services. The WAPC states that it supports the urbanisation of the area as it 'maximises' the use of existing services and infrastructure. However, the existing services and infrastructure are already over capacity and not coping with the level of traffic and residents.

The transport network around the area of the proposed rezoning is already under significant pressure and not coping with the current traffic volume. Large volumes of traffic are using Lyon and Rowley

Roads, and the roundabout at the intersection during peak periods is often way east of Kinley Road, Banjup and to the west extends over the freeway and towards Apsley Estate entrance in Mandogalup on the Western side. School children accessing Hammond Park Secondary College are having to negotiate the dangerous roundabout, freeway, constant haulage trucks and traffic on Rowley Road to get to school.

Existing local development has not considered traffic and transport issues and these are only getting worse as further development occurs on both sides of the freeway. Further development of the area should not be considered until such time that the existing services and infrastructure is improved to accommodate the extra residents and vehicles.

In regard to infrastructure, the Aubin Grove Primary school is also well over capacity and there is little room for more children in the school. The local shopping centres are also not of suitable size to accommodate the extra dwellings and residents this proposal puts forward. The proposal is only going to exacerbate existing issues in relation to traffic and local services.

- The proposal sets a disturbing precedent for development of the areas within the City of Cockburn and adjoining LGAs for development and urbanisation of Priority 2 PDWSA / Groundwater Protection Areas, which comprise Banksia woodland Threatened Ecological Community and several populations of Declared Rare Flora, as well as Black Cockatoo habitat. By approving this scheme change and rezoning, what assurance is there for other residents and the local community that other areas of P2 PDWSA won't also be allowed to be developed, noting their environmental significance. The scheme amendment to allow urbanisation of the P2 PDWSA is not supported.
- The scheme change does not provide for any areas of Parks and Recreation or Conservation zoning, which should be provided to ensure that areas marked for retention are in fact retained for conservation. Conservation and parks and recreation zones should also be applied to areas that support local ecological linkages, conserve vegetation in very good condition or greater or areas that provide important black cockatoo foraging and roosting habitat, or the identify and retain the Resource Enhancement Wetland areas and their 50m buffers.

The zoning of these areas as designated environmental/recreation and parks spaces (not urban) is vital to ensure that future development does not impact these areas. It allows any future development around (not on) these areas to be properly planned and considered, to get the best visual amenity, lifestyle amenity and environmental outcomes possible for the community and local flora and fauna populations.

- The area subject to the proposal is not 'primarily cleared' as indicated in the supporting documentation prepared by WAPC in relation to SPP 2.8. At least half of the area proposed for rezoning comprises remnant or native vegetation of habitat value and including areas of vegetation representative of Floristic Community Types within the protected Banksia Woodland of the Swan Coastal Plain. No rezoning of this land should be considered without thorough environmental survey and assessment, including Detailed Spring Flora and Vegetation surveys

and Targeted Orchid surveys. These surveys should be part of the guiding documents that consider and set areas for rezoning. Have these surveys been done?

If not, these surveys and assessment must be required as part of any LPS amendment to ensure that any further planning proposals provide this level of assessment and appropriately plan around key environmental attributes.

- The current zoning proposal does not support the retention of key environmental attributes and the retention of local ecological corridors and areas of the Resource Enhancement Wetlands and the required 50m buffer. The whole area should not be rezoned as whole to Urban or Urban Deferred but rather include the use of 'Conservation' and 'Parks and Recreation' zoning to allow for the early identification and protection of areas with high environmental values, wetland, Declared Rare Flora or significant Black Cockatoo Habitat.
- The proposed density of housing is not supported. The proposal appears to indicate a future residential lot density of R25/R30. This density of urban development is not supported. The majority of local residents and new residents to the areas do not want blocks of 250-400 square metres. The community want a min. of R17.5 density, which allows for families (which this suburb is known and identified for - being a family friendly area and the 'nappy capital' of the Metro area) to grow their family and allow ample backyard space for play and lifestyle.

250 and 400 square meter blocks do not provide for a growing family or allow for a good lifestyle or good outcomes for community mental and physical health, especially when developers are not required to provide sufficient Public Open Space and sufficient areas of activity and passive recreation. Minimum lot sizes of 500 square metres are highly sought after in this area (after all, new developments are 220m², or you have to buy 5 acres - there is nothing offered to families in between) and sell quickly. Ideally, min. 1,000m² lots would be amazing for those families who are now relocating to the peri urban areas (Serpentine, for example) to try and obtain the lifestyle and amenity those blocks provide.

- Further, the proposed sizing of lots does not provide a suitable interface with the existing urban area of the adjoining rural areas which will remain. Larger family sized lots will provide a better interface between the existing suburb and the adjoining rural zones, whilst also allowing for additional vegetation and tree retention in larger lots and improving visual amenity.
- Noting the environmental significance of the site and the area being within a P2 PDWSA, 1/2 acre (R5)sized properties should be considered most suitable to allow for urbanisation of this area whilst allowing the maximum retention possible of the area's environmental attributes (remnant vegetation across the area, significant tree retention and landscape features), protection of the visual amenity of the area and protection of the Jandakot Mound groundwater area. The scheme change should provide a minimum density requirement that maximises the sites protection, improves and maximises the visual amenity of the area and interface with the rural area whilst also

delivering a much sought after product on the local market. Only 2 r5 lots have come on the market locally in recent years.

They were under offer within minutes and there are many families (including ours) looking at moving away to get a bigger block for our children.

- The area of retained vegetation south of the school site has no ecological connection to adjoining areas of remnant vegetation of proposed Public Open Space. The current placement of small sized lots around the vegetation to be retained next to the school provide a poor environmental outcome for the flora and fauna of this reserve. The proposed Concept Plan should be amended to ensure that all areas of remnant vegetation to be retained are connected to either adjoining remnant areas or areas of future Public Open Space. This will reduce the potential for fauna mortality and improve flora outcomes.
- The proposed 250-400m² lots on the southeastern corner and facing Lyon Road do not provide a suitable interface with the rural area and will provide poor housing outcomes as they area along a heavily used truck route and will be impacted by noise. Recommend a redesign of the Concept Plan such that residential areas are not fronting on to Rowley Road in any capacity.
- The current road network cannot cope with the traffic of the area. The proposal does not provide any changes to the road network of Lyon or Rowley Roads, or upgrade to the current intersection roundabout. The proposed Scheme amendment will only exacerbate the traffic issues in this area.
- Any future development under the Local Planning Scheme, Subdivisions or Development approval must require a spring flora and fauna survey, targeted orchid survey and black cockatoo habitat assessment as a minimum to be prepared prior to and submitted with any applications for planning and development to ensure that all important environmental assets are identified prior to planning and design so that they can be accommodated and retained as far as practicable.

Applying conditions at subdivision approval stage is too late. The WAPC must ensure that these surveys and assessments are done early so that the relevant stakeholders can start providing more considered development that acknowledges and protects to the maximum extent, environmental assets for our community. This is especially important for this Scheme amendment, noting its obtrusion into the Jandakot Mound Groundwater Protection Area.

Planning Comment: Comments noted.
Refer to the 'Planning Framework,' 'Jandakot Groundwater Mound,' 'Environmental Matters,' 'Traffic and Transport Matters' and 'Future Land Uses' sections within Part 6 of the **Report on Submissions**.

Determination: Submission dismissed.

Submitter: Owners of Lot 24 Rowley Roads & Lot 23 Lyon Road, Banjup

Summary of Submission: COMMENT

The owners of the above sites are located within an area that is subject to the proposed amendment. A concept plan has been prepared in support of the proposed Amendment to demonstrate how the Amendment Area might be developed should the proposed Amendment be approved.

The Concept Plan broadly identifies the location of future zones and land uses, residential densities, road layout, and open space and is based on the findings of 'high level' technical reporting which includes a District Water Management Strategy, Environmental Assessment Report (EAR), BAL Assessment, Engineering Report and Traffic Impact Assessment.

The preparation of a Concept Plan at the MRS Amendment stage is not a statutory requirement and is typically only prepared to assist in informing the accompanying 'high level' technical reports which require an indication of potential lot yield, land use mix and road configuration to inform their assessments. Concept Plans prepared at the MRS Amendment stage are refined during subsequent stages of the planning process which include LPS amendment, local structure planning and subdivision processes.

The Concept Plan prepared in relation to the proposed Amendment identifies:

- Lot 24 Rowley Road as accommodating a future commercial centre, surrounded by medium density residential land uses; and
- Lot 23 Lyon Road as being retained for open space/bushland.

Should the proposed Amendment be approved, a further amendment to the City of Cockburn Town Planning Scheme No. 3 (LPS 3) will be required to rezone the Amendment Area from the 'Rural' zone to the Development zone.

A Development zoning will require the preparation and approval of a Local Structure Plan (LSP) to provide a framework for the designation of future land uses, service infrastructure, roads, and open space, and to guide future subdivision and development. During the local structure planning process, the Concept Plan prepared in support of the proposed Amendment will be further refined following the completion of more detailed technical assessment, including targeted environmental surveys. These more detailed assessments may result in changes to the Concept Plan. Any changes will be reflected in a LSP and will undergo a separate and additional review and assessment process.

The proposed Amendment has been reviewed, and the proposed Urban and Urban Deferred zoning is supported. However, the landowners are concerned that the Concept Plan, which identifies Lot 23 Lyon Road as being retained for open space/bushland, will be treated as a statutory document from which departure will not be permitted once the local structure planning process commences. Any such approach would fail to acknowledge the scope and purpose of a conceptual plan in the hierarchy of planning documents and would be grossly inconsistent with the principles of orderly and proper planning.

It is acknowledged that Lot 23 Lyon Road contains environmental attributes, but it is also acknowledged that these attributes have only been considered at a 'high level' and require more detailed (targeted) consideration to appropriately inform the local structure planning process. Given the site's environmental attributes advice from Western Environmental has been sought in relation to a range of environmental matters relating to Lot 23 Lyon Road including wetlands, vegetation and flora, and fauna.

The advice indicates that the 'high level' findings contained within the EAR are generally accurate, except in relation to vegetation type and fauna habitat mapping where some discrepancies may exist which, in turn, could impact the EAR's findings in relation to Black Cockatoo Habitat.

On this basis, Western Environmental recommend that additional targeted Black Cockatoo Habitat Assessment is undertaken at the local structure planning stage to determine the presence and accurate extent of breeding, foraging and/or roosting habitat. The findings of a targeted Black Cockatoo Habitat Assessment may indicate that the retention of all vegetation on the site is not warranted, and that part of the site may be suitable for urban development.

The Concept Plan adopts a broad brush 'avoidance' approach to environmental mitigation and doesn't consider other mitigation measures such as revegetation and/or offsets. This is not unreasonable or unexpected at the MRS Amendment stage however it is acknowledged that other mitigation options should be explored following more detailed environmental review during subsequent stages of the planning process to ensure an appropriate balance between urban and environmental outcomes.

It should not be assumed therefore that Lot 23 Lyon Road has no development potential simply as a consequence of its designation for open space/bushland in a 'concept' plan. Having regard to the above, the amendment is:

- supported to the Urban and Urban Deferred zoning proposed via MRS Amendment No. 1426; and
- conditionally support the Concept Plan prepared in support of MRS Amendment No. 1426 subject to an acknowledgement that the plan is conceptual in nature, is not statutorily binding and will be refined during subsequent stages of the planning process.

Planning Comment:

Comments noted.

Refer to Part 8 of the ***Report on Submissions***.

The MRS amendment has been considered by the EPA who did not assess the amendment. Therefore, if the site is zoned Urban this will then provide for subsequent, more detail work (including flora and fauna studies), to further refine the designation of land uses, include land set aside as open space etc.

The concept plan which accompanies the amendment was used to inform how future development may be. These further investigations are likely to result in further changes to the concept plan. Noting that this process includes a separate public consultation process.

Determination:

Submission noted.

Submission:	69
Submitter:	Department of Primary Industries and Regional Development
Summary of Submission:	<p>COMMENT</p> <p>The Department of Primary Industries and Regional Development (DPIRD) advises as follows:</p> <p><u>Technical Considerations:</u></p> <p>DPIRD degradation hazard mapping shows the phosphorus export hazard rating across the site is high to extreme.</p> <p>Phosphorus export hazard refers to the likelihood that phosphorus (P), usually applied as fertiliser, moves from a given land unit to where it can contribute to eutrophication of surface water.</p> <p>These factors stress the need for well-designed drainage, which is also emphasised in the general policy provisions of SPP 2.1.</p> <p><u>DPIRD Position:</u></p> <p>DPIRD does not object to the proposed Urban zoning but considers that it should be deferred until such time as a structure plan has been prepared, which addresses the outstanding policy and information requirements. E.g. how the risks of nutrient export will be addressed, how groundwater will be protected and how much vegetation clearing is likely to occur.</p> <p>Deferring the rezoning until a structure plan has been prepared will address the comments by the EPA, which note that the future structure plan will need to be consistent with the draft concept plan to avoid the requirement for referral.</p> <p>Alternatively, DPIRD would support rezoning of the entire site to Urban Deferred to allow time for the additional planning and technical studies to occur.</p>
Planning Comment:	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>The amendment is supported by a DWMS which has been assessed by the DWER and sets the framework for water management through subsequent phases of planning and development, including the construction of a drainage system and ongoing monitoring of groundwater.</p> <p>It is the MRS (and concurrent LPS) amendment that will allow for structure planning to take place, noting that the EPA has determined that the amendment does not warrant a formal environmental assessment.</p>
Determination:	Submission noted.

Submission:	70
Submitter:	Qube Property Group Pty Ltd

Summary of Submission: COMMENT

The submitter supports the amendment and requests that the Minister for Planning support a section 126(3) amendment to concurrently rezone the area being zoned Urban to a Development zone in the City of Cockburn LPS 3.

This will allow the planning of the amendment area to progress to structure planning, removing an unnecessary LPS amendment that would add 12 months to the delivery of housing in the Perth metropolitan area.

This request follows the advice received from the EPA that the environmental values of the amendment area can be protected at structure planning and subdivision stages.

Background:

Amendment 1426 comprises 17 individual residential lifestyle lots, measuring approximately 56ha, currently zoned Rural - Water Protection and 'Resource' zones in the MRS and City's LPS 3.

This submission does not reiterate the arguments in favour of Amendment 1426, but the site is well situated, presenting as a logical extension of Aubin Grove, with the Aubin Grove Primary School abutting the northern edge with roads and services connected to the broader network. Located 6km south of Cockburn Central and train station, 2km south of the Aubin Grove train station and the Kwinana Freeway being 300m to the west. Amendment 1426 'rounding off' undeveloped land making it suitable for urban development.

This suitability for urban development was acknowledged by the WAPC, with Amendment 1426 initiated to 'Urban' zoning a on 29 May 2024.

EPA Assessment:

Following initiation by the WAPC, Amendment 1426 was referred to the EPA. On 31 October 2024 the EPA determined that Amendment 1426 did not require assessment under the Environmental Protection Act 1986, with advice that all environmental values could be protected at structure planning and subdivision stages.

There was no part of the EPA's advice that suggested the need for LPS provisions, therefore Qube believe there is strong merit in a section 126(3) amendment to LPS 3, recognising that the land is suitable for urban development.

In considering a section 126(3) amendment request, Qube encourages that the WAPC seek confirmation from the EPA that LPS provisions are unnecessary and that the environmental values of the amendment area can be addressed as part of structure planning and subdivision stages.

Section 126(3) Amendment:

This comprises amending the LPS 3 map to show the subject land as 'Development' zone. Clause 3.2.1(j) of LPS 3 sets out that the purpose of a 'Development' zone is:

To provide for future residential, industrial or commercial development to be guided by a comprehensive Structure Plan prepared under the Scheme LPS 3, by way of Note 3 of Table 1 (Zoning Table) reads:

Development and use of land is to be guided by an approved Structure Plan prepared and adopted under clause 22 of the Deemed Provisions.

This is a link between LPS 3 and the Deemed Provisions because LPS 3 submits the approval process of a structure plan to the Deemed Provisions with LPS 3 only mandating the need for an approved structure plan prior to development.

This is where any LPS amendment should end, meaning only the LPS 3 map needs to be amended, allowing for a Section 126(3) concurrent amendment.

Special Control Areas:

Historically, it has been the adopted practice within LPS 3 to create a corresponding Special Control Area for every 'Development' zone, but this practice does not need to occur. This was undertaken to confirm certain requirements within LPS 3 (to be done at a subsequent planning phase) but we would suggest that this practice pre-dates the Deemed Provisions which now establishes these requirements.

It appears to have been common practice to show a corresponding Special Control Area (Development Area) on the LPS 3 map for every 'Development' zone, with Clause 5.1 of LPS 3 then stating that the Development Area "needs to be shown on the Scheme map as a DA number and included in Table 9".

A review of Table 9 shows that most of the Development Areas read along the lines of "an approved structure plan, together with all approved amendments, shall be given due regard in the assessment of subdivision, land use and development in accordance with Clause 27(1) of the Deemed Provisions".

Therefore, a Section 126(3) amendment is not possible because of the necessary text changes to Table 9, this is the superfluous layering of scheme provisions, and a Special Control Area is not required as it reiterates what LPS 3 already mandates. The redundancies in this approach are more apparent when you consider Clause 27(1) of the Deemed Provisions reads:

"A decision-maker for an application for development approval or subdivision approval in an area that is covered by a structure plan that has been approved by the Commission is to have due regard to, but is not bound by, the structure plan when deciding the application."

Therefore, with the Deemed Provisions coming into effect in 2015, the practice of creating a Special Control Area (Development Area) for no other purpose other than to stipulate the need for a structure plan (which the underlying zone already mandates) is outdated, redundant and only results in an unnecessary LPS amendment process.

Land Use Control:

There is merit in setting out future land use control for the amendment area, particularly in context of the Jandakot groundwater resource, demonstrating that a Special Control Area is unnecessary as this is adequately controlled by subsequent structure planning.

The site is currently zoned 'Resource' which is for the protection of the Perth Metropolitan underground water resource, with Note 1 of Table 1 (Zoning

Table) in LPS 3 currently deferring to Clause 4.10.11 for land use. Clause 4.10.11 then sets out criteria for assessing land use within a 'Resource' zone but essentially it refers to the relevant State Planning Policy for water, which has been taken as being the DWER's *Water Quality Protection Note 25 - Land use compatibility tables for public drinking water source areas*. However, once land is zoned 'Development' then an approved structure plan controls land uses.

Draft SPP 2.9 was accepted as being the authoritative policy, notwithstanding that its status remains 'draft'. Both the District Water Management Strategy and Public Drinking Water Risk Assessment (Pentium Water) which underpinned Amendment 1426 were prepared referencing draft SPP 2.9. Therefore, the water management and monitoring framework has been benchmarked using the most contemporary practices which guide the subsequent Local Water Management Strategy and Urban Water Management Plan(s).

While it is acknowledged that draft SPP 2.9 recommends that for Priority 3 and Priority 3* areas, that a Special Control Area (or equivalent) be established in the local planning scheme, the 'or equivalent' is important as a Special Control Area does not need to be established solely for this purpose.

Draft SPP 2.9 also states that in the priority areas, structure plans (and in some cases subdivisions) must be referred to DWER for its advice. This is further reinforced by clause 16 of the Deemed Provisions which lists what information must be set out in a structure plan, including aspect relating to the natural environment. The WAPC's Manual Guidance for Structure Plans elaborates, listing Environmental Assessment and Management Strategies and a Local Water Management Strategies as technical work to be undertaken, to guide and support structure planning.

With the Deemed Provisions having statutory weight through their automatic application via LPS, and draft SPP 2.9 requiring DWER's advice for any structure plans, the need to establish a Special Control Area to control land use is outdated.

A structure plan can be prepared for the amendment area, considering the site's features and values, and then be assessed considering all relevant State and local government schemes, policies and other relevant instruments. Draft SPP 2.9 is a State Planning Policy which will need to be considered, meaning land use permissibility can correspond with those permissible land uses in DWER's Water Quality Protection Note 25 by virtue of its reference in this SPP.

Development Contribution Area:

The amendment area is already a Special Control Area (Development Contribution Area 13), which requires contributions for a range of community infrastructure. As a development contribution scheme is in place to fund the provision of regional, sub-regional and local community facilities meaning that structure planning and subdivision phases can progress without concerns that contribution to this needed community infrastructure may be avoided.

Planning Comment:

Comments noted.
Refer to Part 8 of the **Report on Submissions**.

It has also been confirmed that specific provisions are not required for the subject land given the subsequent more detailed structure planning and subdivision stages provides for further consideration of environmental and water management requirements via additional information being submitted and also includes consultation with DWER and DBCA.

Determination: Submission noted.

Submission: 71 (Late)

Submitter: Department of Education

Summary of Submission: COMMENT

The proposed amendment is within the student intake area of Aubin Grove Primary School (Primary School) and Hammond Park Secondary College. Currently, the Primary School is operating under significant student enrolment pressure, well beyond its permanent built capacity with the number of temporary accommodation on-site. The primary school is not able to accommodate the anticipated additional students from a residential development of this scale and an additional public primary school site is required to support the increased student population.

Every new residential development or intensification of residential density creates demand for public schools. This requires careful planning consideration to ensure that the anticipated student demand balances with the provision of public schools in the locality.

The amendment area was not contemplated to be considered as an area generating student yield. The *Perth and Peel@3.5million/South Metropolitan Peel Sub-Regional Planning Framework* retains the area as Rural Residential.

If development is contemplated it is recommended that a district structure plan (DSP) be prepared over the wider area. This would allow forward planning for educational needs and identify adequate number of future school sites in accordance Operational Policy 2.4 - Planning for School Sites.

Hammond Park Secondary College is to reach its capacity in the medium to long term and additional/transportable classrooms would likely be required to support the future student population growth from the amendment area.

The DoE has no in principle objection to the proposed amendment subject to a new primary school site being identified through the future local structure planning in the amendment area. The local government and/or proponents should engage with the DoE in the preparation of a local structure plan for the amendment area and/or broader locality.

Planning Comment: Comments noted.


The DoE's advice has been provided to the proponent as a local structure plan is to be prepared for the site which will consider the surrounding context and includes further consultation with the DoE.

It is at this stage that more detailed matters relating to educational uses are further considered noting that the need for DSP is not warranted given the size of the amendment area, no other urban expansion proposed in *Perth and Peel@3.5million/South Metropolitan Peel Sub-Regional Planning Framework* and that the surrounding Urban zoned area is generally developed

Determination: Submission noted.

Schedule 3

amendment figure/s (as advertised)



**Lyon and Kinley Roads, Banjup
Proposed complex MRS amendment
as advertised**

29 May 2024


Proposal 1

- Proposed Amendment:
- Rural-Water Protection zone to Urban zone
 - Rural-Water Protection zone to Urban Deferred zone

Reference no: 4726
File no: RLS/1124
Version number: 1



Date: 31/05/2024
Produced by Data Analytics, Department of Planning, Lands and Heritage, Perth WA
Base information supplied by Western Australian Land Information Authority SLIP 1447-2023-1



Appendix A

list of plans (as advertised)

Metropolitan Region Scheme Amendment 1426 (Complex) Lyon and Kinley Roads, Banjup

as advertised

Amending Plan 3.2839

Detail Plans: 1.6654 & 1.6670

Appendix B

submissions

From: [Engineering Services](#)
To: [Region Planning Schemes](#)
Subject: RE: LM01492114 - Proposed Metropolitan Region Scheme Amendment 1426 (Complex) - Lyon and Kinley Roads, Banjup - RLS/1124
Date: Monday, 30 December 2024 11:53:03 AM
Attachments: [image002.ipa](#)
[ATCO PLAN - LM01492114.pdf](#)
[AGA-ENG-PR12-FM03 GIS Master Symbols Sheet External.pdf](#)
[PLAN WA - TRIGGER DISTANCE - LM01492114.pdf](#)

OFFICIAL

Re: Proposed Metropolitan Region Scheme Amendment 1426 (Complex) - Lyon and Kinley Roads, Banjup - RLS/1124
ATCO Reference: LM01492114

ATCO Gas Australia (ATCO) has **no objection** to the proposed application, based on the information and plan provided.

Advice notes:

- Anyone proposing to carry out construction or excavation works must contact 'Before You Dig Australia' (www.byda.com.au) to determine the location of buried gas infrastructure. Refer to ATCO document AGA-O&M-PR24- Additional Information for Working Around Gas Infrastructure <https://www.atco.com/en-au/for-home/natural-gas/wa-gas-network/working-around-gas.html>
- Proposed construction and excavation works need to be managed in accordance with the ATCO document *Additional Information for Working Around Gas Infrastructure - AGA-O&M-PR24* <https://www.atco.com/en-au/for-home/natural-gas/wa-gas-network/working-around-gas.html>
- If the disconnection and/or removal of an ATCO gas service is required, a request can be submitted via the online ATCO portal found [here](#).

Please accept this email as ATCO's written response.

Should you have any queries regarding the information above, please contact us on 13 13 56 or eservices@atco.com.

Gary Middleton

Land Management Coordinator

ATCO, Gas Division, Australia


P. +61 8 6163 5153

A. 81 Prinsep Road, Jandakot, Western Australia, 6164

atco.com.au [Facebook](#) [Twitter](#) [LinkedIn](#)



ATCO acknowledges Aboriginal people as the Traditional Custodians of country throughout Australia including Torres Strait Islander peoples. We pay respect to their cultures, Elders past and present, and in the spirit of reconciliation, we commit to working together for our shared future.




Gary Middleton 30/12/2024 11:32:49 AM 1:5416
E:393276.2 N:6439300 GDA2020 MGA Z50

WARNING BEWARE
The location of pipes and services are approximate only, and show an indicative position at time of construction. No guarantee can be given to the accuracy or completeness of information due to the age of some pipes and records. Refer to "Occupational Safety & Health" and Utility Providers "Code of Practice" for further information.
© ATCO Gas Australia Pty Ltd ABN 90 089 531 975
© Western Australian Land Information Authority trading as Landgate. Based on information provided by and with the permission of the Western Australian Land Information Authority trading as Landgate.

WARNING

**Refer to cover sheet
for further
information**



SYMBOLS SHEET

GAS UTILITY NETWORK

EXISTING GAS NETWORK

- Transmission Pipelines
- Distribution Pipelines
- Distribution Pipe MAOP 350kPa
- Distribution Pipe MAOP 70kPa
- Distribution Pipe MAOP 7kPa
- Not Gassed (none)
- Service Pipe

PROPOSED GAS ASSETS

- Proposed Meter
- Proposed Main
- Common Trenching
- Replacement Program

ABANDONED GAS NETWORK

- Inactive / Removed Meter
- Abandoned Fitting
- Abandoned Valve
- Abandoned Gas Main
- Abandoned Fitting SOLD
- Abandoned Valve SOLD
- Abandoned Gas Main SOLD

COMPOUNDS

- Gate Station
- Pressure Reducing Station
- L.P.G. Tank
- Hydrogen Plant

VALVES

- Isolation Valves
- Service Valves

MONITORING DEVICES

- Flow Monitoring Device
- Pressure Monitoring Device

ASSOCIATED INFRASTRUCTURE

- Associated Asset

DUCTS AND SLEEVES

- Duct
- Horizontal Boring
- Sleeve
- Road Crossing
- Concrete Slabbing

REGULATOR SETS

- Regulator Set
- Boundary Regulator

DELIVERY POINTS

- Meter
- Interval Meter
- Meter Set

PIPE JUNCTIONS

- End Cap
- Expansion Joint
- Reducer
- Tee
- Transition
- Weld
- Monolithic Joint
- Stopple
- Odorizer
- Junctions

PROTECTION DEVICES


- Test Point
- Anode
- Rectifier

FEATURES

- | | | | |
|-----------------|-----------------------------|------------------|------------------|
| Side Elevation | Linked Document | Reference Line | Not Gassed |
| Obstacle | Pre-Laid Service | Gas Pit | Suburb |
| See Details | Pre-Laid Service Stairs | Arrow Pointer | Local Government |
| Not Connected | Pre-Laid Service Tee | Proving Location | Pressure Upgrade |
| Gas Service | Asset end on Main | | |
| Sign | Asset ends on Direction Peg | | |
| Offline Service | | | |

Asset Identification Legend

1. **Critical Asset** (See Cover Sheet WARNINGS)
2. Pipe Diameter (millimetres)
3. Pipe Material:
CI = Cast Iron PE = Polyethylene, GI = Galvanised Iron,
PVC = PVC, ST = Steel
4. Alignment (in metres from property line)
5. Pressure in main & Gas Type
5a) MAOP (Maximum Allowable Operating Pressure)
5b) Gas Type:
NG = Natural Gas.
H2B = Natural Gas Blended with % Hydrogen.
LPG = Liquefied Petroleum Gas.
6. Off-line Service service may not be straight line to meter.
(WARNING OLS may not always be shown on plan).
See Cover Sheet for More Information.
7. Service Valve in the vicinity
(NOTE: Service Valve may be "BURIED")
8. Pre-laid Service laid in Common Trench
9. Main Status: (See **Cover Sheet WARNINGS**)
9a. AB & ABS = Abandoned Mains, Ab Sold.
9b. PROP = Proposed Mains
10. Customer Connection: Does not indicate actual location of Meter Position
D2 (D = Domestic & 2 = Number of Meters)
C1 (C = Commercial & 1 = Number of Meters)
11. **Additional detail available and Must be obtained if within area of proposed works see Cover Sheet.**
12. Depth of Cover (DOC) in metres.






TRIGGER DISTANCE - LM01492114

Legend

-  DBP - AGIG Trigger Distance
-  Cadastre



1: 15,898



0.8 0 0.40 0.8 Kilometers

Date produced: 30-Dec-2024

This map is a user generated static output from PlanWA (a public interactive mapping tool provided by the Department of Planning, Lands and Heritage and accessed via wa.gov.au) and is for reference only.

THIS MAP IS NOT TO BE USED FOR NAVIGATION

Location information data licensed from Western Australian Land Information Authority (WALIA) trading as Landgate. Copyright in the location information data remains with WALIA. WALIA does not warrant the accuracy or completeness of the location information data or its suitability for any particular purpose.

Notes

**Respondent No:** 1**Login:** Anonymous**Email:** n/a**Responded At:** Dec 24, 2024 13:33:32 pm**Last Seen:** Dec 24, 2024 13:33:32 pm**IP Address:** n/a

Q1. What is your name?

Details removed at the request of the submitter

Q2. What is your surname?

Q3. What is your email address?

Q4. What is your address?

Q5. What is your contact number?

Q6. Submissions may be published as part of the consultation process. Do you wish to have your name removed from your submission? Yes

Q7. Are you responding on behalf of an organisation? No

Q8. What is the name of the organisation? not answered

Q9. Do you support/oppose the proposed amendment to the Metropolitan Region Scheme? Support

Q10. Please type your submission (reasons for support/opposition) into the box below. Any supporting documents may be uploaded below.

I support the submission on a conditional basis that all of the proposed area is rezoned to Urban, Not partial urban and urban deferred. The advertised document does not represent fully the reasoning why the developers recently had their access removed from Lot30. The land in question over the whole lot has areas of the same fauna and flora and makes no sense to zone any part of the land differently to the other. I am happy to discuss this further in person or via email.

Q11. Upload supporting documents not answered

Q12. Upload supporting documents not answered

Q13. Upload supporting documents not answered



Respondent No: 8

Login: Anonymous

Email: n/a

Responded At: Dec 31, 2024 20:59:06 pm

Last Seen: Dec 31, 2024 20:59:06 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. What is your name?

Q2. What is your surname?

Q3. What is your email address?

Q4. What is your address?

Q5. What is your contact number?

Q6. Submissions may be published as part of the consultation process. Do you wish to have your name removed from your submission? Yes

Q7. Are you responding on behalf of an organisation? No

Q8. What is the name of the organisation? not answered

Q9. Do you support/oppose the proposed amendment to the Metropolitan Region Scheme? Oppose

Q10. Please type your submission (reasons for support/opposition) into the box below. Any supporting documents may be uploaded below.

Insufficient information provided in the intended changes to the zoning. The report states 57 hectares to be rezoned, however in the detail it refers to 50 m buffer zones around REW. Where are these as there is wetland trees on most of the lots so which lots would require 50m buffer areas and why 50m when other parts like a long taper road do not have this range from REW.

Q11. Upload supporting documents not answered

Q12. Upload supporting documents not answered

Q13. Upload supporting documents not answered

**Respondent No:** 2**Login:** Anonymous**Email:** n/a**Responded At:** Dec 30, 2024 23:04:18 pm**Last Seen:** Dec 30, 2024 23:04:18 pm**IP Address:** n/a

Q1. What is your name?

Details removed at the request of the submitter

Q2. What is your surname?

Q3. What is your email address?

Q4. What is your address?

Q5. What is your contact number?

Q6. Submissions may be published as part of the consultation process. Do you wish to have your name removed from your submission? Yes

Q7. Are you responding on behalf of an organisation? No

Q8. What is the name of the organisation? not answered

Q9. Do you support/oppose the proposed amendment to the Metropolitan Region Scheme? Oppose

Q10. Please type your submission (reasons for support/opposition) into the box below. Any supporting documents may be uploaded below.

not answered

Q11. Upload supporting documents not answered

Q12. Upload supporting documents not answered

Q13. Upload supporting documents not answered

**Respondent No:** 3**Login:** Anonymous**Email:** n/a**Responded At:** Dec 31, 2024 00:03:20 am**Last Seen:** Dec 31, 2024 00:03:20 am**IP Address:** n/a

Q1. What is your name?

Details removed at the request of the submitter

Q2. What is your surname?

Q3. What is your email address?

Q4. What is your address?

Q5. What is your contact number?

Q6. Submissions may be published as part of the consultation process. Do you wish to have your name removed from your submission? Yes

Q7. Are you responding on behalf of an organisation? No

Q8. What is the name of the organisation? not answered

Q9. Do you support/oppose the proposed amendment to the Metropolitan Region Scheme? Oppose

Q10. Please type your submission (reasons for support/opposition) into the box below. Any supporting documents may be uploaded below.

The only thing I oppose, is if the land is used for government housing! I support using land for residential housing to resemble the rest of the suburb. And for parks, shops and pub.

Q11. Upload supporting documents not answered

Q12. Upload supporting documents not answered

Q13. Upload supporting documents not answered

**Respondent No:** 4**Login:** Anonymous**Email:** n/a**Responded At:** Dec 31, 2024 11:01:40 am**Last Seen:** Dec 31, 2024 11:01:40 am**IP Address:** n/a

Q1. What is your name?

Details removed at the request of the submitter

Q2. What is your surname?

Q3. What is your email address?

Q4. What is your address?

Q5. What is your contact number?

Q6. Submissions may be published as part of the consultation process. Do you wish to have your name removed from your submission? Yes

Q7. Are you responding on behalf of an organisation? No

Q8. What is the name of the organisation? not answered

Q9. Do you support/oppose the proposed amendment to the Metropolitan Region Scheme? Oppose

Q10. Please type your submission (reasons for support/opposition) into the box below. Any supporting documents may be uploaded below.

This new zoning, if approved has the potential to heavily affect current wildlife habitats. This land provide valuable homes to all our native wildlife. Aubin Grove already has a very small amount of natural bushland that has been conserved during the planning process. Many other land developments continue to dedicate far more land to protected reserves in comparison to Aubin Grove. Another point is there is a residence on Kinley Road that is dedicated to a voluntary male drug and alcohol rehabilitation facility. This residence has had the ability to run inconspicuously due to its surroundings, it is a low traffic area with few private residents. Should the surrounding zoning change, foreseeable problems could arise. Firstly, as this is a voluntary facility there could potentially be a decline of people accessing the help they need due to the increase of visibility (properties, people and traffic). Secondly, there is another aspect which is far more alarming. Should development go ahead once zoning is amended we would have potentially young children in the direct vicinity of this facility which is unacceptable. This is a suburban area, located close by is Aubin Grove Primary School. The area the facility is located is relatively closed off from local foot traffic and therefore has the ability to exist as it doesn't not impact the residential surrounds. Also something that has not been sighted but I would expect to come up at a later stage should this rezoning go ahead, is linking the roads between Descanso Loop and Kinley Road. Over 10years ago there was a proposal to open up access from Kinley to Descanso, thus enabling it to become a thoroughfare from Rowley Road. Descanso Loop holds a decent amount of traffic for the amount of houses, I feel it would be unsafe to allow additional traffic to pass through, even if that is from new housing developments in the rezoned area. My husband and I purchased our land 15years ago and we have been living in our house over 13years. We have a young family and enjoy our street immensely due to its location in respect to traffic. Kind Regards, Katie Meredith

Q11. Upload supporting documents

not answered

Q12. Upload supporting documents

not answered

Q13. Upload supporting documents

not answered

**Respondent No:** 5**Login:** Anonymous**Email:** n/a**Responded At:** Dec 31, 2024 12:52:18 pm**Last Seen:** Dec 31, 2024 12:52:18 pm**IP Address:** n/a

Q1. What is your name?

Details removed at the request of the submitter

Q2. What is your surname?

Q3. What is your email address?

Q4. What is your address?

Q5. What is your contact number?

Q6. Submissions may be published as part of the consultation process. Do you wish to have your name removed from your submission? Yes

Q7. Are you responding on behalf of an organisation? No

Q8. What is the name of the organisation? not answered

Q9. Do you support/oppose the proposed amendment to the Metropolitan Region Scheme? Oppose

Q10. Please type your submission (reasons for support/opposition) into the box below. Any supporting documents may be uploaded below.

not answered

Q11. Upload supporting documents not answered

Q12. Upload supporting documents not answered

Q13. Upload supporting documents not answered

**Respondent No:** 6**Login:** Anonymous**Email:** n/a**Responded At:** Dec 31, 2024 13:53:34 pm**Last Seen:** Dec 31, 2024 13:53:34 pm**IP Address:** n/a

Q1. What is your name?

Details removed at the request of the submitter

Q2. What is your surname?

Q3. What is your email address?

Q4. What is your address?

Q5. What is your contact number?

Q6. Submissions may be published as part of the consultation process. Do you wish to have your name removed from your submission? Yes

Q7. Are you responding on behalf of an organisation? No

Q8. What is the name of the organisation? not answered

Q9. Do you support/oppose the proposed amendment to the Metropolitan Region Scheme? Oppose

Q10. Please type your submission (reasons for support/opposition) into the box below. Any supporting documents may be uploaded below.

I oppose the amendment for the following reasons and wish for these reasons to be considered. 1. Aubin Grove is currently lacking the infrastructure to support the area and surrounding areas and will only struggle further by the addition of more residential land. - No fuel station in Aubin Grove or 4 surrounding suburbs. - No car wash in Aubin Grove or 4 surrounding suburbs. - Lack of shopping precincts especially a variety of supermarket options and food outlets. 2. We oppose to the opening of Decanso Loop to to Kinley. - Influx of traffic. - Influx of noise. - Providing a route for escaping the freeway in peak times to reach Rowley road. - Influx of traffic during school hours from residential development as there are no other alternative routes aside from Rowley/Camden. Please consider supporting he current residents that are lacking the infrastructure needed in the area and surroundings before tens of hectares become more residential homes.

Q11. Upload supporting documents not answered

Q12. Upload supporting documents not answered

Q13. Upload supporting documents not answered

**Respondent No:** 7**Login:** Anonymous**Email:** n/a**Responded At:** Dec 31, 2024 18:03:46 pm**Last Seen:** Dec 31, 2024 18:03:46 pm**IP Address:** n/a

Q1. What is your name?	George
Q2. What is your surname?	Aleksic
Q3. What is your email address?	djo_aleksic@hotmail.com
Q4. What is your address?	Descanso loop Aubin Grove
Q5. What is your contact number?	0434582326
Q6. Submissions may be published as part of the consultation process. Do you wish to have your name removed from your submission?	No
Q7. Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?	No
Q8. What is the name of the organisation?	not answered
Q9. Do you support/oppose the proposed amendment to the Metropolitan Region Scheme?	Oppose
Q10. Please type your submission (reasons for support/opposition) into the box below. Any supporting documents may be uploaded below. DO NOT TRY TO FIX FREEWAY TRAFFIC WITH OPENING DESCANSO LOOP AND DISTURBING AUBIN,GROVE RESIDENTS EVEN MORE EVERYONES SAFETY WILL BE IMPACTED BY THIS AS PEOPLE WILL USE IT AS A ALTERNATIVE FREEWAY ROUTE.BUILD PETROL STATION MAYBE OR GIVE US ANOTHER SHOP BEFORE CONSIDERING BRINGING ANYMORE PEOPLE IN RESIDENTS OF AUBIN GROVE STAND UNITED OUR KIDS CANNOT EXPOSED TO THIS NON SENSE	
Q11. Upload supporting documents	not answered
Q12. Upload supporting documents	not answered
Q13. Upload supporting documents	not answered

**Respondent No:** 9**Login:** Anonymous**Email:** n/a**Responded At:** Jan 04, 2025 20:23:31 pm**Last Seen:** Jan 04, 2025 20:23:31 pm**IP Address:** n/a

Q1. What is your name?	Jovana
Q2. What is your surname?	Jovanovic
Q3. What is your email address?	jovana20@hotmail.com.au
Q4. What is your address?	36 sida street wandi
Q5. What is your contact number?	051056218
Q6. Submissions may be published as part of the consultation process. Do you wish to have your name removed from your submission?	No
Q7. Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?	No
Q8. What is the name of the organisation?	not answered
Q9. Do you support/oppose the proposed amendment to the Metropolitan Region Scheme?	Oppose
Q10. Please type your submission (reasons for support/opposition) into the box below. Any supporting documents may be uploaded below.	
	<p>I live in the neighbouring suburb- we desperately need more fuel station, more shops Coles aldi or another iga, and to leave more green space. My sister lives on Descanso and I'm opposed to this street opening. I currently live next to Lyon road and many use the road to evade the freeway during peak hour causing chaos on suburban roads and I wouldn't like that happening to another street in the local.</p>
Q11. Upload supporting documents	not answered
Q12. Upload supporting documents	not answered
Q13. Upload supporting documents	not answered

**Respondent No:** 10**Login:** Anonymous**Email:** n/a**Responded At:** Jan 07, 2025 15:15:51 pm**Last Seen:** Jan 07, 2025 15:15:51 pm**IP Address:** n/a

Q1. What is your name?

Details removed at the request of the submitter

Q2. What is your surname?

Q3. What is your email address?

Q4. What is your address?

Q5. What is your contact number?

Q6. Submissions may be published as part of the consultation process. Do you wish to have your name removed from your submission? Yes

Q7. Are you responding on behalf of an organisation? No

Q8. What is the name of the organisation? not answered

Q9. Do you support/oppose the proposed amendment to the Metropolitan Region Scheme? Oppose

Q10. Please type your submission (reasons for support/opposition) into the box below. Any supporting documents may be uploaded below.

I oppose this plan for additional housing in the set-out area. The roads and infrastructure on the southern part of Aubin Grove struggles with the current traffic. In addition to that the destruction of the bush land. Future developments need to start going up and not continuing on this destructive urban sprawl. That's a solid NO vote.

Q11. Upload supporting documents not answered

Q12. Upload supporting documents not answered

Q13. Upload supporting documents not answered

**Respondent No:** 11**Login:** Anonymous**Email:** n/a**Responded At:** Jan 07, 2025 15:17:29 pm**Last Seen:** Jan 07, 2025 15:17:29 pm**IP Address:** n/a

Q1. What is your name?

Details removed at the request of the submitter

Q2. What is your surname?

Q3. What is your email address?

Q4. What is your address?

Q5. What is your contact number?

Q6. Submissions may be published as part of the consultation process. Do you wish to have your name removed from your submission? Yes

Q7. Are you responding on behalf of an organisation? No

Q8. What is the name of the organisation? not answered

Q9. Do you support/oppose the proposed amendment to the Metropolitan Region Scheme? Oppose

Q10. Please type your submission (reasons for support/opposition) into the box below. Any supporting documents may be uploaded below.

We know first hand how many animals and birds live in the bushland behind us; kangaroos, quenda, lizards and black cockatoos are frequently seen in the trees and bush. I would hate for these birds and animals to no longer have a safe space to live.

Q11. Upload supporting documents not answered

Q12. Upload supporting documents not answered

Q13. Upload supporting documents not answered

**Respondent No:** 12**Login:** Anonymous**Email:** n/a**Responded At:** Jan 07, 2025 17:44:33 pm**Last Seen:** Jan 07, 2025 17:44:33 pm**IP Address:** n/a

Q1. What is your name?

Details removed at the request of the submitter

Q2. What is your surname?

Q3. What is your email address?

Q4. What is your address?

Q5. What is your contact number?

Q6. Submissions may be published as part of the consultation process. Do you wish to have your name removed from your submission? Yes

Q7. Are you responding on behalf of an organisation? No

Q8. What is the name of the organisation? not answered

Q9. Do you support/oppose the proposed amendment to the Metropolitan Region Scheme? Oppose

Q10. Please type your submission (reasons for support/opposition) into the box below. Any supporting documents may be uploaded below.

Loss of beautiful bush and native wildlife. Loss of privacy. Worsening traffic conditions in the area.

Q11. Upload supporting documents not answered

Q12. Upload supporting documents not answered

Q13. Upload supporting documents not answered

**Respondent No:** 13**Login:** Anonymous**Email:** n/a**Responded At:** Jan 07, 2025 18:24:56 pm**Last Seen:** Jan 07, 2025 18:24:56 pm**IP Address:** n/a

Q1. What is your name?

Details removed at the request of the submitter

Q2. What is your surname?

Q3. What is your email address?

Q4. What is your address?

Q5. What is your contact number?

Q6. Submissions may be published as part of the consultation process. Do you wish to have your name removed from your submission? Yes

Q7. Are you responding on behalf of an organisation? No

Q8. What is the name of the organisation? not answered

Q9. Do you support/oppose the proposed amendment to the Metropolitan Region Scheme? Oppose

Q10. Please type your submission (reasons for support/opposition) into the box below. Any supporting documents may be uploaded below.

Wildlife

Q11. Upload supporting documents not answered

Q12. Upload supporting documents not answered

Q13. Upload supporting documents not answered

**Respondent No:** 14**Login:** Anonymous**Email:** n/a**Responded At:** Jan 08, 2025 11:14:02 am**Last Seen:** Jan 08, 2025 11:14:02 am**IP Address:** n/a

Q1. What is your name?	Allan
Q2. What is your surname?	O'Connor
Q3. What is your email address?	alonrig@gmail.com
Q4. What is your address?	6 Crewe St, Bicton WA 6157
Q5. What is your contact number?	0419859857
Q6. Submissions may be published as part of the consultation process. Do you wish to have your name removed from your submission?	No
Q7. Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?	No
Q8. What is the name of the organisation?	not answered
Q9. Do you support/oppose the proposed amendment to the Metropolitan Region Scheme?	Support
Q10. Please type your submission (reasons for support/opposition) into the box below. Any supporting documents may be uploaded below. On behalf of the O'Connor family who own Lot 29 Kinley Road, Banjup, we fully support the proposed MRS Amendment. We have never understood the reasoning why this parcel of land was excluded from the original amendment which favourably zoned the surrounding Aubin Grove land back in 1990. This appears to have been a planning anomaly at the time. Like Aubin Grove, our land is close to the freeway, public transport, shops, schools and is a logical extension of the urban front. The groundwater extraction would be minimal in light of new desalination water sources and several studies have shown that water protection after development can be adequately managed. We look forward to seeing this amendment approved.	
Q11. Upload supporting documents	not answered
Q12. Upload supporting documents	not answered
Q13. Upload supporting documents	not answered

**Respondent No:** 15**Login:** Anonymous**Email:** n/a**Responded At:** Jan 08, 2025 19:36:56 pm**Last Seen:** Jan 08, 2025 19:36:56 pm**IP Address:** n/a

Q1. What is your name?

Q2. What is your surname?

Q3. What is your email address?

Q4. What is your address? Summers St, Perth WA 6004

Q5. What is your contact number?

Q6. Submissions may be published as part of the consultation process. Do you wish to have your name removed from your submission? Yes

Q7. Are you responding on behalf of an organisation? Yes

Q8. What is the name of the organisation? Public Transport Authority of Western Australia

Q9. Do you support/oppose the proposed amendment to the Metropolitan Region Scheme? Support

Q10. Please type your submission (reasons for support/opposition) into the box below. Any supporting documents may be uploaded below.

On behalf of the Public Transport Authority (PTA), I support the proposed amendment to Metropolitan Region Scheme Amendment 1426 for Lyon and Kinley Roads, Banjup, with no comments.

Q11. Upload supporting documents not answered

Q12. Upload supporting documents not answered

Q13. Upload supporting documents not answered

**Respondent No:** 16**Login:** Anonymous**Email:** n/a**Responded At:** Jan 10, 2025 10:24:35 am**Last Seen:** Jan 10, 2025 10:24:35 am**IP Address:** n/a

Q1. What is your name?

Details removed at the request of the submitter

Q2. What is your surname?

Q3. What is your email address?

Q4. What is your address?

Q5. What is your contact number?

Q6. Submissions may be published as part of the consultation process. Do you wish to have your name removed from your submission? Yes

Q7. Are you responding on behalf of an organisation? No

Q8. What is the name of the organisation? not answered

Q9. Do you support/oppose the proposed amendment to the Metropolitan Region Scheme? Oppose

Q10. Please type your submission (reasons for support/opposition) into the box below. Any supporting documents may be uploaded below.

Triandra Court will now back onto the estate. What is being done to prevent people going into the buffer area? Will fencing be installed? The fences for housing on Triandra Court will need to be upgraded to protect from trespassers. Rowley road is very busy and this adds more traffic. It'll be very difficult turning right out of the estate. Are roundabouts proposed? What goes in the commercial area shouldn't disturb the local area with noise. Also it shouldn't be a petrol station due to Jandakot.mound. Again issue with location and how busy Rowley road is. Extending the sporting field that is used by clubs like Aubin Grove United should be included as the club has outgrown it's facility and needs more grassed area for pitches. It will not be a good idea having housing backing onto the current grass area with footballs always going into the area behind. This would be great for the local community.

Q11. Upload supporting documents not answered

Q12. Upload supporting documents not answered

Q13. Upload supporting documents not answered



Respondent No: 17

Login: Anonymous

Email: n/a

Responded At: Jan 16, 2025 14:15:09 pm

Last Seen: Jan 16, 2025 14:15:09 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. What is your name?

Details removed at the request of the submitter

Q2. What is your surname?

Q3. What is your email address?

Q4. What is your address?

Q5. What is your contact number?

Q6. Submissions may be published as part of the consultation process. Do you wish to have your name removed from your submission? Yes

Q7. Are you responding on behalf of an organisation? No

Q8. What is the name of the organisation? not answered

Q9. Do you support/oppose the proposed amendment to the Metropolitan Region Scheme? Support

Q10. Please type your submission (reasons for support/opposition) into the box below. Any supporting documents may be uploaded below.

I strongly support the proposed amendment ...this area should have been included in original Aubin Grove amendment back in the 1990's ...it just doesn't make sense that this area has been excluded...particularly now when WA is in desperate need for more housing. This area has all the appropriate surrounding facilities ie School, medical centre, shopping centre, train station etc. It also has access to all the service infrastructure that is currently in place. The argument that it will impact on the groundwater is now irrelevant with the introduction of the desalination planthousing in this area will have little impact on the ground water supply. Finally i will add that the City Of Cockburn has already identified the land as future urban.

Q11. Upload supporting documents not answered

Q12. Upload supporting documents not answered

Q13. Upload supporting documents not answered

**Respondent No:** 18**Login:** Anonymous**Email:** n/a**Responded At:** Jan 26, 2025 22:52:56 pm**Last Seen:** Jan 26, 2025 22:52:56 pm**IP Address:** n/a

Q1. What is your name?

Details removed at the request of the submitter

Q2. What is your surname?

Q3. What is your email address?

Q4. What is your address?

Q5. What is your contact number?

Q6. Submissions may be published as part of the consultation process. Do you wish to have your name removed from your submission? Yes

Q7. Are you responding on behalf of an organisation? No

Q8. What is the name of the organisation? not answered

Q9. Do you support/oppose the proposed amendment to the Metropolitan Region Scheme? Oppose

Q10. Please type your submission (reasons for support/opposition) into the box below. Any supporting documents may be uploaded below.

No, this region is overpopulated and too many micro block. Too many traffic, too many people

Q11. Upload supporting documents not answered

Q12. Upload supporting documents not answered

Q13. Upload supporting documents not answered



Respondent No: 19

Login: Anonymous

Email: n/a

Responded At: Jan 27, 2025 00:48:31 am

Last Seen: Jan 27, 2025 00:48:31 am

IP Address: n/a

Q1. What is your name?

Details removed at the request of the submitter

Q2. What is your surname?

Q3. What is your email address?

Q4. What is your address?

Q5. What is your contact number?

Q6. Submissions may be published as part of the consultation process. Do you wish to have your name removed from your submission? Yes

Q7. Are you responding on behalf of an organisation? No

Q8. What is the name of the organisation? not answered

Q9. Do you support/oppose the proposed amendment to the Metropolitan Region Scheme? Oppose

Q10. Please type your submission (reasons for support/opposition) into the box below. Any supporting documents may be uploaded below.

Your proposed amendment appears to have little regard for the native flora and fauna of the area. There are endangered animals that rely on this form of vegetation for their survival. Our city is already the longest in the world, we don't need more space for single dwellings, we should be looking to infill already cleared areas with higher density homes to preserve the banksia woodlands and remaining natural spaces on the swan river coastal plain.

Q11. Upload supporting documents not answered

Q12. Upload supporting documents not answered

Q13. Upload supporting documents not answered

From: [Yang A](#)
To: [Region Planning Schemes](#)
Subject: Objection to MRS Amendment 1426 - Rezoning Proposal for Lyon and Kinley Roads, Banjup
Date: Monday, 27 January 2025 11:00:38 AM

You don't often get email from yangrle@hotmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

To The Secretary,
Western Australian Planning Commission,
Locked Bag 2506, PERTH WA 6001
Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing to express my objection to the proposed Metropolitan Region Scheme (MRS) Amendment 1426, which seeks to rezone approximately 57.76 hectares from the Rural–Water Protection zone to Urban and Urban Deferred zones in the Lyon and Kinley Roads area of Banjup.

As a resident of Lyon Road, I have noticed a dramatic increase in traffic on this road as more and more drivers bypass the Kwinana Freeway. This increased traffic has significantly disrupted my family's life, with constant noise, congestion, and safety concerns becoming a part of our daily routine. This situation is already unacceptable and would undoubtedly worsen with the proposed urban development.

Additionally, I have the following concerns about this proposal:

Environmental Concerns:

The Banjup area is currently zoned as Rural–Water Protection for a valid reason. It plays a critical role in protecting groundwater quality and preserving sensitive ecosystems. Rezoning this area for urban development would likely lead to increased surface runoff, pollution, and habitat destruction, which would severely impact local flora and fauna.

Water Resource Management:

The proposed rezoning conflicts with State Planning Policy 2.9 – Planning for Water, which prioritizes the conservation of water resources in areas like Banjup. The amendment would place further pressure on already fragile water supplies and is inconsistent with long-term water management strategies.

Incompatibility with South Metropolitan Peel Sub-Regional Planning Framework:

As noted in your amendment report, this proposal is inconsistent with the South Metropolitan Peel Sub-Regional Planning Framework. Approving such a change would undermine the planning principles that guide sustainable development in the region.

Community Impact:

The proposed urban development threatens to alter the semi-rural lifestyle that residents highly value. In addition to the existing traffic issues, increased traffic volume, noise, and urban sprawl would further deteriorate our quality of life and negatively impact the community.

Lack of Justification:

This amendment does not demonstrate a compelling need for additional residential

development in this area, especially when other, more suitable sites could meet this demand without compromising environmental and water protection objectives.

Given these reasons, I strongly urge the WAPC to reject this amendment to safeguard the environmental integrity, water resources, and rural character of the area while also addressing the severe traffic issues already affecting residents.

Thank you for considering this submission. I trust the WAPC will prioritize sustainable and community-centered planning practices in its decision-making process.

Yours sincerely,

Lyon road, Aubin Grove,
Aska Yang
yangrle@hotmail.com

**Respondent No:** 20**Login:** Anonymous**Email:** n/a**Responded At:** Jan 27, 2025 21:37:32 pm**Last Seen:** Jan 27, 2025 21:37:32 pm**IP Address:** n/a

Q1. What is your name?	Jelena
Q2. What is your surname?	Jovanovic
Q3. What is your email address?	jelenacojic@hotmail.com
Q4. What is your address?	28 Camden Boulevard, Aubin Grove WA 6164
Q5. What is your contact number?	0438956157
Q6. Submissions may be published as part of the consultation process. Do you wish to have your name removed from your submission?	No
Q7. Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?	No
Q8. What is the name of the organisation?	not answered
Q9. Do you support/oppose the proposed amendment to the Metropolitan Region Scheme?	Oppose
Q10. Please type your submission (reasons for support/opposition) into the box below. Any supporting documents may be uploaded below.	
<p>During school hours it is extremely hard getting through Camden Boulevard and Lyon Road. Adding the additional housing and open road from Rowley Rd through Descanso Loop is going to make even worse congestion/traffic. It is already dangerous for children walking to and from school, with the additional traffic it is going to make it even more so dangerous. We need more amenities available in the area such as a petrol station, car wash, a larger grocery store and other business spaces.</p>	
Q11. Upload supporting documents	not answered
Q12. Upload supporting documents	not answered
Q13. Upload supporting documents	not answered

**Respondent No:** 21**Login:** Anonymous**Email:** n/a**Responded At:** Jan 28, 2025 13:17:21 pm**Last Seen:** Jan 28, 2025 13:17:21 pm**IP Address:** n/a

Q1. What is your name?

Details removed at the request of the submitter

Q2. What is your surname?

Q3. What is your email address?

Q4. What is your address?

Q5. What is your contact number?

Q6. Submissions may be published as part of the consultation process. Do you wish to have your name removed from your submission? Yes

Q7. Are you responding on behalf of an organisation? No

Q8. What is the name of the organisation? not answered

Q9. Do you support/oppose the proposed amendment to the Metropolitan Region Scheme? Oppose

Q10. Please type your submission (reasons for support/opposition) into the box below. Any supporting documents may be uploaded below.

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed development plan, which threatens the destruction of precious Banksia woodlands and the habitat of the Carnaby's black cockatoo, along with countless other threatened species. While I understand the need for housing, this plan represents yet another failure to balance development with the preservation of our natural heritage—a heritage that is not only ecologically vital but also deeply meaningful to our community and our identity as Australians. South West Australia is recognized as one of the world's 36 biodiversity hotspots, home to unique and irreplaceable ecosystems. Yet, our government continues to allow the destruction of these precious habitats. This development plan is another example of how we are failing to protect what little remains of our natural heritage. It's not just about the endangered Carnaby's black cockatoos—though their plight is a heartbreaking symbol of what we stand to lose. It's about the countless other species that rely on these woodlands for survival. Once these habitats are gone, they're gone forever. How can we call ourselves stewards of this land when we allow this destruction to continue? The Banksia woodlands are a critical ecosystem, providing essential services such as carbon sequestration, water filtration, and soil stabilization. Their destruction will have far-reaching consequences for our environment and our community. Perth already has a poor record when it comes to tree destruction, and our shrinking tree canopy is leading to increased urban heat, reduced air quality, and a loss of green spaces that are vital for mental and physical health. Retaining and expanding our tree canopy should be a priority, not an afterthought. Where I live, the Carnaby's black cockatoos are frequent visitors. Their calls, their presence, their sheer beauty—they bring me and my community so much joy. They remind us that we are part of something bigger, something alive and precious. Nature and biodiversity aren't just "nice to have"—they are essential to our mental well-being, our connection to this land, and our identity as Australians. To witness the destruction of these habitats is not just heartbreaking; it's soul-crushing. It feels like we're losing a part of ourselves. Without these natural spaces, what are we? Soul-less prisoners in a concrete jungle, dragged along by consumerism, working to afford useless things that keep the capitalists rich while the most valuable things—nature, birds, clean air—are destroyed right before our eyes. It's ironic, isn't it? The things that truly matter are free, yet we're letting them slip through our fingers. We're sacrificing the irreplaceable for the sake of profit, and it's a tragedy. I don't want to live in a future where I have to show my child photos on my phone and say, "This is what used to be here." I want to take them outside, to play among the birds and trees, to feel the same connection to nature that I've been lucky enough to experience. But if we keep going down this path, that future won't exist. Our quality of life will decrease, and we'll be left with nothing but regret. This development plan highlights the urgent need for stronger nature laws to protect our most irreplaceable assets. We cannot continue to prioritize profit over the environment. There are alternative solutions that can accommodate growth without sacrificing our natural heritage. For example, the council could prioritize infill development, brownfield sites, or higher-density housing in already urbanized areas. Additionally, stronger protections for environmentally significant areas must be implemented to ensure that development is truly sustainable. I urge the council to reject this plan and take a stand for our Banksia woodlands, for the Carnaby's black cockatoos, and for all the species that call this habitat home. This isn't just about trees or birds—it's about who we are as a community, as Australians, and as human beings. We have a responsibility to protect what little remains of our natural heritage. Please, don't let this destruction continue. Thank you for considering my submission. I trust that the council will make a decision that reflects the values of our community and the importance of preserving our environment for generations to come.

Q11. Upload supporting documents

not answered

Q12. Upload supporting documents

not answered

Q13. Upload supporting documents

not answered

**Respondent No:** 22**Login:** Anonymous**Email:** n/a**Responded At:** Jan 28, 2025 19:17:03 pm**Last Seen:** Jan 28, 2025 19:17:03 pm**IP Address:** n/a

Q1. What is your name?

Details removed at the request of the submitter

Q2. What is your surname?

Q3. What is your email address?

Q4. What is your address?

Q5. What is your contact number?

Q6. Submissions may be published as part of the consultation process. Do you wish to have your name removed from your submission? Yes

Q7. Are you responding on behalf of an organisation? No

Q8. What is the name of the organisation? not answered

Q9. Do you support/oppose the proposed amendment to the Metropolitan Region Scheme? Support

Q10. Please type your submission (reasons for support/opposition) into the box below. Any supporting documents may be uploaded below.

We are long-term rate payers in Cockburn shire. Highly supportive of this proposed amendment. We are of the view that this parcel of land was originally omitted from the Directions 2031 framework by mistake. With the growing infrastructure in the area, including schools, shops, power, sewerage, public transport, this is a significantly underutilised parcel of land. If the aim of the government is transport oriented development, this parcel fits the bill perfectly. There is no detrimental impact.

Q11. Upload supporting documents not answered

Q12. Upload supporting documents not answered

Q13. Upload supporting documents not answered

**Respondent No:** 23**Login:** Anonymous**Email:** n/a**Responded At:** Jan 29, 2025 17:55:44 pm**Last Seen:** Jan 29, 2025 17:55:44 pm**IP Address:** n/a

Q1. What is your name?	David Bushell
Q2. What is your surname?	Bushell
Q3. What is your email address?	cbushell@bigpond.net.au
Q4. What is your address?	339 Lyon Road Banjup
Q5. What is your contact number?	0409177371
Q6. Submissions may be published as part of the consultation process. Do you wish to have your name removed from your submission?	No
Q7. Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?	No
Q8. What is the name of the organisation?	not answered
Q9. Do you support/oppose the proposed amendment to the Metropolitan Region Scheme?	Support
Q10. Please type your submission (reasons for support/opposition) into the box below. Any supporting documents may be uploaded below. As landowners in the subject area we consider the original exclusion of the Lyon and Kinley Road lots from the original Urban Zoning (under the MRS) to be a planning anomaly and as such fully support the proposed MRS amendment. This precinct is close to Kwinana Freeway, public transport, shops and schools with access to essential service infrastructure and would round off the urban zoned area.	
Q11. Upload supporting documents	not answered
Q12. Upload supporting documents	not answered
Q13. Upload supporting documents	not answered

**Respondent No:** 24**Login:** Anonymous**Email:** n/a**Responded At:** Jan 30, 2025 15:06:32 pm**Last Seen:** Jan 30, 2025 15:06:32 pm**IP Address:** n/a

Q1. What is your name?	Mina
Q2. What is your surname?	Roberts
Q3. What is your email address?	minajr@gmail.com
Q4. What is your address?	13/128 Washington St, Victoria Park, WA 6100
Q5. What is your contact number?	0428393573
Q6. Submissions may be published as part of the consultation process. Do you wish to have your name removed from your submission?	No
Q7. Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?	No
Q8. What is the name of the organisation?	not answered
Q9. Do you support/oppose the proposed amendment to the Metropolitan Region Scheme?	Oppose
Q10. Please type your submission (reasons for support/opposition) into the box below. Any supporting documents may be uploaded below. All areas of remnant bush in the Perth area are highly valuable wildlife habitat given how extensive clearing is. Currently, our previous endangered black cockatoos are starving due to a lack of food trees, which this area includes. Further clearing of mature cockatoo food trees and habitat is short-sighted and unacceptable.	
Q11. Upload supporting documents	not answered
Q12. Upload supporting documents	not answered
Q13. Upload supporting documents	not answered



Respondent No: 25

Login: Anonymous

Email: n/a

Responded At: Jan 31, 2025 23:41:40 pm

Last Seen: Jan 31, 2025 23:41:40 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. What is your name?

Details removed at the request of the submitter

Q2. What is your surname?

Q3. What is your email address?

Q4. What is your address?

Q5. What is your contact number?

Q6. Submissions may be published as part of the consultation process. Do you wish to have your name removed from your submission? Yes

Q7. Are you responding on behalf of an organisation? No

Q8. What is the name of the organisation? not answered

Q9. Do you support/oppose the proposed amendment to the Metropolitan Region Scheme? Oppose

Q10. Please type your submission (reasons for support/opposition) into the box below. Any supporting documents may be uploaded below.

This will degrade our suburb. Will create a thoroughfare and reduce safety for our community, specifically children.

Q11. Upload supporting documents not answered

Q12. Upload supporting documents not answered

Q13. Upload supporting documents not answered

Anthony Muscara
Principal Planner
Department of Planning, Lands and Heritage
Sent by Email — Anthony.muscara@dplh.wa.gov.au
140 William Street, Perth WA 6000

Dear Anthony Muscara

**MRS - PROPOSED METROPOLITAN REGION SCHEME AMENDMENT 1426
(COMPLEX) - LYON AND KINLEY ROADS BANJUP - RLS/1124**

Thank you for your letter dated 24 December 2024 inviting comment on the Metropolitan Region Scheme (MRS) Amendment located at Lyon and Kinley Roads, Banjup in the City of Cockburn (RLS/1124).

The Department of Energy, Mines, Industry Regulation and Safety (DEMIRS) has determined that this proposal raises no significant issues with respect to mineral and petroleum resources, geothermal energy, and basic raw materials.

Note that a response was sent (06 December 2023) for an assessment for this same area that was sent to us "letter dated 28 November 2023". Without comparing the two submissions it is not clear why there is a repeat submission, however, the assessment remains the same and there are no concerns for this area.

DEMIRS lodges no objections to the above MRS amendment.

Yours sincerely



Steven Batty | Senior Geologist
Resource Security Directorate
03 February 2025

**Respondent No:** 26**Login:** Anonymous**Email:** n/a**Responded At:** Feb 03, 2025 15:07:29 pm**Last Seen:** Feb 03, 2025 15:07:29 pm**IP Address:** n/a

Q1. What is your name?

Details removed at the request of the submitter

Q2. What is your surname?

Q3. What is your email address?

Q4. What is your address?

Q5. What is your contact number?

Q6. Submissions may be published as part of the consultation process. Do you wish to have your name removed from your submission? Yes

Q7. Are you responding on behalf of an organisation? No

Q8. What is the name of the organisation? not answered

Q9. Do you support/oppose the proposed amendment to the Metropolitan Region Scheme? Oppose

Q10. Please type your submission (reasons for support/opposition) into the box below. Any supporting documents may be uploaded below.

There is vast and very unique bushland in the areas of this proposal, supporting a large amount of wildlife and scenario for the community. Aubin Grove and Surrounding Hammond Park has recently been very built up and it is important that these areas are kept for future generations. If further housing is needed then perhaps the land which runs next to Lyon Road on the plan could be used as these are already residential houses which could support more housing. On the Map, these properties listed 192,191,100,101, 211, 212, 22 and 23. That would then leave the surrounding bushland around Kinley Road untouched and maintain the natural environment for so many Wild Life. The suburb does also not need any commercial land for use of a Petrol Station if that is in the plans. Aubin Grove have access to Petrol station just 5KM North to Cockburn and 5KM South in Anketell, these are all very accessible for the Community. I am opposed to the plans and suggest if Land must be used then the blocks mentioned above next to Lyon road can be used as these are already cleared for residential houses currently, The Land from Kinley and out towards the East should be preserved for the future.

Q11. Upload supporting documents not answered

Q12. Upload supporting documents not answered

Q13. Upload supporting documents not answered



Government of **Western Australia**
Department of **Water and Environmental Regulation**

Your ref: RLS/1124
Our ref: RF3755-06, PA 069228
Enquiries: Jane Sturgess, Ph 9550 4228

Department of Planning, Lands and Heritage
Level 5, 140 William Street
PERTH WA 6000

Attention: Anthony Muscara

Dear Anthony

REQUEST FOR COMMENT - PROPOSED METROPOLITAN REGION SCHEME AMENDMENT 1426 (COMPLEX) – LYON AND KINLEY ROADS, BANJUP

Thank you for your email received 24 December 2024 requesting comment upon a proposed Metropolitan Region Scheme (MRS) Amendment 1426, at various lots on Lyon and Kinley Roads in Banjup.

The Department of Water and Environmental Regulation (Department) wishes to advise it does not support this proposal for a rezoning from “Rural - Water Protection” to “Urban” as it contravenes relevant state planning policies, is inconsistent with sub-regional planning frameworks for *Perth and Peel @ 3.5 Million* and has the potential to impact Perth’s Integrated Water Supply Scheme (IWSS).

There are some misconceptions contained in the previously presented supporting reports pertaining to drinking water source protection principles, interpretation of the state planning policy, and the basis for previous decision-making relating to urban development within the Jandakot Underground Water Pollution Control Area (UWPCA). Further information is provided below.

Jandakot Underground Water Pollution Catchment Area

The land subject to this proposal is located within the Jandakot UWPCA which is a constituted Public Drinking Water Source Area under the *Metropolitan Water Supply, Sewerage, and Drainage Act 1909* which supplies drinking water into the IWSS. The land has been classified as a Priority 2 (P2) area and is managed to maintain or improve the quality of the drinking water source with the objective of risk minimisation.

The Jandakot UWPCA is managed in accordance with the Western Australian Planning Commission’s (WAPC’s) *State Planning Policy No 2.3 Jandakot groundwater protection policy* (SPP 2.3) and draft *State Planning Policy No 2.9 Planning for Water* (draft SPP 2.9), which state:

“In order to protect the quality of the public drinking water source, there is a presumption against new urban or industrial land uses in the Water Catchment reservation and the Rural-Water Protection zone of the Metropolitan Region Scheme.”

Consistent with the aforementioned state planning policies and the Department's *Strategic Policy: Protecting Public Drinking Water Source Areas in WA* (DoW, 2016), the intensification of land uses within public drinking water source areas (PDWSAs) is not recommended due to the increased risk to drinking water quality and public health.

"Increased development in a PDWSA will increase the risk to water quality and public health. For example, urban areas pose a greater risk of water quality contamination than rural areas, and rural areas pose a greater risk of contamination than naturally forested areas. This is an inevitable consequence of more chemical, biological and physical hazards being introduced due to more people, buildings, vehicles and rubbish associated with land use intensification."

There are no urban building or engineering methods that can effectively manage risks to drinking water resources in perpetuity and as such, the State's policy framework has a presumption against intensified land uses in P1 and P2 PDWSAs.

Notwithstanding this policy position, SPP 2.3 and draft SPP 2.9 recognises that there are situations where development may be appropriate, following a government led strategic planning process that determines an urban rezoning is the preferred outcome for the land. The policy stipulates that an MRS amendment will only be supported where the land has been identified for development through a strategic planning document, such as the *Perth and Peel @ 3.5million* planning frameworks. The *South Metropolitan Peel Sub-regional Planning Framework* identifies this site as a Rural Residential land use, the existing land use.

In addition, SPP 2.3 and draft SPP 2.9 also states that upon consideration of such future rezonings through strategic planning instruments, subject land should also be *large landholdings that were already substantially cleared at the time this policy was published*. The intent for retained vegetated areas, such as this site, is also reiterated in the objectives of the policies as *“to maintain or increase natural vegetation cover over the policy area”*.

The subsequent decision to rezone, and subsequently reclassify to Priority 3* (P3*), acknowledges the supply from this area will likely be subject to higher water quality treatment costs, used less frequently as part of the IWSS, and eventually may be abandoned.

The subject site has not been identified within the framework as future urban or in a planning investigation area (PIA) and as such would contravene SPP 2.3 and draft SPP 2.9 and would not be supported by the Department.

Jandakot-Treeby Planning Investigation Area

The State's policy framework, through SPP 2.3 and draft SPP 2.9, supports the consideration of issues such as the economy, housing supply, urban consolidation, transport, societal benefit, infrastructure provision, environment, risks to current water supply and future supply options through Government led processes to determine strategic planning outcomes of greatest benefit to the State and community.

The Department of Planning, Lands and Heritage (DPLH) previously led strategic investigations into land and water values and was consistent with the above scope for the Jandakot-Treeby PIA, located north of this site. In August 2023, Government resolved to designate this 600 ha site as “urban expansion” to meet the needs of future land supply. This decision determines the government’s preferred strategic planning outcome as urban development and acknowledges the likely impacts to supply costs, reliability and potential loss from Perth’s IWSS.

The Jandakot-Treeby urban expansion area is located approximately 6km from the subject site, and consolidates the urban footprint north of Armadale Road, to the Jandakot Airport. As such, the site subject to this proposed MRS amendment does not appear to represent a planning outcome consistent with the aforementioned principles of strategic planning in PDWSAs, nor necessary to meet future housing needs of the Perth-Peel Region.

District Water Management Strategy

A draft District Water Management Strategy (DWMS) was previously reviewed during preliminary comment period in 2023, consistent with *Better Urban Water Management* (WAPC, 2008). However, a DWMS is not the mechanism to determine whether a rezoning within a PDWSA. It is to be a strategic decision by Government considering land supply factors and resultant impact and costs to water supply. This is consistent with the approach for the previous limited urban rezonings on the Jandakot UWPCA, and relevant DWMS’s were prepared in the context of recognition of the strategic decision making, rather than attempting to demonstrate the urban development will not impact the PDWSA.

As previously identified, the DWMS and associated reports (including the scheme amendment report), are based on inaccurate assumptions and information regarding water resource protection and relevant science, policy and planning process. The Department has not undertaken a full assessment of the report, however responses are provided to the key principles proposed to justify the urban rezoning are provided in Attachment 1.

The proposal significantly departs from the intent of SPP 2.3 and draft SPP 2.9 regarding drinking water protection principles and Governments need to strategically balance urban expansion and water supply for the Perth-Peel Region, and as such would not be supported by the Department. The issue of precedent should also be considered for this proposal.

Should you require any further information on the comments, please contact the undersigned at the Mandurah office on 9550 4228.

Yours sincerely



Jane Sturgess
A/Program Manager – Planning Advice
Kwinana Peel Region

07 / 02 / 2025

Attachment 1 – Department’s response to key principles that were proposed to demonstrate urban rezoning does not constitute a risk to public drinking water sources at various lots on Lyon and Kinley Roads, Banjup.

Misconception - Urban subdivision is a lower risk than rural residential.

Low intensity land uses (e.g. special-rural) constitutes a far lower risk to PDWSAs than urbanisation of these areas, and this is reflected through general principles of higher intensity land uses introducing infrastructure, vehicles, businesses, services, chemicals, people and their associated behaviours.

Furthermore, risks to water quality may be of a diffuse and cumulative nature, or from point sources as a result of infrastructure failures or spills. Identification and mitigation of contamination sources is generally not achievable given the density of residential development, and associated buildings and infrastructure and there are no practical regulatory or engineering methods that can safeguard PDWSA’s with assurity.

Water Corporation have decommissioned several production bores in urban Priority 3 areas supplying the IWSS due to the impact of hydrocarbons, PFAS, pathogens and pesticides associated with urban development.

Following a strategic planning process for the Banjup Quarry rezoning (Calleya Estate), north-west of the subject land, within 18 months of the first stage of development the site was subject to contamination due to a sewerage spill event resulting in enterococci detection in an adjacent IWSS production bore, triggering a shutdown.

A previous literature review undertaken by the former Department of Water in 2009 found over 150 pieces of published literature from WA, Australia and around the world, overwhelming noting increased concentration of pollutants with urbanisation.

A precautionary risk-based approach consistent with the Australian Drinking Water Guidelines is typically adopted to protect drinking water quality. In the northern area of Jandakot UWPCA, the planning process undertaken by DPLH determined the strategic development benefit to be greater than the water quality protection benefit. The subsequent cost to the State if the groundwater supply were to become contaminated and contingency options to continue supply into the IWSS were considered against the social and economic benefits of infill development within Jandakot-Treeby Planning Investigation Area (PIA).

As such, a decision for future urban development does not manage the increased risk, it acknowledges the increased risk and subsequent potential impacts and costs to water supply services.

Misconception - Water quality typically improves post development when WSUD principles for drainage management are used.

The Department has identified that this approach is not feasible given:

- WSUD will only manage stormwater runoff from streetscape infrastructure, not private properties.
- WSUD will only manage nutrients and hydrocarbons from street runoff, and not to a water source protection standard. It does not manage any of the major contaminants such as pathogens, herbicides, pesticides, PFAS etc;

- Public open space and drainage infrastructure are managed by the local government in an amenity and environmental value context, not to control risk to PDWSA's and this is not an achievable expectation.

Furthermore, if the scenario was feasible to “*treat stormwater to a drinking water standard*” through WSUD, the infrastructure would yield significant management cost to the local government. However, for the above reasons such a scenario is not practical nor feasible, and should be removed, as should any other references within the report that suggest WSUD as a protective method for PDWSA's.

Strategic importance of Jandakot UWPCA.

Wellhead Protection Zones (WHPZ) exist around drinking water bores to protect the area most vulnerable to contamination. The WHPZ of bores J210 and J220 are located within the western portion of the subject site. The DWMS incorrectly illustrates smaller WHPZs for J210 and J220, and that the WHPZ for J220 does not extend into the subject area, however this is incorrect.

Reports provided state that Jandakot UWPCA contributes a minor proportion of water to the IWSS, as do bores J210 and J220, and that this is another justification for development. The Jandakot UWPCA provides high quality, low cost water which serves an important purpose of blending with desalinated and artesian water prior to supply to the community. As such the resource is of a significantly high value, with replacement value of the total resource estimated to be \$200 million.

Notwithstanding, with future urban development of the Jandakot Treeby urban expansion area likely to impact future supply from bores in the area, draw from J210 and J220 outside of the urban footprint may become increasingly important.

Development
Services

629 Newcastle Street
Leederville WA 6007

PO Box 100
Leederville WA 6902

T (08) 9420 2099
F (08) 9420 3193



Your Ref: RLS_1124
Our Ref: 164148838 - MRS405044
Enquiries: Luke Gabriel
Direct Tel: 9420 2099
Email: land.planning@watercorporation.com.au

07 February 2025

Principal Planner
Department Of Planning Lands And Heritage
140 William St
PERTH WA 6000

Attention of: Anthony Muscara

Re: Lyon & Kinley Roads, Banjup

Thank you for your letter dated 24 December 2024. We offer the following comments regarding this proposal.

The area is located within the Jandakot Underground Water Pollution Control Area (UWPCA) and the subject land is classified as "Priority 2" within which urban development is **not permitted**. 'Priority 2' areas carry a high priority for public drinking water supply and are therefore managed to ensure only low risk and low intensity land use are permitted to ensure no increased risk of groundwater contamination.

Because Water Corporation is a major licensed abstractor of groundwater as part of a multi-source approach for consumption within the metropolitan Integrated Water Supply System, we remain opposed to any loss of currently protected groundwater resources due to the increased groundwater contamination risks posed by urban development activities in the groundwater protection area.

The Western Australian Planning Commission is advised to liaise with the Department of Water and Environmental Regulation regarding the acceptability of urban development in this location within the context of strategic metropolitan water resource planning and regarding the process to change the classification of this area from P2 to P3 prior to the amendment being formally advertised.

General Comments

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.

Should you have any queries or require further clarification on any of the above issues, please do not hesitate to contact the Enquiries Officer.

Luke Gabriel
Senior Planner
Development Services

From: [Luke Gabriel](#)
To: [Anthony Muscara](#)
Subject: RE: MRS Amendment 1426 (Complex) - Lyon and Kinley Roads, Banjup
Date: Monday, 9 June 2025 12:35:20 PM

OFFICIAL

Hi Anthony,

Thank you for your email.

Please see the comments below regarding water and wastewater servicing for the above MRS.

Water

Part of this MRS amendment is in the Thomsons Gravity Water zone, based on the existing infrastructure in the area, the only requirements would most likely be reticulation to service the area, this will need to be further investigated by our planning team once developer's intentions have been received.

Wastewater

The subject area is outside the Thomsons Lake Sewer District, this area was excluded due to being a P2 area. Due to the levels for this area, this development will need to be its own catchment and will require a type 10 pumpstation and associated gravity sewers. The adjacent wastewater pumpstation Durango Bend is only a type 10 pump station and is currently unable to accept any additional flow. This downstream pumpstation and gravity sewers will require upgrades to accept the additional flow.

Our planning team will need to investigate this further once developer's intentions have been received to identify the extent of the scheme upgrades.

General comments

As stated in previous correspondence, please note the following:

The area is located within the Jandakot Underground Water Pollution Control Area (UWPCA) and the subject land is classified as "Priority 2" within which urban development is **not permitted**. 'Priority 2' areas carry a high priority for public drinking water supply and are therefore managed to ensure only low risk and low intensity land use are permitted to ensure no increased risk of groundwater contamination.

Because Water Corporation is a major licensed abstractor of groundwater as part of a multi-source approach for consumption within the metropolitan Integrated Water Supply System, we remain opposed to any loss of currently protected groundwater resources due to the increased groundwater contamination risks posed by urban development activities in the groundwater protection area.

The Western Australian Planning Commission is advised to liaise with the Department of Water and Environmental Regulation regarding the acceptability of urban development in this location within the context of strategic metropolitan water resource planning and regarding the process to change the classification of this area from P2 to P3 prior to the amendment being formally advertised.

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.

Best regards,

Luke.

Luke Gabriel
Snr Plnr – Land Use Planning
Development Services
E Luke.Gabriel@watercorporation.com.au
T (08) 9420 3966



watercorporation.com.au



From: [Golestani, Shanthi](#)
To: [Region Planning Schemes](#)
Cc: [Anthony Muscara](#)
Subject: 20250211 DoT response RE: Proposed Metropolitan Region Scheme Amendment 1426 (Complex) - Lyon and Kinley Roads, Banjup - RLS/1124
Date: Tuesday, 11 February 2025 9:15:46 AM

OFFICIAL

OFFICIAL

Your ref: RLS/1124
Our ref: DT/24/00332
Enquiries: Shanthi Golestani (9216 8774)

Ms Sam Fagan
Secretary, Western Australian Planning Commission
Department of Planning, Lands and Heritage
140 William Street
PERTH WA 6000

Attention: Anthony Muscara

Dear Sam

RE: PROPOSED Metropolitan Region Scheme Amendment 1426 (Complex) - Lyon and Kinley Roads, Banjup - RLS/1124

Thank you for your email dated 24 December 2024 inviting the Department of Transport (DoT) to provide comment on the above proposed amendment. The Urban Mobility (UM) division of DoT has reviewed the submitted documents and advises that DoT has no objection to the proposal and provides the following comments:

1. Future stages of planning should be supported by a Transport Impact Assessment that includes a safe walk to school assessment given the proximity to Aubin Grove Primary School immediately north of the future urban area.
2. DoT's strategic cycle network plan is the Long Term Cycle Network (LTCN) which was endorsed by the City of Cockburn Council of 9 April 2020. This strategic cycling network has been developed in collaboration with respective Local Government Authorities and aims to ensure State and Local Governments continue to work together towards the delivery of a continuous cycling network providing additional transport options, recreational opportunities and support for tourism and commercial activity.
 - a. The Amendment Area is situated in proximity to a Primary route along Rowley Rd and a Local route along Lyon Rd in the LTCN. Opportunities should be identified to provide cycling connections within and between the Amendment Area and the longer-term cycling network.
3. The Public Transport Authority has advised that the eastern portion of the amendment area fall outside of a walkable catchment of existing bus services. PTA currently has no plan to extend bus service to serve the area.
4. Given that the PTA has advised that the existing bus route along Lyon Rd is the only public transport service currently planned for the area, DoT makes the following recommendations on the Concept Plan included in the amendment documentation (acknowledging that it is not an endorsed plan):
 - a. DoT notes that a portion of higher density residential ("medium-density lots") is shown near a proposed commercial lot on Rowley Road, distant from the existing bus route. DoT recommends that any future

Structure Plan orient higher density lots and any commercial centre towards Lyon Rd to ensure that more residents have access to the existing bus route to Aubin Grove train station.

- b. DoT recommends that WAPC consider strategies to limit the residential population outside the commonly accepted (approximately 400-metre) catchment of likely bus services.

DoT has not liaised with Main Roads WA (MRWA) with regards to this application. It is recommended that DPLH obtain MRWA comments directly, particularly regarding future planning of and connection to Rowley Road.

DoT would welcome the opportunity to comment at further planning stages.

If you wish to follow up, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Kind regards,

Shanthy Golestani

Senior Project Officer - Transport Planner | Urban Mobility | Department of Transport

GPO Box C102, Perth WA 6839

Tel: (08) 92168774

Email: Shanthy.Golestani@transport.wa.gov.au | Web: www.transport.wa.gov.au

Part time - Tues/Thurs/Fri



We acknowledge the Traditional Custodians of this land and pay respect to the Elders past and present.

DISCLAIMER This email and any attachments are confidential and may contain legally privileged and/or copyright material. You should not read, copy, use or disclose any of the information contained in this email without authorization. If you have received it in error please contact us at once by return email and then delete both emails. There is no warranty that this email is error or virus free.

From: [BALL Michael](#)
To: [Region Planning Schemes](#)
Cc: [Anthony Muscara](#)
Subject: RE: RLS/1124 - 1426 - 18 Lots in the Locality of Banjup, Bound by Lyon Road to the West and Rowley Road to the South - DFES Response
Date: Thursday, 13 February 2025 1:25:27 PM
Attachments: [RLS1124 - Lyon & Kinley Roads, Banjup - Proposed Metropolitan Region Scheme - DFES Second Response.pdf](#)

OFFICIAL

Our Ref: D32040
Your Ref: RLS/1124

Dear Mr Muscara

RE: MULTIPLE LOTS, LYON AND KINLEY ROAD, BANJUP - PROPOSED METROPOLITAN REGION SCHEME AMENDMENT

In relation to the above application, DFES note that no updated BMP has been provided.

DFES previously provided a response to version 3 of the BMP (dated 30 April 2024), with several issues raised that require action at this stage. A copy of this response is attached to this email.

DFES request that the updated BMP is referred for comment once it is completed to ensure that the BMP adequately addressed the requirements of SPP 3.7.

Please call me on 9395 9819 if you have any queries regarding the above.

Kind regards,

Michael Ball
Senior Land Use Planning Officer

20 Stockton Bend, Cockburn Central, Perth WA 6164
T: 08 9395 9819 | E: advice@dfes.wa.gov.au | W: dfes.wa.gov.au



FOR A SAFER STATE

**CHANGES TO
FIRE DANGER RATINGS**

As of 1 September 2022, WA is implementing simplified and nationally consistent Fire Danger Ratings.

HOW FIREPROOF IS YOUR PLAN? AFDRS

dfes.wa.gov.au/prepare

The advertisement features a firefighter in full gear standing next to a fire truck, with a large fire in the background. The text is overlaid on a dark background.

Acknowledgement of Country: DFES acknowledges the Traditional Owners of Country throughout Australia, and their connections to land, sea and community. We pay our respects to Elders past and present.



Our Ref: D32040
Your Ref: RLS/1124

Anthony Muscara
Department of Planning, Lands and Heritage
regionplanningschemes@dplh.wa.gov.au

Dear Mr Muscara

RE: REQUEST FOR PRELIMINARY COMMENT - MULTIPLE LOTS, LYON AND KINLEY ROAD, BANJUP - PROPOSED METROPOLITAN REGION SCHEME AMENDMENT

I refer to your email dated 2 April 2024 regarding the submission of a Bushfire Management Plan (BMP) (revision 3), prepared by Urbanplan and dated 22 March, for the above MRS Amendment.

This advice relates only to *State Planning Policy 3.7 Planning in Bushfire Prone Areas* (SPP 3.7) and the *Guidelines for Planning in Bushfire Prone Areas* (Guidelines). It is the responsibility of the proponent to ensure the proposal complies with all other relevant planning policies and building regulations where necessary. This advice does not exempt the applicant/proponent from obtaining necessary approvals that may apply to the proposal including planning, building, health or any other approvals required by a relevant authority under other written laws.

Assessment

- DFES have previously provided advice on Version 2 of the BMP, with a response dated 22 December 2023 provided to DPLH.
- Several issues raised with both the BAL assessment and compliance with the Bushfire Protection Criteria have not been fully addressed, with several issues raised below consistent with our previous response.
- DFES have tried to provide advice for issues that can be addressed at future stages, however some information should be provided at this stage, prior to approval.

1. Policy Measure 6.3 a) (ii) Preparation of a BAL Contour Map

Issue	Assessment	Action
Vegetation Classification	Vegetation Classification – not demonstrated DFES note that submission of updated figures in Version 3 of the BMP, however several issues remain. <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The BMP does not include a pre-development vegetation assessment.• Topographic contours are shown on figures, however they are not labelled. DFES is unable to validate slopes where heights are not labelled.• Plots do not have clear boundaries on all sides, and the separation of boundaries are not clearly shown for the entirety of the 150m assessment area surrounding the site.• No updated photos have been provided to resolve issues raised in DFES previous response. Further	Modification required.

	<p>photos are also required to ensure that the proposed plots are representative of the overall areas classified.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a lack of detail provided to support exclusions of surrounding areas, with no confirmation of management of rural-residential sites, and Plot 10 excluded incorrectly as vegetation in this area appears to extend to the west towards the Kwinana Freeway. • The post-development status includes the exclusion of Public Open Space and detention areas. It is noted that areas used for water detention are typically difficult to manage to low threat as per AS3959 due to issues in accessing them and controlling the vegetation. Where management in perpetuity is relied upon, sufficient evidence should be provided to demonstrate how it will be achieved. <p>DFES requests an updated vegetation assessment to be provided, which clearly shows pre- and post- development vegetation assessment, supported by sufficient evidence to clearly substantiate both, as required by Appendix 2 and 3 of the Guidelines.</p>	
--	--	--

2. Policy Measure 6.3 c) Compliance with the bushfire protection criteria

Issue	Assessment	Action
<p>Location and Siting and Design</p>	<p>A1.1 and A2.1 – not demonstrated</p> <p>The BAL ratings cannot be validated, as the vegetation classification inputs require modification as per the above table.</p> <p>DFES note that as this stage a BHL is sufficient to validate that hazard level for the subject site. DFES note that an updated pre-development and post development vegetation assessment should be submitted to allow for Elements 1 and 2 to be validated. The vegetation assessment/BHL or BAL should be prepared in accordance with the requirements of the Guidelines to allow DFES to validate the outputs.</p> <p>DFES note that the site appears capable of compliance with Elements 1 and 2, however the information provided to date is not sufficient to confirm this at this.</p>	<p>Modification to the BMP is required.</p>
<p>Vehicular Access</p>	<p>A3.2a, A3.3 and A3.4a – not demonstrated</p> <p>As noted in DFES' previous response, the information provided in the BMP is not sufficient to confirm compliance.</p> <p>A review of the overall site indicates that access is available in two directions to two destinations, there are no barriers to a design providing through roads, and perimeter roads may be required in some area. The BMP however has included a proposed lot layout that will create no-through roads, proposes FSARs in lieu of perimeter roads in some areas (noted on</p>	<p>Modification to the BMP is required.</p>

Issue	Assessment	Action
	<p>figure B3), and overall does not provide sufficient information to detail how his layout can achieve compliance.</p> <p>As an MRS amendment is the earliest stage of planning, it is recommended that the BMP is modified to remove the proposed layout, and detail that compliance can be achieved at future stages of planning.</p> <p>DFES notes that the figures provided for the proposed development have not been sufficiently updated to detail where no through roads are proposed, and the justification in the table is not sufficient to detail why a redesign to a compliant outcome could not be achieved at subsequent planning stages, give the large regular shape of the site, and the ability to design around any access issues to Lyon and Kinley road to avoid the need for no-through roads.</p>	

Recommendation – Compliance with Acceptable Solutions not demonstrated - modification required

Given the proposed MRS Amendment has the potential to increase the threat of bushfire to people, property and infrastructure, the decision maker should ensure the bushfire risk is understood before making a determination.

DFES has assessed the BMP and identified a number of issues that need to be addressed.

Should you require further information, please contact me on telephone number 9395 9819.

Yours sincerely



Michael Ball
SENIOR LAND USE PLANNING OFFICER

30 April 2024

CC anthony.muscara@dplh.wa.gov.au

From: [DFES Land Use Planning](#)
To: [Anthony Muscara](#)
Subject: METROPOLITAN REGION SCHEME AMENDMENT 1426 (COMPLEX) - LYON AND KINLEY ROAD, BANJUP (RLS/1124) - DFES Response May 2025
Date: Wednesday, 28 May 2025 9:50:57 AM

OFFICIAL

Our Ref: D32040
Your Ref: RLS/1124

Good morning Anthony,

Following our discussion on Friday I've completed a review of the updated BMP (dated 21 March 2025) and provided updated comments below.

I note that overall, DFES' position has not changed, with modifications required prior to supporting the BMP. However, as this is the first planning stage to guide future development, DFES believe that the location is suitable for further intensification and presents as a logical extension to the existing residential area. Updated comments regarding our assessment are provided below.

Given the minor nature of the changes, it was not considered beneficial to DFES or DPLH to provide updated detailed assessment comments at this time. Please reference our previous response (dated 30 April 2024) for a detailed assessment. It is noted that the below comments reflect the previous version of the Guidelines (V1.4), as the BMP has not been updated to address the current version of the Guidelines (2024).

- DFES have advised previously that a Bushfire Hazard Level assessment is sufficient for this stage of the planning process, however if a BAL Contour was to be submitted it must be prepared in accordance with the Guidelines. This includes a pre-development vegetation assessment (which will be required for future stages of planning). The level of detail provided in the updated BMP (with two additional vegetation photos) is not sufficient to address the issues raised in DFES' prior responses. DFES remains unable to validate some vegetation classifications and exclusions. As such, DFES cannot validate the proposed BAL contour/BAL outputs.
- The BMP does not provide sufficient evidence to support the proposed lot layout without future modifications to remove lots in BAL-40/FZ, and changes to the road layout to achieve compliance with the requirements of Element 3.
- Key issues to be resolved at future stages remain as discussed in DFES' previous response, with siting and design (ensuring all residential scale lots are BAL-29 or below), and vehicular access (sufficient hazard separation and multiple access/egress routes to be provided to all lots and compliance with perimeter roads/FSAR requirements)

On the basis of the above, DFES do not object to the MRS amendment moving forward, however requires amendments to the BMP at future stages to address areas of non-compliance.

Please call me on 9395 9819 if you have any queries regarding the above.

Kind regards,

Michael Ball
Senior Land Use Planning Officer

20 Stockton Bend, Cockburn Central, Perth WA 6164
T: 08 9395 9819 | E: advice@dfes.wa.gov.au | W: dfes.wa.gov.au



FOR A SAFER STATE



Acknowledgement of Country: DFES acknowledges the Traditional Owners of Country throughout Australia, and their connections to land, sea and community. We pay our respects to Elders past and present.

**Respondent No:** 27**Login:** Anonymous**Email:** n/a**Responded At:** Feb 17, 2025 14:07:01 pm**Last Seen:** Feb 17, 2025 14:07:01 pm**IP Address:** n/a

Q1. What is your name?	Simon
Q2. What is your surname?	Fryer
Q3. What is your email address?	facesje@gmail.com
Q4. What is your address?	19 Turnix Street, Wandi, 6167
Q5. What is your contact number?	0499776224
Q6. Submissions may be published as part of the consultation process. Do you wish to have your name removed from your submission?	No
Q7. Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?	No
Q8. What is the name of the organisation?	not answered
Q9. Do you support/oppose the proposed amendment to the Metropolitan Region Scheme?	Support
Q10. Please type your submission (reasons for support/opposition) into the box below. Any supporting documents may be uploaded below.	
	<p>Whilst I support, the traffic at that particular round-a-about is absolutely mind blowing in the morning. Trucks are barely slowing for the roundabout at the best of times, so my largest concern is sub dividing that will push so much more traffic onto that road, and given the poorly designed road layout there, they have but only one option, that roundabout. Please, please push to get that road and intersection upgraded, including the Wandi District Centre Precinct (I believe approved, but seems to have stalled?) so that Honeywood traffic has other options for exiting the estate, which will also ease that issue. Regards, Simon.</p>
Q11. Upload supporting documents	not answered
Q12. Upload supporting documents	not answered
Q13. Upload supporting documents	not answered

**Respondent No:** 28**Login:** Anonymous**Email:** n/a**Responded At:** Feb 17, 2025 14:17:05 pm**Last Seen:** Feb 17, 2025 14:17:05 pm**IP Address:** n/a

Q1. What is your name?

Details removed at the request of the submitter

Q2. What is your surname?

Q3. What is your email address?

Q4. What is your address?

Q5. What is your contact number?

Q6. Submissions may be published as part of the consultation process. Do you wish to have your name removed from your submission? Yes

Q7. Are you responding on behalf of an organisation? No

Q8. What is the name of the organisation? not answered

Q9. Do you support/oppose the proposed amendment to the Metropolitan Region Scheme? Oppose

Q10. Please type your submission (reasons for support/opposition) into the box below. Any supporting documents may be uploaded below.

not answered

Q11. Upload supporting documents not answered

Q12. Upload supporting documents not answered

Q13. Upload supporting documents not answered



Respondent No: 29

Login: Anonymous

Email: n/a

Responded At: Feb 17, 2025 15:05:38 pm

Last Seen: Feb 17, 2025 15:05:38 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. What is your name?

Details removed at the request of the submitter

Q2. What is your surname?

Q3. What is your email address?

Q4. What is your address?

Q5. What is your contact number?

Q6. Submissions may be published as part of the consultation process. Do you wish to have your name removed from your submission? Yes

Q7. Are you responding on behalf of an organisation? No

Q8. What is the name of the organisation? not answered

Q9. Do you support/oppose the proposed amendment to the Metropolitan Region Scheme? Oppose

Q10. Please type your submission (reasons for support/opposition) into the box below. Any supporting documents may be uploaded below.

The Kwinana freeway does not have more capacity to support population growth in that area. The freeway has been already overloaded most days and nights. Also, the land is living place for many wild animals and local vegetation, therefore from environmental point of view is not acceptable.

Q11. Upload supporting documents not answered

Q12. Upload supporting documents not answered

Q13. Upload supporting documents not answered



Respondent No: 30

Login: Anonymous

Email: n/a

Responded At: Feb 17, 2025 17:29:51 pm

Last Seen: Feb 17, 2025 17:29:51 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. What is your name?

Details removed at the request of the submitter

Q2. What is your surname?

Q3. What is your email address?

Q4. What is your address?

Q5. What is your contact number?

Q6. Submissions may be published as part of the consultation process. Do you wish to have your name removed from your submission? Yes

Q7. Are you responding on behalf of an organisation? No

Q8. What is the name of the organisation? not answered

Q9. Do you support/oppose the proposed amendment to the Metropolitan Region Scheme? Support

Q10. Please type your submission (reasons for support/opposition) into the box below. Any supporting documents may be uploaded below.

I think this is a fabulous extension of our suburb. Having lived here for 18 years I have seen a number of developments come to fruition. They make sense. We have terrific schools, shops and train stations near by. The only concern I have is the traffic flow through Lyon Road and the roundabout at Lyon Road and Rowley Road. I am sure they will do traffic management. So long as they fix the traffic, it will be a logical extension of our suburb and those lucky enough to get to live in the suburb will find it to be a lovely location.

Q11. Upload supporting documents not answered

Q12. Upload supporting documents not answered

Q13. Upload supporting documents not answered



Respondent No: 31

Login: Anonymous

Email: n/a

Responded At: Feb 17, 2025 19:10:01 pm

Last Seen: Feb 17, 2025 19:10:01 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. What is your name?

Details removed at the request of the submitter

Q2. What is your surname?

Q3. What is your email address?

Q4. What is your address?

Q5. What is your contact number?

Q6. Submissions may be published as part of the consultation process. Do you wish to have your name removed from your submission? Yes

Q7. Are you responding on behalf of an organisation? No

Q8. What is the name of the organisation? not answered

Q9. Do you support/oppose the proposed amendment to the Metropolitan Region Scheme? Oppose

Q10. Please type your submission (reasons for support/opposition) into the box below. Any supporting documents may be uploaded below.

This whole intersection every single day is an absolute debacle. I use this round about multiple times a day through out the day at all different times & it is never easy, it's always massive traffic jams in every direction. Add more housing right here which will have no other choice then use this interesection is stupid. We can't even leave honeywood estate between 7-8am for some days up to 20 mins waiting on traffic at that round about??

Q11. Upload supporting documents not answered

Q12. Upload supporting documents not answered

Q13. Upload supporting documents not answered



Respondent No: 32

Login: Anonymous

Email: n/a

Responded At: Feb 17, 2025 19:31:29 pm

Last Seen: Feb 17, 2025 19:31:29 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. What is your name?

Details removed at the request of the submitter

Q2. What is your surname?

Q3. What is your email address?

Q4. What is your address?

Q5. What is your contact number?

Q6. Submissions may be published as part of the consultation process. Do you wish to have your name removed from your submission? Yes

Q7. Are you responding on behalf of an organisation? No

Q8. What is the name of the organisation? not answered

Q9. Do you support/oppose the proposed amendment to the Metropolitan Region Scheme? Oppose

Q10. Please type your submission (reasons for support/opposition) into the box below. Any supporting documents may be uploaded below.

With the ongoing traffic saga in the neighbour hood adding additional homes will cause chaos! If there is a fire emergency you have that many people trying to escape and that many trying to get in to pick up there children with all the daycare centres. I 100% oppose for safety reasons.

Q11. Upload supporting documents not answered

Q12. Upload supporting documents not answered

Q13. Upload supporting documents not answered

**Respondent No:** 33**Login:** Anonymous**Email:** n/a**Responded At:** Feb 17, 2025 20:00:10 pm**Last Seen:** Feb 17, 2025 20:00:10 pm**IP Address:** n/a

Q1. What is your name?

Details removed at the request of the submitter

Q2. What is your surname?

Q3. What is your email address?

Q4. What is your address?

Q5. What is your contact number?

Q6. Submissions may be published as part of the consultation process. Do you wish to have your name removed from your submission? Yes

Q7. Are you responding on behalf of an organisation? No

Q8. What is the name of the organisation? not answered

Q9. Do you support/oppose the proposed amendment to the Metropolitan Region Scheme? Support

Q10. Please type your submission (reasons for support/opposition) into the box below. Any supporting documents may be uploaded below.

I support the proposed changes to allow for rezoning for residential development.

Q11. Upload supporting documents not answered

Q12. Upload supporting documents not answered

Q13. Upload supporting documents not answered

**Respondent No:** 34**Login:** Anonymous**Email:** n/a**Responded At:** Feb 17, 2025 20:34:16 pm**Last Seen:** Feb 17, 2025 20:34:16 pm**IP Address:** n/a

Q1. What is your name?	JulieAnne
Q2. What is your surname?	Ellison
Q3. What is your email address?	jellybean7611@gmail.com
Q4. What is your address?	4 Goldwyer Drive
Q5. What is your contact number?	0427477646
Q6. Submissions may be published as part of the consultation process. Do you wish to have your name removed from your submission?	No
Q7. Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?	No
Q8. What is the name of the organisation?	not answered
Q9. Do you support/oppose the proposed amendment to the Metropolitan Region Scheme?	Oppose
Q10. Please type your submission (reasons for support/opposition) into the box below. Any supporting documents may be uploaded below. Leave the area alone. It was zoned this way for a reason. Is this not to protect our water sources? Stop trying to change things to build more housing!!!! We will have nothing left, we are devastating the land all down the freeway. Let's get the freeway sorted before adding more housing as it's a joke as it is and let's not forget the wildlife but no one seems to give a shit as long as money is involved. Not impressed with this proposal.	
Q11. Upload supporting documents	not answered
Q12. Upload supporting documents	not answered
Q13. Upload supporting documents	not answered

**Respondent No:** 35**Login:** Anonymous**Email:** n/a**Responded At:** Feb 18, 2025 01:01:13 am**Last Seen:** Feb 18, 2025 01:01:13 am**IP Address:** n/a

Q1. What is your name?

Details removed at the request of the submitter

Q2. What is your surname?

Q3. What is your email address?

Q4. What is your address?

Q5. What is your contact number?

Q6. Submissions may be published as part of the consultation process. Do you wish to have your name removed from your submission? Yes

Q7. Are you responding on behalf of an organisation? No

Q8. What is the name of the organisation? not answered

Q9. Do you support/oppose the proposed amendment to the Metropolitan Region Scheme? Oppose

Q10. Please type your submission (reasons for support/opposition) into the box below. Any supporting documents may be uploaded below.

Cannot change water protection area. What is the point of having any area designated for water protection if you're just going to treat it as any other area

Q11. Upload supporting documents not answered

Q12. Upload supporting documents not answered

Q13. Upload supporting documents not answered

**Respondent No:** 36**Login:** Anonymous**Email:** n/a**Responded At:** Feb 18, 2025 13:08:19 pm**Last Seen:** Feb 18, 2025 13:08:19 pm**IP Address:** n/aQ1. **What is your name?***Details removed at the request of the submitter*Q2. **What is your surname?**Q3. **What is your email address?**Q4. **What is your address?**Q5. **What is your contact number?**

Q6. **Submissions may be published as part of the consultation process. Do you wish to have your name removed from your submission?** Yes

Q7. **Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?** No

Q8. **What is the name of the organisation?** not answered

Q9. **Do you support/oppose the proposed amendment to the Metropolitan Region Scheme?** Oppose

Q10. **Please type your submission (reasons for support/opposition) into the box below. Any supporting documents may be uploaded below.**

We should be conserving precious resources and let it remain as it is. Have consideration and think about the wildlife and animals, flora and fauna.

Q11. **Upload supporting documents** not answered

Q12. **Upload supporting documents** not answered

Q13. **Upload supporting documents** not answered



Respondent No: 37
Login: secretary.banjup
Email: secretary.banjup@gmail.com
m

Responded At: Feb 18, 2025 14:27:02 pm
Last Seen: Feb 18, 2025 03:01:49 am
IP Address: 103.108.231.165

Q1. What is your name?	Ian
Q2. What is your surname?	Thurston
Q3. What is your email address?	secretary.banjup@gmail.com
Q4. What is your address?	207 Liddelow Road, Banjup
Q5. What is your contact number?	0414885447
Q6. Submissions may be published as part of the consultation process. Do you wish to have your name removed from your submission?	No
Q7. Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?	Yes
Q8. What is the name of the organisation?	Banjup Residents Group
Q9. Do you support/oppose the proposed amendment to the Metropolitan Region Scheme?	Support

Q10. Please type your submission (reasons for support/opposition) into the box below. Any supporting documents may be uploaded below.

Submission on Lyon and Kinley Roads MRS Amendment 1426 At several AGMs of the Banjup Residents Group (BRG) this planning anomaly has been discussed at length. When the Aubin Grove sub-division was first mooted by the WA Planning Commission in the 1990s the south west corner Banjup was not included for reasons that remain obscure. The rural landowners in the corner have been there 30 and more years and have campaigned ever since to have the land included in urban Aubin Grove. The City of Cockburn has long recognised that the corner is a planning anomaly and for 20 years has lobbied WAPC to resolve it. The rural landowners on Lyon and Kinley are now surrounded by urban development and, like rural Jandakot and Treeby, their rural amenity is lost. Their once treasured lifestyle has gone. All landowners are supportive of the proposed re-zoning of the south west corner. The BRG has long campaigned to have this planning anomaly resolved. We had explicit Cockburn council support at their October 2022 meeting for the Banjup Preservation Principles that included at point 4: The City will earnestly seek to resolve the zoning anomaly in the south west corner of Banjup. This was restated in the BRG submission to Cockburn on the Local Planning Strategy that was put to members and to those on Facebook on 1 November 2022. The LPS submission was strongly supported by residents. We received no dissenting views. Banjup residents lament the loss of rural residential lands, just as we lament the loss of rural residential lands in Jandakot and Treeby. However, the residents in the south west corner of Banjup are not the unpaid curators of a museum surrounded by suburbia. All residents of the south west corner have lived there for decades. As they get older, they will necessarily consider their ability to maintain their 2 hectares. We cannot expect them to hang on to protect the rural amenity for the rest of us. When their time comes to sell, it would likely be to speculators who will have little interest in rural amenity. Rather, the speculators would campaign even more vigorously for re-zoning. The draft structure plans for the urbanisation show an undeveloped buffer zone on the western side of Triandra. To clearly define and separate the urban development from the rural living areas, Banjup Residents urge DPLH to ensure that this is realised. The Banjup Residents Group is committed to preserve the integrity of Banjup as a safe green haven of peace and tranquillity.

Q11. Upload supporting documents

not answered

Q12. Upload supporting documents

not answered

Q13. Upload supporting documents

not answered

**Respondent No:** 38**Login:** Anonymous**Email:** n/a**Responded At:** Feb 18, 2025 18:22:36 pm**Last Seen:** Feb 18, 2025 18:22:36 pm**IP Address:** n/a

Q1. What is your name?	Timothy
Q2. What is your surname?	Smith
Q3. What is your email address?	timandbeksmith@gmail.com
Q4. What is your address?	16 Brampton road wandi wa 6167
Q5. What is your contact number?	0404615270
Q6. Submissions may be published as part of the consultation process. Do you wish to have your name removed from your submission?	No
Q7. Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?	No
Q8. What is the name of the organisation?	not answered
Q9. Do you support/oppose the proposed amendment to the Metropolitan Region Scheme?	Oppose
Q10. Please type your submission (reasons for support/opposition) into the box below. Any supporting documents may be uploaded below.	
	<p>I strongly oppose the clearing of this land, there is very little bush left and at the rate we are clearing there will be no bush left. The black cockatoos are going to go extinct as all their habitat is cleared. We need to say enough is enough and stop clearing more bushland for tiny houses. We will have no bush left in the area in a few years with the land developers clearing everything. We need to protect the bush that remains</p>
Q11. Upload supporting documents	not answered
Q12. Upload supporting documents	not answered
Q13. Upload supporting documents	not answered

**Respondent No:** 39**Login:** Anonymous**Email:** n/a**Responded At:** Feb 18, 2025 20:04:42 pm**Last Seen:** Feb 18, 2025 20:04:42 pm**IP Address:** n/a

Q1. What is your name?	Edward
Q2. What is your surname?	Chidlow
Q3. What is your email address?	eddiechidlow@gmail.com
Q4. What is your address?	24 Cornell Way Aubin Grove WA 6164
Q5. What is your contact number?	0450882898
Q6. Submissions may be published as part of the consultation process. Do you wish to have your name removed from your submission?	No
Q7. Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?	No
Q8. What is the name of the organisation?	not answered
Q9. Do you support/oppose the proposed amendment to the Metropolitan Region Scheme?	Support
Q10. Please type your submission (reasons for support/opposition) into the box below. Any supporting documents may be uploaded below. As a young parent with kids at Aubin Grove Primary School, I think this is a great decision. As I currently rent in this exorbitant climate, I feel as this decision will increase affordable housing in the Aubin Grove area.	
Q11. Upload supporting documents	not answered
Q12. Upload supporting documents	not answered
Q13. Upload supporting documents	not answered

**Respondent No:** 40**Login:** Anonymous**Email:** n/a**Responded At:** Feb 19, 2025 03:47:56 am**Last Seen:** Feb 19, 2025 03:47:56 am**IP Address:** n/a

Q1. What is your name?	Gail
Q2. What is your surname?	Christensen
Q3. What is your email address?	gailmickchristensen@hotmail.com
Q4. What is your address?	84 Bodeman Road Wandi 6167
Q5. What is your contact number?	0409996865
Q6. Submissions may be published as part of the consultation process. Do you wish to have your name removed from your submission?	No
Q7. Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?	No
Q8. What is the name of the organisation?	not answered
Q9. Do you support/oppose the proposed amendment to the Metropolitan Region Scheme?	Oppose
Q10. Please type your submission (reasons for support/opposition) into the box below. Any supporting documents may be uploaded below. Our environment is already under stress. Many of the banksia trees are dying and I'm seeing fewer red and white tailed cockatoos in the area. I have lived here for over 20 years and the impact of current development in this area has increased rapidly resulting in traffic congestion on the freeway and Lyon Road. We need to retain our open spaces.	
Q11. Upload supporting documents	not answered
Q12. Upload supporting documents	not answered
Q13. Upload supporting documents	not answered

**Respondent No:** 41**Login:** Anonymous**Email:** n/a**Responded At:** Feb 19, 2025 09:14:52 am**Last Seen:** Feb 19, 2025 09:14:52 am**IP Address:** n/a

Q1. What is your name?	Shaun
Q2. What is your surname?	Hack
Q3. What is your email address?	hacksie@hotmail.com
Q4. What is your address?	5 saltbush st, wandi
Q5. What is your contact number?	0448618987
Q6. Submissions may be published as part of the consultation process. Do you wish to have your name removed from your submission?	No
Q7. Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?	No
Q8. What is the name of the organisation?	not answered
Q9. Do you support/oppose the proposed amendment to the Metropolitan Region Scheme?	Oppose
Q10. Please type your submission (reasons for support/opposition) into the box below. Any supporting documents may be uploaded below.	
	Leave the region rural and stop developing the area. Also, The roads needs updating prior to this anyway
Q11. Upload supporting documents	not answered
Q12. Upload supporting documents	not answered
Q13. Upload supporting documents	not answered

IAN J. TEALE

LOT 518 on 103

PHONE 046 37 0095

HEBBLE LOOP BANJUP. 6064

I HAVE LIVED ON THIS BLOCK SINCE 1981. HAVE HOUSE GRAMA FLAT TWO LARGE SHED ON THE SITE. RE: HRS AMENDMENT 1426 COMPLD LYON RD KINLUY RD BANJUP AS BENEED PART OF WAGER EARLY OF BANJUP TO BE REZONED AS RESIDENTIAL HOUSING I PROTEST AGAINST THIS BECAUSE IT WILL START THE REST OF BANJUP COME UNDER SAME AMENDMENTS AS LIKE TREBBY WAS PART OF BANJUP NOW IS REAL SMALL BLOCKS OF RESIDENTIAL THE LAND DEVELOPERS WILL ALL BE TRY TOO DEOP THE RES OF $2\frac{1}{2}$ ACB TOO 10 AREAS BLOCKS INTOO RESIDENAL BLOCKS. THERE IS A LARGE BLOCK OF LAND OF SALE NORTH OF GUN CLUP CR AMANDALE RD + WARTON ~~RD~~ WEST. WICK IS PART OF COCKBUND. COUNCIL. NEXT THING WILL HERE THEY ARE TRYING TO DEOP THE LAND. THERE IS AOTS OF DEVOLPMENT ON EAST SIDE OF WARTON. RD WICK BLONGS TOO AMANDALE COUNCIL.

SO LOOK ACE DEVELOPER WILL LOOKING TOO JET IN.



Judy Laidy
14. 2. 2025



Respondent No: 42

Login: Anonymous

Email: n/a

Responded At: Feb 19, 2025 19:46:39 pm

Last Seen: Feb 19, 2025 19:46:39 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. What is your name?

Details removed at the request of the submitter

Q2. What is your surname?

Q3. What is your email address?

Q4. What is your address?

Q5. What is your contact number?

Q6. Submissions may be published as part of the consultation process. Do you wish to have your name removed from your submission? Yes

Q7. Are you responding on behalf of an organisation? No

Q8. What is the name of the organisation? not answered

Q9. Do you support/oppose the proposed amendment to the Metropolitan Region Scheme? Support

Q10. Please type your submission (reasons for support/opposition) into the box below. Any supporting documents may be uploaded below.

Need to release more land to construct houses to support population growth that helps Perth grow beyond Sydney sooner.

Q11. Upload supporting documents not answered

Q12. Upload supporting documents not answered

Q13. Upload supporting documents not answered

**Respondent No:** 43**Login:** Anonymous**Email:** n/a**Responded At:** Feb 19, 2025 21:01:03 pm**Last Seen:** Feb 19, 2025 21:01:03 pm**IP Address:** n/a

Q1. What is your name?	Jared
Q2. What is your surname?	Scherer
Q3. What is your email address?	gemcollector95@hotmail.com
Q4. What is your address?	63 Calista Ave Calista 6167
Q5. What is your contact number?	0437305928
Q6. Submissions may be published as part of the consultation process. Do you wish to have your name removed from your submission?	No
Q7. Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?	No
Q8. What is the name of the organisation?	not answered
Q9. Do you support/oppose the proposed amendment to the Metropolitan Region Scheme?	Oppose
Q10. Please type your submission (reasons for support/opposition) into the box below. Any supporting documents may be uploaded below. Keep protect waterways as they are. Cramming extra housing into the area instead of improving the existing zones is backwards thinking. Improve our greenery and make Kwinana a leader in carbon reduction as well as social justice and support.	
Q11. Upload supporting documents	not answered
Q12. Upload supporting documents	not answered
Q13. Upload supporting documents	not answered



Respondent No: 44

Login: Anonymous

Email: n/a

Responded At: Feb 20, 2025 01:39:57 am

Last Seen: Feb 20, 2025 01:39:57 am

IP Address: n/a

Q1. What is your name?

Details removed at the request of the submitter

Q2. What is your surname?

Q3. What is your email address?

Q4. What is your address?

Q5. What is your contact number?

Q6. Submissions may be published as part of the consultation process. Do you wish to have your name removed from your submission? Yes

Q7. Are you responding on behalf of an organisation? No

Q8. What is the name of the organisation? not answered

Q9. Do you support/oppose the proposed amendment to the Metropolitan Region Scheme? Oppose

Q10. Please type your submission (reasons for support/opposition) into the box below. Any supporting documents may be uploaded below.

removal of bush land, over crowded, traffic as there is only one way in and out on Lyons Road

Q11. Upload supporting documents not answered

Q12. Upload supporting documents not answered

Q13. Upload supporting documents not answered

**Respondent No:** 45**Login:** Anonymous**Email:** n/a**Responded At:** Feb 20, 2025 23:53:18 pm**Last Seen:** Feb 20, 2025 23:53:18 pm**IP Address:** n/a

Q1. What is your name?

Details removed at the request of the submitter

Q2. What is your surname?

Q3. What is your email address?

Q4. What is your address?

Q5. What is your contact number?

Q6. Submissions may be published as part of the consultation process. Do you wish to have your name removed from your submission? Yes

Q7. Are you responding on behalf of an organisation? No

Q8. What is the name of the organisation? not answered

Q9. Do you support/oppose the proposed amendment to the Metropolitan Region Scheme? Oppose

Q10. Please type your submission (reasons for support/opposition) into the box below. Any supporting documents may be uploaded below.


There should be NO MORE RESIDENTIAL development until KWINANA FREEWAY has been widened to allow for traffic. Is currently dangerous and contributing more greenhouse gases than a coalmine. Back prior to COVID the widening was a priority but how will Baldivis residents get Ambulance services to Fiona Stanley? Especially with young families, how many babies will be born on the side of the freeway? Will you be placing birthing suites along the side in the breakdown lane?

Q11. Upload supporting documents https://s3-ap-southeast-2.amazonaws.com/ehq-production-australia/b9798da4374914ce62b71630e6ebad5fd03f552e/original/1740055520/2c8ffdfd0fb1496a6632ec644651fe17_Screenshot_20250220-155420.png?1740055520


Q12. Upload supporting documents https://s3-ap-southeast-2.amazonaws.com/ehq-production-australia/7ba4793a0b850696841951d280cbfbd69af8e891/original/1740055781/bdda87a6d4c606cda154fcc585902d08_Screenshot_20250220-204813.png?1740055781

Q13. Upload supporting documents https://s3-ap-southeast-2.amazonaws.com/ehq-production-australia/9a8fe70f608db145d3322798e6ef2bd9a78f4826/original/1740055789/2d080bfb8af3f7c959feb3c6d97c1afa_Screenshot_20250220-204907.png?1740055789

Stay on  2
12 km to  



 Re-centre



18 min

16 km • 16:12



The additional lanes opening on the Kwinana Freeway will reduce travel times and improve safety for commuters while also providing better access to key local services such as Fiona Stanley Hospital.

This will be followed in July with the opening of a new third lane for one kilometre adjacent to Cockburn Central station, upon completion of vital METRONET and pier installation works for the Armadale Road to North Lake Road Bridge project.

"Upon completion of our Kwinana Freeway Northbound Widening and Smart Freeway project, over 15,000 current road users will save up to 21 minutes on their morning commute from Rowley Road to Narrows Bridge."



Respondent No: 46

Login: Anonymous

Email: n/a

Responded At: Feb 21, 2025 19:36:15 pm

Last Seen: Feb 21, 2025 19:36:15 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. What is your name?

Details removed at the request of the submitter

Q2. What is your surname?

Q3. What is your email address?

Q4. What is your address?

Q5. What is your contact number?

Q6. Submissions may be published as part of the consultation process. Do you wish to have your name removed from your submission? Yes

Q7. Are you responding on behalf of an organisation? No

Q8. What is the name of the organisation? not answered

Q9. Do you support/oppose the proposed amendment to the Metropolitan Region Scheme? Oppose

Q10. Please type your submission (reasons for support/opposition) into the box below. Any supporting documents may be uploaded below.

I t's a rural Water Protection Zone. There will be more traffic on Rowley Road and Lyon Road. The road cannot cope with the volume of traffic now. What about the black cockatoos, trees removed. Loss of habitat for wildlife. If anything Aubin Grove Reserve needs to be extended to cope with school and club requirements. Need to sort out the roads first not take down trees. The Government seem to do what they like anyway. So wasting my time!!

Q11. Upload supporting documents not answered

Q12. Upload supporting documents not answered

Q13. Upload supporting documents not answered

**Respondent No:** 47**Login:** Anonymous**Email:** n/a**Responded At:** Feb 22, 2025 23:29:38 pm**Last Seen:** Feb 22, 2025 23:29:38 pm**IP Address:** n/aQ1. **What is your name?***Details removed at the request of the submitter*Q2. **What is your surname?**Q3. **What is your email address?**Q4. **What is your address?**Q5. **What is your contact number?**

Q6. **Submissions may be published as part of the consultation process. Do you wish to have your name removed from your submission?** Yes

Q7. **Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?** No

Q8. **What is the name of the organisation?** not answered

Q9. **Do you support/oppose the proposed amendment to the Metropolitan Region Scheme?** Oppose

Q10. **Please type your submission (reasons for support/opposition) into the box below. Any supporting documents may be uploaded below.**

There are so many new developments going up at the expense of our native wildlife. We don't need another one. This area should be kept as Rural and not be rezoned. The bushland is already so fragmented. This change would see the clearing of even more land. Such a change should not happen here or anywhere else in Banjup and surrounding suburbs. Our native wildlife can coexist on acreage properties. They cannot survive in tiny subdivided blocks with not a single tree on them.

Q11. **Upload supporting documents** not answered

Q12. **Upload supporting documents** not answered

Q13. **Upload supporting documents** not answered

**Respondent No:** 48**Login:** Anonymous**Email:** n/a**Responded At:** Feb 23, 2025 16:32:23 pm**Last Seen:** Feb 23, 2025 16:32:23 pm**IP Address:** n/a

Q1. What is your name?

Details removed at the request of the submitter

Q2. What is your surname?

Q3. What is your email address?

Q4. What is your address?

Q5. What is your contact number?

Q6. Submissions may be published as part of the consultation process. Do you wish to have your name removed from your submission? Yes

Q7. Are you responding on behalf of an organisation? No

Q8. What is the name of the organisation? not answered

Q9. Do you support/oppose the proposed amendment to the Metropolitan Region Scheme? Support

Q10. Please type your submission (reasons for support/opposition) into the box below. Any supporting documents may be uploaded below.

not answered

Q11. Upload supporting documents not answered

Q12. Upload supporting documents not answered

Q13. Upload supporting documents not answered

**Respondent No:** 49**Login:** Anonymous**Email:** n/a**Responded At:** Feb 23, 2025 17:15:56 pm**Last Seen:** Feb 23, 2025 17:15:56 pm**IP Address:** n/a

Q1. What is your name?	Joan and Ian
Q2. What is your surname?	Weston
Q3. What is your email address?	weston.joan@gmail.com
Q4. What is your address?	315 Lyon Road, Banjup. WA 6164
Q5. What is your contact number?	0403262049
Q6. Submissions may be published as part of the consultation process. Do you wish to have your name removed from your submission?	No
Q7. Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?	No
Q8. What is the name of the organisation?	not answered
Q9. Do you support/oppose the proposed amendment to the Metropolitan Region Scheme?	Support
Q10. Please type your submission (reasons for support/opposition) into the box below. Any supporting documents may be uploaded below. SUBMISSION - Western Australian Planning Commission Metropolitan Region Scheme Amendment 1426 (Complex Amendment) SUBMISSION DOCUMENT ATTACHED	
Q11. Upload supporting documents	https://s3-ap-southeast-2.amazonaws.com/ehq-production-australia/5ef0f587fd33ff857c60d867e8ee7817a7e201e7/original/1740291342/834abd56e5319295a84800e17fa6bdd3_MRS%20Amendment%20WAPC%20-%20Joan%20and%20Ian%20Weston.docx?1740291342
Q12. Upload supporting documents	not answered
Q13. Upload supporting documents	not answered

SUBMISSION

Western Australian Planning Commission

Metropolitan Region Scheme Amendment 1426
(Complex Amendment)

Lyon & Kinley Roads, Banjup

Joan and Ian Weston
315 Lyon Road
BANJUP WA 6164
0403 262 049

SUBMISSION TO THE WESTERN AUSTRALIAN PLANNING COMMISSION

This submission is in full support of the MRS Amendment 1426 (Complex Amendment) Lyon and Kinley Roads, Banjup.

The area bounded by Lyon Road (south of Aubin Grove Primary School) to Rowley Road and east to Kinley Road (including Kinley Road) is a planning oversight (and has been identified as such by the City of Cockburn). This small area should always have been included in the Urban Zoning as Aubin Grove. The landowners in this area are identified as the **Lyon Kinley Land Owners Collaborative**.

This MRS Amendment is well overdue in addressing the original Amendment of 1998/9 when this area of land was included, then removed from, the rezoning of the area. The result is that the land is bounded by urban development both to the north and west along Lyon Road.

Our property at 315 Lyon Road, Banjup is part of the Lyon Kinley Land Owners Collaborative – a group of 17 landowners who are united in their quest to achieve Urban status for their land. We have a proposed innovative and sustainable design concept which demonstrates how it could connect and provide community betterment.

On the northern boundary of these properties, separated by a wire fence is Aubin Grove Primary School - which has a current enrolment of in excess of 1000 students – and the Aubin Grove Sport and Community Facility, which operates 7 days per week, including evenings.

The area has now lost its rural feel. While the residents of Aubin Grove feel they are a valued community within the City of Cockburn the landowners in the south west corner of Banjup are left to feel excluded.

These land holdings are within easy access of tax payer Government funded **existing community facilities and infrastructure**:

- Bus stops – on our driveway (heading south) and directly over the road heading north including to the Harvest Lakes Shopping precinct and the Aubin Grove train station.
- Aubin Grove Primary School is on our side boundary to the north with only a wire fence dividing us – currently has 1024 students – trending downwards – and has been facilitated for in excess of this enrolment number.
- Aubin Grove Recreation and Community Centre on our side boundary to the north with only a dividing wire fence which is constantly scaled and damaged by users of the Centre. We have an ongoing problem removing rubbish and drug paraphernalia.
- Aubin Grove shopping centre – 850m – provides shopping, personal and medical services.
- Child minding services – 850 m
- Honeywood pharmacy, medical services and cafe – 800m
- Aubin Grove Train Station – 2kms
- Kwinana Freeway – less than 1 km
- Harvest Lakes shopping precinct which includes several types of medical services – 2kms.
- Hammond Park Secondary School – ever growing feeder school from Aubin Grove Primary School
- Newly developed and well patronised Frankland Park Sports and Community Centre
- Gateway Shopping Centre in Cockburn
- The Arc in Cockburn
- Cockburn Central and East Cockburn precincts including the newly proposed Wave Park

All of the above amenities provide **employment**, support the **local economy** to residents and address the principles which are derived from the State Planning Strategy 2050 (2014).

Both Rowley and Lyon Roads provide first choice access to all of the aforementioned amenities. Services such as water, gas, power and NBN all pass our doorstep. Underground power is also installed along Lyon Road to our boundary with the school, and on the western side of the road to Rowley Road.

If the land bounded by Lyon, Rowley and Kinley roads was rezoned (and even renamed) to connect directly as part of Aubin Grove, then the residents would in the main be young, provide students to local schools, shop, play and use already established facilities in the local areas. This Amendment would be a rounding off of the urban zoned area of Aubin Grove and an ideal infill site.

In the report from the City of Cockburn community workshops held in 2018, this specific area was identified and desired by attendees as being an area which needed to be brought into the urban development of Aubin Grove.

This proposed Amendment has full support of the City of Cockburn as demonstrated in the Minutes of the OCM 09/07/2015 City of Cockburn Council Meeting (pages 29-31).

(https://www.cockburn.wa.gov.au/getattachment/5fc2d4a6-5559-4dc5-9fb1-67019f7a2ade/ECM_4335682_v1_Ordinary-Council-Meeting-Minutes-9-July-2015-pdf.aspx).

that:

*“there is an area shown in previous planning studies (bound by Kwinana Freeway, Rowley Road and properties on the eastern side of Kinley Road) that has not been identified in this document (The draft Perth and Peel @3.5 Million Plan). **This seems to have been an oversight in leaving this area out of the urban expansion area.***

The background to this area is that the land was identified as Future Urban within the Urban Expansion Policy Statement (1990) (proposals 36 and 37). This was a (then) Department of Planning and Urban Development document. Following this, DPUD released the Draft Jandakot Landuse and Water Management Strategy (1992) which also identified the land as Urban (existing or proposed). However, the final (1995) version of the JLUWMS omitted the land, replacing it instead with the following text:

The following land may have the potential for urban development in the future if the development constraints can be overcome:

(i) Land located on the north side of Rowley Road abutting both sides of Kinley Road and extending west to Lyon Road, Banjup.

Possible urban development of this land should be assessed in light of the findings of the Select Committee on Development over Groundwater area in the metropolitan Region and an assessment of environmental and drainage management issues.

Referring back to the Urban Expansion Policy Statement (1990), proposals 36 and 37 were subject to district planning by virtue of the South Jandakot/Mandogalup District Planning Strategy (1993). The subject land was included in the district structure plan, with the following notes:

The Structure Plan report states, “There is nothing in the physical nature of the land or environmental constraints which differentiates it from the future urban land to the north or west.”

While we acknowledge and support the desire for most of Banjup to retain its Rural and protected status, there is also strong support from other Banjup land owners for the WAPC and Council to address the anomaly of the future zoning of the land held by the Lyon Kinley Landowners Collaborative.

In 2022, the Banjup Residents’ Group developed a document (Banjup Preservation Principles) which the City of Cockburn has fully supported. Principle 4 states: *The City will earnestly seek to resolve the zoning anomaly in the south west corner of Banjup.*

SUBMISSION TO WESTERN AUSTRALIAN PLANNING COMMISSION

Metropolitan Region Scheme Amendment 1426 (Complex Amendment) Lyon & Kinley Roads, Banjup.

Submitted by JOAN WESTON

The development by the State Government of new desalination water sources and production, has resulted in the groundwater extraction being minimal in comparison resulting in groundwater extraction becoming largely redundant. Previous developments including the area from Atwell to Aubin Grove have proven that with good planning, contemporary water sensitive urban design can co-exist with water protection.

CLOSING STATEMENT:

This submission is in full support of the MRS Amendment 1426 (Complex Amendment) Lyon and Kinley Roads, Banjup.



Respondent No: 50

Login: Anonymous

Email: n/a

Responded At: Feb 24, 2025 11:20:23 am

Last Seen: Feb 24, 2025 11:20:23 am

IP Address: n/a

Q1. What is your name?

Details removed at the request of the submitter

Q2. What is your surname?

Q3. What is your email address?

Q4. What is your address?

Q5. What is your contact number?

Q6. Submissions may be published as part of the consultation process. Do you wish to have your name removed from your submission? Yes

Q7. Are you responding on behalf of an organisation? No

Q8. What is the name of the organisation? not answered

Q9. Do you support/oppose the proposed amendment to the Metropolitan Region Scheme? Support

Q10. Please type your submission (reasons for support/opposition) into the box below. Any supporting documents may be uploaded below.

While I support the amendment, I strongly urge that any development takes the advice of the EPA and retains pockets of banksia woodland.

Q11. Upload supporting documents not answered

Q12. Upload supporting documents not answered

Q13. Upload supporting documents not answered



Government of **Western Australia**
Department of **Health**

Your Ref: RLS/1124
Our Ref: F-AA-90444-20-1 / D-AA-25/2194
Contact: Bethany Angus 9222 2000

Ms Zoë Chalwell-James
Planning Administration Coordinator
Department of Planning, Lands and Heritage
Bunbury Tower, Level 6
61 Victoria Street
BUNBURY WA 6230

Via email: regionplanningschemes@dplh.wa.gov.au

Dear Ms Chalwell-James

PROPOSED METROPOLITAN REGION SCHEME AMENDMENT (COMPLEX) – LYON AND KINLEY ROADS, BANJUP – RLS/1124

Thank you for your email dated 24 December 2024, requesting comment from the Department of Health (DoH) on the above proposal.

The DoH provides the following comment:

1. Water Supply

It is noted the proposal is located within a Public Drinking Water Source Area, P2, and areas of the proposal are located within Wellhead Protection Zones.

The DoH does not support the proposal until the proponent obtains approval from the Department of Water and Environmental Regulation (DWER). This is to ensure Perth's drinking water aquifers and water sources are preserved long term, prevent contamination and protect public health safety.

2. Contaminated Sites

The site has not been classified and recorded on DWER's contaminated sites database (*Contaminated Sites Act 2003*). However, although this site does not appear on DWER's public access database, it may be subject to other important classifications not recorded on that database. The proponent should obtain a Basic Summary of Records relating to the land and its surroundings to complete their assessment of the site's suitability for a rezoning to a more sensitive land use: [Schedule 1 — Forms \(www.wa.gov.au\)](http://www.wa.gov.au).

Storage and use of agricultural chemicals, fuels and wastes are often associated with contaminated sites. Other hazardous materials including asbestos should be safely removed from buildings prior to demolition and clearance to avoid the creation of new contaminated sites. Under section 11 of the *Contaminated Sites Act 2003*, if a site is 'known or suspected' of being a contaminated site, it should be reported to DWER.

Should you have any queries or require further information, please contact System Performance on 9222 2000 or eh.eSubmissions@health.wa.gov.au.

Yours sincerely



Dr Michael Lindsay
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH DIRECTORATE

24 February 2025

24 February 2025

Sam Boucher
The Secretary
Western Australian Planning Commission
Locked Bag 2506
PERTH WA 600

Our Ref: D25/9419
Officer: Gary Williams
Phone: 9439 0430
email: gary.williams@kwinana.wa.gov.au

Dear Ms Boucher

CITY OF KWINANA SUBMISSION ON PROPOSED METROPOLITAN REGION SCHEME AMENDMENT 1426 - LYON & KINLEY ROADS, BANJUP

The City of Kwinana appreciates the opportunity to comment on Metropolitan Region Scheme Amendment 1426 which proposes to rezone a substantial area of land adjacent to the City's northern boundary, from 'Rural – Water Protection' zone to 'Urban' and 'Urban Deferred' zones.

The City does not object to the proposal, however wishes to make the following comments.

Traffic Planning

The Rowley Road / Lyon Road intersection is operating beyond its design capacity and is heavily congested on a regular basis. Rowley Road currently carries a high number of vehicles per day (17,500 annual average daily traffic) include a high volume of truck traffic (9% of overall traffic). The truck traffic contribute to the safety and congestion issues at the Rowley Road / Lyon Road intersection.

As stated in the Transport Impact Assessment Guidelines (WAPC, 2016) it is important to understand potential transport impacts during the early stages of the planning framework, prior to the more detailed subsequent stages of structure planning and subdivision.

It is particularly important that wider transport impacts are considered as part of Amendment 1426 because future consideration of traffic issues will be limited to resolution through the local structure planning process.

The City recommends that the proponents and/or their appointed traffic engineers should discuss the specific transport requirements with the City of Kwinana prior to the preparation of a local structure plan(s) for the subject area.

City of Kwinana Administration

Corner Gilmore Avenue and Sulphur Road, Kwinana WA 6167

PO Box 21, Kwinana WA 6966 | **Telephone** 08 9439 0200

NRS 133 677 (*hearing/speech impaired*) | **TIS National** 131 450 (*Translating and Interpreting Service*)

Email customer@kwinana.wa.gov.au | **Website** kwinana.wa.gov.au



Environmental Values, Concept Plan and Implementation

The EPA highlights the draft concept plan (which depicts retention areas containing significant environmental values) as a '*fundamental consideration for the EPA*', in concluding that the scheme amendment is unlikely to have a significant effect on the environment and in deciding that a Part IV assessment is not required.

Local structure planning is limited in setting aside land for both public open space and environmental conservation, usually only through identified wetlands and the minimum 10% POS contribution. The City requests that the WAPC consider what statutory mechanisms maybe required to ensure future development is consistent with the draft concept plan, so as to ensure that development does not have a significant impact on the environment, therefore being consistent with the EPA's consideration of the proposal.

Should you have any enquiries regarding this correspondence please contact Gary Williams (Senior Strategic Planning Officer) on 9439 0430 or gary.williams@kwinana.wa.gov.au.

Yours faithfully



Brett Cammell

A/Director City Development and Sustainability



Enquiries: Strategic Planning – 9411 3505
Our ref: 108/001
Your ref: RLS/1124

26 February 2025

Western Australian Planning Commission
Locked Bag 256
PERTH WA 6001

Attention: Anthony Muscara

**CITY OF COCKBURN COMMENTS
PROPOSED METROPOLITAN REGION SCHEME (MRS) AMENDMENT #1426
LYON AND KINLEY ROAD, BANJUP**

Dear Sir/Madam

Thank you for the invitation to provide comments on the proposed Metropolitan Region Scheme (MRS) amendment for multiple lots on Lyon and Kinley Roads, Banjup.

It is recognised that the boundary of the MRS 'Rural – Water Protection' zone south of Armadale Road has a spatially regular western interface with the City of Cockburn 'urban' zone, except for the subject area, which since the 1990's has formed the subject of planning investigations foreshadowing potential urbanisation of the area.

Of note, the advertised draft of *Perth and Peel @3.5million* defined urban expansion as "land that has been identified for potential urban development in preceding planning studies or represents the logical expansion of an existing urban area". It is on this basis that the City's 2015 submission on *Perth and Peel @3.5million* advocated for this area to be identified for 'urban expansion'.

Despite the land ultimately not being identified in *Perth and Peel @3.5million* as an urban expansion or planning investigation area, Council has continued to see merit in a potential 'urban' zoning for the land. As recently as in April 2023, in response to feedback received during advertising of the City's *Local Planning Strategy*, Council recommended the area's identification as a 'Planning Area' to provide a framework to consider future MRS Amendment requests for intensification.

Whilst the Western Australian Planning Commission (WAPC) did not include the proposed 'Planning Area' in the endorsed *Local Planning Strategy* (which shows the area remaining 'rural water protection'), given it then initiated the MRS Amendment, and Council's longstanding support through various formal resolutions, the City assessed the proposal against the principles previously endorsed by Council for proposed Planning Area K.

Key matters are discussed below:

Environmental Values

The subject area contains significant environmental values, and the concept plan (included in the pre-referral MRS Amendment) and the EPA referral show areas of “retained bushland”, including Lot 30 Kinley Road annotated as “remaining undeveloped”, and Lot 23 Lyon Road annotated as “retained bushland”.

However, this provides no certainty regarding the future tenure and potential land use or development of the land. This is of particular concern where there is no identified developable portion of the land, such as for Lot 30 Kinley Road and Lot 23 Lyon Road.

Lot 30 Kinley Road

It is noted the EPA’s assessment, and the WAPC report assume the vegetation on Lot 30 will be retained, including a 50m buffer to the Resource Enhancement Wetland (REW), however there is no certainty this will occur.

The EPA have noted the vegetation on Lot 30 may be of regional significance, and the REW may have conservation values more akin to a Conservation Category Wetland (CCW), however insufficient information has been provided regarding the environmental values of Lot 30.

Given Lot 30 has not been included in the Environmental Assessment report, addressed by the concept plan (which does not show a future zoning for the land) and is not proposed to be part of a future structure plan, there is no advantage from an orderly and proper planning perspective to rezoning the site to ‘urban’ at this point in time. Should the rest of the precinct be rezoned to ‘urban’, future structure planning of that area would still be required to achieve an appropriate interface to the lot.

As insufficient justification has been provided to demonstrate the appropriateness of Lot 30 being rezoned to ‘Urban’, the City is of the view Lot 30 should remain in the ‘Rural Water Protection’ zone.

In the future, an MRS Amendment could be lodged for Lot 30 with appropriate justification and supporting environmental studies. This would be referred to the EPA, enabling a thorough environmental assessment which has not occurred via this Amendment proposal.

Lot 23 Lyon Road

Lot 23 Lyon Road is an undeveloped vegetated lot that was included in the Environmental Assessment Report. It contains closed Banksia Woodland in good condition, and the EPA’s assessment assumes this bushland will be retained. Whilst the concept plan annotates this entire lot as ‘retained bushland’ with no development potential, there is no indication of the future tenure or zoning of the land demonstrating how this will be achieved.

Rezoning the lot to 'urban' will set an expectation of some level of urban development, and it would not be appropriate or reasonable for a future structure plan to designate the entire lot as unrestricted Public Open Space (POS).

Unless there are appropriate arrangements to secure the transfer and long-term management of this bushland (beyond the standard requirement for at least 8% unrestricted POS), it is the City's recommendation that Lot 23 also remain in the 'Rural Water Protection' zone.

It is recognised the proponent may have an intended arrangement to achieve this outcome.

Groundwater Protection Area

The site is currently identified as a 'Priority 2' (P2) area under *State Planning Policy 2.3 – Jandakot Groundwater Protection* and draft *State Planning Policy 2.9 – Water Resources* (draft SPP 2.9).

The City notes there is a potential impact of incremental urbanisation of the area on the groundwater mound that goes beyond the site-specific impact on groundwater quality. This includes an impact on the wetland chain, given the interrelationship with the groundwater mound, and a risk to the drinking water resource, which at a point may be irreversible.

In accordance with the Actions of the Local Planning Strategy, the City continues to advocate for the State Government to undertake a comprehensive groundwater and hydrological technical study and assessment of the Jandakot Groundwater Protection Area to better understand the hydrogeological processes.

Future Structure Plan

Given the range of environmental values and the EPA referral being premised on a concept plan showing areas of bushland to be retained, the City is of the view a structure plan should be prepared for the entirety of any future 'urban' area to ensure this occurs.

This will also ensure orderly and proper planning of the precinct, including provision of POS to meet the recreational needs of the community, and appropriate staging of any subdivision and development.

Future of the Rural Water Protection zone

Support for the potential rezoning of the subject land (excluding Lot 30) is based on Council's longstanding support through various formal Council resolutions relating to this specific area.

However, the City is concerned ad-hoc and incremental urbanisation of the rural water protection area will make forward planning difficult, hindering capacity for coordination between government agencies to efficiently deliver infrastructure and services. This will create a cost burden for future taxpayers and ratepayers.

Such an approach may also create a legacy of poorly planned, disconnected and underserviced communities. The consequence of this will be reduced liveability and increased costs-of-living for future residents.

It is noted the housing targets in *Perth and Peel @3.5million* may no longer be sufficient to meet demand, and the City recommends the Department of Planning, Lands and Heritage (DPLH) review the dwelling targets to determine if this is the case.

It is noted the underlying Sub-Regional Frameworks (SRFs) are not static documents, intended to be monitored continuously and reviewed to ensure they remain contemporary and responsive to Government priorities and community need. Therefore, if the housing targets are determined to no longer be appropriate it is recommended the WAPC prepare an update report as an addendum to *Perth and Peel @3.5million* (such the 2022 'Planning Investigations Area Update') as a priority.

At a minimum this should set out guidance/criteria to assess proposed MRS Amendments that vary from the SRFs. It is recommended this include specific criteria for the 'Rural Water Protection' zone, taking into consideration water supply planning, environmental impacts, infrastructure planning and the role of the Jandakot groundwater resource into the future.

This will provide a framework to balance timely delivery of housing with orderly and proper planning in manner that is cost effective, equitable and transparent.

Rowley Road

Rowley Road is identified as a future Primary Regional Road Reserve in *Perth and Peel @3.5million*. It is critical Main Roads WA (MRWA) and the Department of Planning, Lands and Heritage (DPLH) work together to define the needs of the Rowley Road corridor and provide clarity to all parties concerned, in particular potentially affected landowners. It is noted the proposals shows an area along Rowley Road as 'urban deferred', and the future road reservation will force a number of alternative access points to the existing lots along Rowley Road as it becomes a controlled access road.

Local Planning Scheme provisions

Please be advised if the proposed MRS rezoning is supported by the WAPC the City does not support a concurrent rezoning under the local planning scheme to 'Development' or any other zone, given there would need to be complementary text modifications. This includes matters raised by the EPA to ensure the retention of environmental values through the future stages of planning.

It should be noted Developer Contribution Area 13 (DCA13) for Community Infrastructure have been prepared with infrastructure and catchments that did not include planning for further urban development within the 'Rural Water Protection' zone. This matter requires resolution.

Active playing field

The City has identified the projected population from this scale of potential development would result in the need for a second active playing field (multi-purpose) in Aubin Grove. This could either be an expansion of the existing playing fields along the northern boundary of the subject area (with upgrades/additional embellishments to the existing building), or a second active playing field. A second active playing field would be a satellite facility, needing to accommodate a building of approximately 550m² for toilets, changerooms, storage, kiosk etc. rather than full clubrooms.

To ensure such a facility can be facilitated, the proponent is encouraged to pursue a private landowner arrangement to ensure an equitable distribution of POS.

Concept Plan

The City previously reviewed the concept plan submitted with the preliminary MRS request and reiterates the previous comments, outlined below:

- Vehicle access arrangements to Rowley Road require further discussion, as the additional access point is unlikely to be acceptable given current issues on this section of Rowley Road.
- There are functionality issues with the proposed local road network, which include numerous four-way intersections.
- The extent of the proposed R60 coded areas are considered unjustified in this location.
- Any proposed local centre would require justification and an appropriate design and interface with the residential area and Rowley Road.
- While no land areas are indicated, a number of proposed POS areas appear too small to be functional.
- The zoning and tenure of land areas shown as “retained bushland” requires clarification.
- Figure 3 (Post Development BAL Contour Plan) is missing from the Bush Fire Management Plan.
- There is no evidence of consultation with the Department of Education in accordance OP2.4 ‘Planning for School Sites’, and there is insufficient evidence of the existing projected catchments of nearby schools.

Should you wish to discuss any of the matters raised in this submission, please contact Donna Di Renzo on 9411 3573 or ddirenzo@cockburn.wa.gov.au in the first instance.

Sincerely,



Carol Catherwood
Acting Director Planning and Sustainability



mainroads
WESTERN AUSTRALIA

Enquiries: Arfanara Najnin on (08) 9323 6119

Our Ref: 23/9132 (D25#205509)

Your Ref: RLS/1124

28 February 2025

The Secretary
Western Australian Planning Commission
Locked Bag 2506
PERTH WA 6001

Email: regionplanningschemes@dplh.wa.gov.au

Attention: Anthony Muscara

**PROPOSED METROPOLITAN REGION SCHEME AMENDMENT 1426
(COMPLEX) - LYON AND KINLEY ROADS, BANJUP - RLS/1124**

Thank you for your correspondence dated 24/12/2024 inviting Main Roads to comment on the above MRS proposed to rezone Rural Water Protection to Urban and Urban Deferred.

Main Roads has no objection to the proposed amendment as the proposal excludes a 50 metre wide strip of land immediately north of Rowley Road for the future road widening purposes.

Main Roads requests a copy of the WAPC's final recommendation to be sent to planninginfo@mainroads.wa.gov.au quoting the file reference above.

If you require any further information, please contact Planning Information Manager Arfanara Najnin on (08) 9323 6119 or via email at arfanara.najnin@mainroads.wa.gov.au.

Yours sincerely

Markus Botte
Manager Statutory Road Planning

**Respondent No:** 51**Login:** Anonymous**Email:** n/a**Responded At:** Mar 01, 2025 13:22:46 pm**Last Seen:** Mar 01, 2025 13:22:46 pm**IP Address:** n/a

Q1. What is your name?	Anwen
Q2. What is your surname?	Taplin
Q3. What is your email address?	anwen_taplin@hotmail.com
Q4. What is your address?	97 magenup drive wandi
Q5. What is your contact number?	0422946206
Q6. Submissions may be published as part of the consultation process. Do you wish to have your name removed from your submission?	No
Q7. Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?	No
Q8. What is the name of the organisation?	not answered
Q9. Do you support/oppose the proposed amendment to the Metropolitan Region Scheme?	Oppose
Q10. Please type your submission (reasons for support/opposition) into the box below. Any supporting documents may be uploaded below.	<p>The Rowley-Lyon road circle can not handle the current traffic from the new honeywood estate and aubin grove. Major road works need to be completed so that the traffic doesn't back up from 6.30 to 8.00 am in the mornings. As a daily commuter who takes public transport from aubin grove station but lives over 2 km from the nearest bus stop, it takes me on average 20 minutes to get through this intersection in the mornings. This subdivision will only add more cars trying to get through this intersection during peak hours. It would be completely irresponsible to even consider this development without improving the bus network to aubin grove station or improving the Rowley - Lyon road intersection. Secondly, species like the black cockatoos are incredibly vulnerable at the moment with the amount of banksia woodland clearing that is occurring across the state. If this clearing occurs then they lose another connecting section of woodland and will be forced out of their habitat. The species is declining and I have personally noticed a reduction in the populations that visit since the honewood estate was built going from large flocks to groups of 4 or 5 cockatoos only. This development simply cannot be allowed to proceed if we are aiming to protect black cockatoos and other endangered species. Thirdly, there is a reason this land was originally designated as a water protection zone. We should not overlook the importance of protecting our water sources in WA while we are in the midst of a drought (which will only be made worse by climate change). If the development proceeds then it will be obvious that the City of Cockburn council cares only about profits and not about supporting its constituents into the future. Thank you for taking the time to read my submission.</p>
Q11. Upload supporting documents	not answered
Q12. Upload supporting documents	not answered
Q13. Upload supporting documents	not answered

**Respondent No:** 52**Login:** Anonymous**Email:** n/a**Responded At:** Mar 03, 2025 16:45:38 pm**Last Seen:** Mar 03, 2025 16:45:38 pm**IP Address:** n/a

Q1. What is your name?	Denelle
Q2. What is your surname?	Kennedy
Q3. What is your email address?	maggyacemitchell@hotmail.com
Q4. What is your address?	136 Comic Court Circuit DARLING DOWNS
Q5. What is your contact number?	0439945462
Q6. Submissions may be published as part of the consultation process. Do you wish to have your name removed from your submission?	No
Q7. Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?	No
Q8. What is the name of the organisation?	not answered
Q9. Do you support/oppose the proposed amendment to the Metropolitan Region Scheme?	Oppose
Q10. Please type your submission (reasons for support/opposition) into the box below. Any supporting documents may be uploaded below.	
<p>I drive past this everyday and think how much of a wildlife haven it is. The proposed area is crucial habitat for many wildlife species, including critically and endangered species. It also has Banksia, Banksia Woodlands are threatened ecological communities on the Swan Coastal Plain with only a very few percentage left. Further destruction should not occur!! I see endangered and critically endangered species of Black Cockatoos consistently use this area, it is a safe feeding habitat and used by them as a safe corridor. The undulation and hydrology of the land is also vital for water supplies and dumping a heap of housing on this is ludicrous!!!!</p>	
Q11. Upload supporting documents	not answered
Q12. Upload supporting documents	not answered
Q13. Upload supporting documents	not answered

**Respondent No:** 53**Login:** Anonymous**Email:** n/a**Responded At:** Mar 03, 2025 16:48:02 pm**Last Seen:** Mar 03, 2025 16:48:02 pm**IP Address:** n/a

Q1. What is your name?	Pamela Kennedy
Q2. What is your surname?	Ken
Q3. What is your email address?	pamakennedy@gmail.com
Q4. What is your address?	7 THOMAS STREET SOURTH
Q5. What is your contact number?	0439945490
Q6. Submissions may be published as part of the consultation process. Do you wish to have your name removed from your submission?	No
Q7. Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?	No
Q8. What is the name of the organisation?	not answered
Q9. Do you support/oppose the proposed amendment to the Metropolitan Region Scheme?	Oppose
Q10. Please type your submission (reasons for support/opposition) into the box below. Any supporting documents may be uploaded below. This area is used by a myriad of wildlife and it is criminal to turn it into housing. The endless destruction of critical urban habitat needs to stop. Perth's Urban Tree Canopy is less than 16% and this planning amendment would add to reduced tree cover.	
Q11. Upload supporting documents	not answered
Q12. Upload supporting documents	not answered
Q13. Upload supporting documents	not answered

**Respondent No:** 54**Login:** Anonymous**Email:** n/a**Responded At:** Mar 03, 2025 23:47:01 pm**Last Seen:** Mar 03, 2025 23:47:01 pm**IP Address:** n/a

Q1. What is your name?

Details removed at the request of the submitter

Q2. What is your surname?

Q3. What is your email address?

Q4. What is your address?

Q5. What is your contact number?

Q6. Submissions may be published as part of the consultation process. Do you wish to have your name removed from your submission? Yes

Q7. Are you responding on behalf of an organisation? No

Q8. What is the name of the organisation? not answered

Q9. Do you support/oppose the proposed amendment to the Metropolitan Region Scheme? Oppose

Q10. Please type your submission (reasons for support/opposition) into the box below. Any supporting documents may be uploaded below.

I live looking out onto the proposed development. I am concerned for the wildlife as we sit outside almost on a daily basis, looking at kangaroos, quinda and numerous bird species and with their natural habitat being destroyed, they will possibly reduce in numbers. My main concern is the black cockatoos that we watch nest and roost and use this area and their ability to survive in this area should their natural habitat be destroyed. I have other concerns as well such that may not be as relevant as the above such as road congestion. Aubin grove essentially has 1 main rd in and out. I used to live on Lyon rd and moved off given the traffic having lived on Lyon rd since 2006 and you could not get out of our driveway in peak periods for vast periods of time. Lyon rd is currently used as a rat run from the freeway and should and further development would increase what is already a major concern in the area, especially with a recent death on Lyon rd, multiple accidents on Lyon rd intersecting rowley rd, increased traffic will only cause further issues.

Q11. Upload supporting documents not answered

Q12. Upload supporting documents not answered

Q13. Upload supporting documents not answered

**Respondent No:** 55**Login:** Anonymous**Email:** n/a**Responded At:** Mar 04, 2025 00:10:56 am**Last Seen:** Mar 04, 2025 00:10:56 am**IP Address:** n/a

Q1. What is your name?

Details removed at the request of the submitter

Q2. What is your surname?

Q3. What is your email address?

Q4. What is your address?

Q5. What is your contact number?

Q6. Submissions may be published as part of the consultation process. Do you wish to have your name removed from your submission? Yes

Q7. Are you responding on behalf of an organisation? No

Q8. What is the name of the organisation? not answered

Q9. Do you support/oppose the proposed amendment to the Metropolitan Region Scheme? Oppose

Q10. Please type your submission (reasons for support/opposition) into the box below. Any supporting documents may be uploaded below.

Environmental- impacts to ground water Species of black cocktails use the area daily and would be impacted. Increased traffic flow on Lyon rd which is dangerously busy already with more cars, population using that rd would make it even more dangerous, especially Lyon/rowley intersection.

Q11. Upload supporting documents not answered

Q12. Upload supporting documents not answered

Q13. Upload supporting documents not answered



Respondent No: 56

Login: Anonymous

Email: n/a

Responded At: Mar 04, 2025 02:11:21 am

Last Seen: Mar 04, 2025 02:11:21 am

IP Address: n/a

Q1. What is your name?

Details removed at the request of the submitter

Q2. What is your surname?

Q3. What is your email address?

Q4. What is your address?

Q5. What is your contact number?

Q6. Submissions may be published as part of the consultation process. Do you wish to have your name removed from your submission? Yes

Q7. Are you responding on behalf of an organisation? No

Q8. What is the name of the organisation? not answered

Q9. Do you support/oppose the proposed amendment to the Metropolitan Region Scheme? Oppose

Q10. Please type your submission (reasons for support/opposition) into the box below. Any supporting documents may be uploaded below.

1) The proposal WILL result in the loss of a large area of Black Cockatoo habitat and significant areas of Banksia Woodland Threatened Ecological Community. It is incorrect of the reports to state that impacts 'may' occur, when rezoning the land to urban will allow for clearing to occur (up to 90% of the area to be developed and noting that a 10% Public Open Space requirement does not require the developers of the land to retain native vegetation in situ). Any amendments proposed should consider up front, offset requirements, or provide a thorough assessment of the areas impacted to determine the extent of damage the proposal will cause from the development of areas of native vegetation. 2) Unsuitable infrastructure and services. The WAPC states that it supports the urbanisation of the area as it 'maximises' the use of existing services and infrastructure. However, the existing services and infrastructure are already over capacity and not coping with the level of traffic and residents. The transport network around the area of the proposed rezoning is already under significant pressure and not coping with the current traffic volume. Large volumes of traffic are using Lyon and Rowley Roads, and the roundabout at the intersection during peak periods is often way east of Kinley Road, Banjup and to the west extends over the freeway and towards Aplesey Estate entrance in Mandogalup on the Western side. School children accessing Hammond Park Secondary College are having to negotiate the dangerous roundabout, freeway, constant haulage trucks and traffic on Rowley Road to get to school. Existing local development has not considered traffic and transport issues and these are only getting worse as further development occurs on both sides of the freeway. Further development of the area should not be considered until such time that the existing services and infrastructure is improved to accommodate the extra residents and vehicles. In regard to infrastructure, the Aubin Grove Primary school is also well over capacity and there is little room for more children in the school. The local shopping centres are also not of suitable size to accommodate the extra dwellings and residents this proposal puts forward. The proposal is only going to exacerbate existing issues in relation to traffic and local services. 3) The proposal sets a disturbing precedent for development of the areas within the City of Cockburn and adjoining LGAs for development and urbanisation of Priority 2 PDWSA / Groundwater Protection Areas, which comprise

Banksia woodland Threatened Ecological Community and several populations of Declared Rare Flora, as well as Black Cockatoo habitat. By approving this scheme change and rezoning, what assurance is there for other residents and the local community that other areas of P2 PDWSA won't also be allowed to be developed, noting their environmental significance???

The scheme amendment to allow urbanisation of the P2 PDWSA is not supported. 4) The scheme change does not provide for any areas of Parks and Recreation or Conservation zoning, which should be provided to ensure that areas marked for retention are in fact retained for conservation. Conservation and parks and recreation zones should also be applied to areas that support local ecological linkages, conserve vegetation in very good condition or greater or areas that provide important black cockatoo foraging and roosting habitat, or the identify and retain the Resource Enhancement Wetland areas and their 50m buffers. The zoning of these areas as designated environmental/recreation and parks spaces (not urban) is vital to ensure that future development does not impact these areas. It allows any future development AROUND (not on) these areas to be properly planned and considered, to get the best visual amenity, lifestyle amenity and environmental outcomes possible for the community and local flora and fauna populations. 5) The area subject to the proposal is not 'primarily cleared' as indicated in the supporting documentation prepared by WAPC in relation to SPP2.8. At least half of the area proposed for rezoning comprises remnant or native vegetation of habitat value and including areas of vegetation representative of Floristic Community Types within the protected Banksia Woodland of the Swan Coastal Plain. No rezoning of this land should be considered without thorough environmental survey and assessment, including Detailed Spring Flora and Vegetation surveys and Targeted Orchid surveys. These surveys should be part of the guiding documents that consider and set areas for rezoning. Have these surveys been done? If not, these surveys and assessment MUST be required as part of any local scheme amendment to ensure that any further planning proposals provide this level of assessment and appropriately plan around key environmental attributes. 6) The current zoning proposal does not support the retention of key environmental attributes and the retention of local ecological corridors and areas of the Resource Enhancement Wetlands and the required 50m buffer. The whole area should not be rezoned as whole to 'Urban' or 'Urban Deferred' but rather include the use of 'Conservation' and 'Parks and Recreation' zoning to allow for the early identification and protection of areas with high environmental values, wetland, Declared Rare Flora or significant Black Cockatoo Habitat. 7) The proposed density of housing is not supported. The proposal appears to indicate a future residential lot density of R25/R30. This density of urban development is not supported. The majority of local residents and new residents to the areas do not want blocks of 250-400 square metres. The community want a min. of R17.5 density, which allows for families (which this suburb is known and identified for - being a family friendly area and the 'happy capital' of the Metro area) to grow their family and allow ample backyard space for play and lifestyle. 250 and 400 square meter blocks do not provide for a growing family or allow for a good lifestyle or good outcomes for community mental and physical health, especially when developers are not required to provide sufficient Public Open Space and sufficient areas of activity and passive recreation. Minimum lot sizes of 500 square metres are highly sought after in this area (after all, new developments are 220m², or you have to buy 5 acres - there is nothing offered to families in between) and sell quickly. Ideally, min. 1000m² lots would be amazing for those families who are now relocating to the peri urban areas (Serpentine, for example) to try and obtain the lifestyle and amenity those blocks provide. 8) Further, the proposed sizing of lots does not provide a suitable interface with the existing urban area of the adjoining rural areas which will remain. Larger family sized lots will provide a better interface between the existing suburb and the adjoining rural zones, whilst also allowing for additional vegetation and tree retention in larger lots and improving visual amenity. 9) Noting the environmental significance of the site and the area being within a P2 PDWSA, 1/2 acre (R5) sized properties should be considered most suitable to allow for urbanisation of this area whilst allowing the maximum retention possible of the area's environmental attributes (remnant vegetation across the area, significant tree retention and landscape features), protection of the visual amenity of the area and protection of the Jandakot Mound groundwater area. The scheme change should provide a minimum density requirement that maximises the sites protection, improves and maximises the visual amenity of the area and interface with the rural area whilst also delivering a much sought after product on the local market. Only 2 r5 lots have come on the market locally in recent years. They were under offer within minutes and there are many families (including ours) looking at moving away to get a bigger block for our children. 10) The area of retained vegetation south of the school site has no ecological connection to adjoining areas of remnant vegetation of proposed Public Open Space. The current placement of small sized lots around the vegetation to be retained next to the school provide a poor environmental outcome for the flora and fauna of this reserve. The proposed Concept Plan should be amended to ensure that all areas of remnant vegetation to be retained are connected to either adjoining remnant areas or areas of future Public Open Space. This will reduce the potential for fauna mortality and improve flora outcomes. 11) The proposed 250-400m² lots on the southeastern corner and facing Lyon Road do not provide a suitable interface with the rural area and will provide poor housing outcomes as they area along a heavily used truck route

and will be impacted by noise. Recommend a redesign of the Concept Plan such that residential areas are not fronting on to Rowley Road in any capacity. 12) The current road network cannot cope with the traffic of the area. The proposal does not provide any changes to the road network of Lyon or Rowley Roads, or upgrade to the current intersection roundabout. The proposed Scheme amendment will only exacerbate the traffic issues in this area. 13) any future development under the Local Planning Scheme, Subdivisions or Development approval MUST require a spring flora and fauna survey, targeted orchid survey and black cockatoo habitat assessment as a MINIMUM to be prepared PRIOR TO and submitted with any applications for planning and development to ensure that all important environmental assets are identified PRIOR to planning and design so that they can be accommodated and retained as far as practicable. Applying conditions at subdivision approval stage is TOO LATE!!! The WAPC must ensure that these surveys and assessments are done early so that the relevant stakeholders can start providing more considered development that acknowledges and protects to the maximum extent, environmental assets for our community. This is especially important for this Scheme amendment, noting its obtrusion into the Jandakot Mound Groundwater Protection Area.

Q11. Upload supporting documents

not answered

Q12. Upload supporting documents

not answered

Q13. Upload supporting documents

not answered

**ROWE**
GROUP

Job Ref: 10011
4 March 2025

The Secretary
Western Australian Planning Commission
Locked Bag 2506
PERTH WA 6001
RegionPlanningSchemes@dplh.wa.gov.au

Attention: Region Schemes Team

Dear Sir/Madam

Submission on MRS Amendment No. 1426 – Lyon and Kinley Roads, Banjup

Rowe Group acts on behalf of the owners of Lot 24 (No. 173) Rowley Road and Lot 23 Lyon Road, Banjup (**site**) in relation to the above. The site is located within an area that is subject to Metropolitan Region Scheme (**MRS**) Amendment No. 1426 - Lyon and Kinley Roads, Banjup (**proposed Amendment**).

The proposed Amendment seeks to rezone approximately 57.75ha of land in the Banjup locality (**Amendment Area**) from the 'Rural - Water Protection' Zone to the 'Urban' and 'Urban Deferred' Zones under the MRS. The purpose of the proposed Amendment is to provide for future urban (residential) development. The location of the site in relation to the broader Amendment Area is illustrated on the Amendment Proposal Plan at **Attachment One**.

A Concept Plan has been prepared in support of the proposed Amendment to demonstrate how the Amendment Area *might* be developed should the proposed Amendment be approved. The Concept Plan broadly identifies the location of future zones and land uses, residential densities, road layout, and open space and is based on the findings of 'high level' technical reporting which includes a District Water Management Strategy, Environmental Assessment Report (**EAR**), BAL Assessment, Engineering Report and Traffic Impact Assessment.

The preparation of a Concept Plan at the MRS Amendment stage is not a statutory requirement and is typically only prepared to assist in informing the accompanying 'high level' technical reports which require an indication of potential lot yield, land use mix and road configuration to inform their assessments. Concept Plans prepared at the MRS Amendment stage are refined during subsequent stages of the planning process which include local scheme amendment, local structure planning and subdivision processes.

Level 3
369 Newcastle Street
Northbridge 6003
Western Australia

p: 08 9221 1991
f: 08 9221 1919
info@rowegroup.com.au
rowegroup.com.au



The Concept Plan prepared in relation to the proposed Amendment identifies:

- Lot 24 (No. 173) Rowley Road as accommodating a future commercial centre, surrounded by medium density residential land uses; and
- Lot 23 Lyon Road as being retained for open space/bushland.

The site's designation under the Concept Plan is illustrated in **Attachment Two**.

Should the proposed Amendment be approved, a further amendment to the City of Cockburn Town Planning Scheme No. 3 (**LPS3**) will be required to rezone the Amendment Area from the 'Rural' Zone to the 'Development' Zone. A 'Development' zoning will require the preparation and approval of a Local Structure Plan (**LSP**) to provide a framework for the designation of future land uses, service infrastructure, roads, and open space, and to guide future subdivision and development. During the local structure planning process, the Concept Plan prepared in support of the proposed Amendment will be further refined following the completion of more detailed technical assessment, including targeted environmental surveys. These more detailed assessments may result in changes to the Concept Plan. Any changes will be reflected in a LSP and will undergo a separate and additional review and assessment process.

Our Clients have reviewed the proposed Amendment and are supportive of the proposed 'Urban' and 'Urban Deferred' zoning. However, they are concerned that the Concept Plan, which identifies Lot 23 Lyon Road as being retained for open space/bushland, will be treated as a statutory document from which departure will not be permitted once the local structure planning process commences. Any such approach would fail to acknowledge the scope and purpose of a conceptual plan in the hierarchy of planning documents and would be grossly inconsistent with the principles of orderly and proper planning.

It is acknowledged that Lot 23 Lyon Road contains environmental attributes but it is also acknowledged that these attributes have only been considered at a 'high level' and require more detailed (targeted) consideration to appropriately inform the local structure planning process. Given the site's environmental attributes, our Clients have sought advice from Western Environmental in relation to a range of environmental matters relating to Lot 23 Lyon Road including wetlands, vegetation and flora, and fauna. A copy of Western Environmental's advice is enclosed at **Attachment Three**.

The advice indicates that the 'high level' findings contained within the EAR in relation to the site are generally accurate, except in relation to vegetation type and fauna habitat mapping where some discrepancies may exist which, in turn, could impact the EAR's findings in relation to Black Cockatoo Habitat. On this basis, Western Environmental recommend that additional targeted Black Cockatoo Habitat Assessment is undertaken over the site at the local structure planning stage to determine the presence and accurate extent of breeding, foraging and/or roosting habitat. The findings of a targeted Black Cockatoo Habitat Assessment may indicate that the retention of all vegetation on the site is not warranted and that part of the site may be suitable for urban development.



The Concept Plan seemingly adopts a broad brush 'avoidance' approach to environmental mitigation and doesn't consider other legitimate and appropriate mitigation measures such as revegetation and/or off-sets. This is not unreasonable or unexpected at the MRS Amendment stage however it must be acknowledged that other mitigation options should be explored following more detailed environmental review during subsequent stages of the planning process to ensure an appropriate balance between urban and environmental outcomes. It should not be assumed therefore that Lot 23 Lyon Road has no development potential simply as a consequence of its designation for open space/bushland in a 'concept' plan.

Having regard to the above, we confirm that our Clients:

- **support** the 'Urban' and 'Urban Deferred' zoning proposed via MRS Amendment No. 1426; and
- **conditionally support** the Concept Plan prepared in support of MRS Amendment No. 1426 subject to an acknowledgement that the plan is conceptual in nature, is not statutorily binding and will be refined during subsequent stages of the planning process.

Please note that whilst the closing date for submissions on MRS Amendment No. 1426 was Monday 3 March 2025, an extension of one (1) day was requested by our Office and granted by the Department of Planning, Lands and Heritage (**DPLH**) on the basis that Monday 3 March 2025 was a public holiday. Email communication between our Office and the DPLH confirming the granting of an extension is enclosed at **Attachment Four**.

We trust this submission is of assistance to the DPLH in its consideration of MRS Amendment No. 1426. Should you require any further information or clarification in relation to this submission, please contact David Maiorana on 9221 1991.

Yours faithfully,

David Maiorana

Rowe Group


Encl.

cc: Client



Attachment One

Site Location – MRS Amendment Map



**Lyon and Kinley Roads, Banjup
Proposed complex MRS amendment
as advertised**

29 May 2024


Proposal 1

Proposed Amendment:

-  Rural-Water Protection zone to Urban zone
-  Rural-Water Protection zone to Urban Deferred zone

OTHER
 SITE

Reference no: 4726
File no: RLS/1124
Version number: 1





Attachment Two


Site Location – Concept Plan

KEY

- 250 - 400m² Lots
- 700m² BAL Setback Lots
- Medium Density Lots
- Commercial Lot
- Public Open Space
- Retained Bushland
- Bio-retention Basin
- Paving Indicator
- Roundabout
- Road Centrelines
- Contours

OTHER

- SITE



Subject to:
Earthworks Plan
Site Survey

Lyon & Kinley Concept

Aug 2023





Attachment Three

Western Environmental Advice



Thursday, 27 February 2025

Our Ref: A25.058-LRP-ENVAD_0_FINAL

Rowe Group
David Maiorana
Level 3 369 Newcastle Street
Northbridge WA 6003

(08) 6162 8980
PO Box 437, Leederville, WA 6903
enquiries@westenv.com.au

ATTENTION: David

SUBJECT: LOT 23 LYON ROAD, BANJUP – ENVIRONMENTAL ADVICE ON MRS AMENDMENT 1426

Western Environmental Approvals Pty Ltd (WEPL) presents the following environmental advice in relation to the planned land use of Lot 23 Lyon Road, Banjup (the Site), in the context of Metropolitan Region Scheme (MRS) Amendment No. 1426.

Project Background

MRS Amendment No. 1426 is currently advertised and open for public comment until 3 March 2025. The amendment proposes a rezoning of 57.76 ha (18 lots) from 'Rural-Water Protection zone' to 'Urban' and 'Urban Deferred'.

The majority of the Site is proposed to be zoned 'Urban' (northern portion), with the southern third being proposed to be zoned 'Urban Deferred'.

A draft concept plan was developed by Urban Plan in 2023 to support the MRS Amendment submission. The concept plan shows the Site as a bushland retention area.

WEPL notes that the Environmental Protection Authority (EPA) has considered the application and determined that the proposed amendment as not warranting formal assessment under Part IV of the *Environmental Protection Act 1986* (EP Act). The EPA noted that the provided draft concept plan was of fundamental consideration for the decision outcome based on the proposed avoidance of impacts to environmental values.

WEPL has been engaged to provide advice on the environmental constraints present within the Site and the future development potential.

Scope of Work

The scope of work completed for this report comprised a desktop investigation using publicly available data and aerial photography, as well as a review of previously prepared documentation. This included:

- Determination of potential environmental constraints present within the Site. Only constraints that are present will be included in the assessment table.

- Identification of any ecologically valuable flora and vegetation such as Environmentally Sensitive Areas, Threatened Ecological Communities (TECs) or Threatened and Priority Flora.
- A review of the following previously prepared reports and documentation:
 - Coterra Environment. (2023). *Environmental Assessment Report. Various Lots, Lyon and Kinley Roads, Banjup*. Report prepared for QUBE Property. (referred to as EAR)
 - Anders Environmental Consulting (Anders). (2023). *Flora and Vegetation Survey. Lyon and Kinley Road Precinct Aubin Grove*. Report prepared for Coterra Environment.
 - Bamford Consulting Ecologists (Bamford). (2023). *Aubin Grove Fauna Assessment Report*. prepared for Coterra Environment.
 - City of Cockburn. (2024). *Metropolitan Region Scheme Amendment 1426 (Complex Amendment), Lyon and Kinley Roads, Banjup. Amendment Report* (including the attached Draft Concept Plan prepared by Urban Plan [2023]).
- Advice on the likely developable area of the Site and potential approval requirements.

Audit Assessment

Findings from the review of publicly available data, the EAR (Coterra, 2023) and the draft Concept Plan (Urban Plan, 2023) are provided in Table 1. Advice regarding the future development potential of Site, potentially required environmental approvals and pathways are provided in the following section Advice on Development Potential of the Site.

Table 1: Summary of Desktop Environmental Assessment

Issue	Results from EAR (Coterra, 2023)	WEPL Audit Outcome
Flora and Vegetation		
Historical Clearing	<p>The Site is not specifically mentioned within the report. Only Lot 30 Lyon Road, Banjup was identified as not having been completely cleared for development.</p>	<p>Vegetation within the Site (Lot 23) has largely been retained. No visible clearing is observed other than provisional access tracks and a small portion in the most south-western corner of the Site. The majority of native vegetation has remained intact.</p>
Vegetation Types	<p>The surevy undertaken by Coterra identified the following vegetation types within the Site:</p> <p>VT1 – Banksia woodland (BmMtDb) <i>Banksia attenuata</i>, <i>B. menziesii</i> and <i>B. ilicifolia</i> low open woodland over <i>Adenanthos cygnorum</i>, <i>Melaleuca thymoides</i> and <i>Xanthorrhoea preissii</i> tall open shrubland over <i>Calytrix flavescens</i>, <i>Dasypogon bromeliifolius</i> and <i>Leptospermum erubescens</i> low open shrubland.</p> <p>VT2 – Kunzea shrubland (BKgDb) <i>Banksia littoralis</i>, <i>B. menziesii</i> and <i>B. ilicifolia</i> low open woodland over <i>Adenanthos cygnorum</i> and <i>Kunzea glabrescens</i> and <i>Melaleuca lateritia</i> tall closed shrubland over <i>Acacia huegelii</i> and <i>Dasypogon bromeliifolius</i> low open shrubland.</p> <p>The Site was mapped as VT1 comrpiding the majority of the Site (approximately 3.15 ha) with a pocket of VT2 located in the south-eastern corner (approximately 0.34 ha).</p>	<p>Assessment of Google Street View and aerial photography indicates that the mapping presented in the Coterra (2023) report is accurate.</p> <p>WEPL notes that slight inaccuracies in vegetation mapping can occur due to transition zones between vegetation types, where species from both units may start to overlap and boundaries may not be fully clear.</p> <p>Screenshots of assessment from Google Streetview are provided in Appendix A.</p>

Issue	Results from EAR (Coterra, 2023)	WEPL Audit Outcome
	The fringes of the Site along the site boundaries were assessed as 'Disturbed urban area'.	
Vegetation Condition	VT1 and VT2 within the Site were assessed as being in 'Good' condition in accordance with the Keighery (1994) vegetation condition scale. The rest of the Site associated with margin areas along the site boundaries were assessed as 'Completely Degraded'.	Based on assessment of aerial imagery and given the limited historical disturbance of the Site the assessment is considered accurate.
Threatened and Priority Ecological Communities	<p>A multivariate statistical analysis of all quadrat data was undertaken to determine the presence of Threatened and Priority Ecological Communities (TECs/PECs).</p> <p>Quadrat data collected within the Site from VT1 aligned with SCP21c - <i>Low lying Banksia attenuata woodlands or shrublands</i>, which is listed as Priority 3 by DBCA.</p>	<p>The methodology described in Coterra (2023) and Anders (2023) is in alignment with EPA (2016) <i>Technical Guidance – Flora and Vegetation Surveys for Environmental Impact Assessment</i>. The assessment is considered accurate.</p> <p>VT1 is considered to be Low lying Banksia attenuata woodlands or shrublands – listed as Priority 3 by DBCA. The ecological community is further a component of the Commonwealth listed Threatened Ecological Community (TEC) Banksia Woodland of the Swan Coastal Plain – listed as Endangered under the EPBC Act.</p> <p>WEPL has assessed the extent of the TEC within the Site as approximately 3.15 ha.</p>
Flora	There were no conservation significant flora species recorded within the Site.	<p>The survey method is considered to be consistent with EPA guidance for Targeted flora searches as described in EPA (2016) <i>Technical Guidance – Flora and Vegetation Surveys for Environmental Impact Assessment</i>. WEPL considers the assessment as accurate.</p>

Issue	Results from EAR (Coterra, 2023)	WEPL Audit Outcome
Wetlands	<p>Anders (2023) identified VT2 – Kunzea shrubland as representing wetlands occurring in the lower lying areas of the MRS Amendment area.</p> <p>The wetlands is currently unclassified. The wetlands are mapped as VT2 and represent sumplands similar to wetlands surrounding the survey area (i.e., Mandogalup Swamp). The wetlands vegetation has been assessed to be in ‘Good’ condition.</p> <p>The wetlands were determined to meet the classification of a resource enhancement wetland, as they have been partially modified due to clearing and weed cover, however they still contain substantial wetland attributes and functions.</p>	<p>From an assessment of the aerial imagery WEPL agrees that the vegetation structure and composition suggest the present of a wetland in the area of VT2 within the Site. No surface water features appear to be present within the Site.</p> <p>No statement about the appropriate management classification can be made based on the data available. However, given the small extent of the wetland, species list of VT2 vegetation and location in the south-eastern corner, immediately adjacent to a portion of cleared land indicates that the Resource Enhancement classification suggested by Anders (2023) may be appropriate.</p>
Fauna		
Black Cockatoo Habitat	<p>Carnaby’s black cockatoo (<i>Zanda latirostris</i>) and Forest red-tailed black cockatoo (<i>Calyptorhynchus banksii naso</i>) have been identified as regular visitors to the MRS Amendment area, including the Site.</p> <p>Carnaby’s <u>Breeding Habitat</u></p> <p>The following breeding habitat has been identified within the Site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Three Class 4 trees (hollows of insufficient size visible) have been recorded within the Site. • One Class 3 tree (potentially suitable hollow visible) has been recorded within the Site. 	<p>Assessments undertaken are in alignment with EPA (2020) <i>Technical Guidance - Terrestrial vertebrate fauna surveys for environmental impact assessment</i>.</p> <p>WEPL considered the assessment of black cockatoo breeding and roosting habitat as accurate.</p> <p>WEPL has found discrepancies between the vegetation type mapping by Anders (2023) and the vegetation substrate association (fauna habitat) mapping by Bamford (2023).</p> <p>Given that there were two different vegetation types assessed to be present within the Site with one of them being Kunza shrubland, representing a wetland vegetation type, there is a potential that</p>

Issue	Results from EAR (Coterra, 2023)	WEPL Audit Outcome
	<p><u>Foraging Habitat</u></p> <p>The EAR identifies the entirety of vegetation present within the Site as fauna habitat type VSA1 – Closed Banksia Woodland (approximately 3.49 ha).</p> <p>This habitat type has been assessed to provide high foraging value (score of 8/10) for Carnaby’s black cockatoo.</p> <p><u>Roosting Habitat</u></p> <p>There is a potential for the Site to be utilised for roosting opportunity by black cockatoo.</p> <p>There is an abundance of large, tall, introduced and native trees throughout the Site in all VSAs. These trees provide suitable roosting opportunities for black cockatoos due to several factors: the abundance and height of the trees, the location of the project area within 500 m of a known roost area, the presence of artificial water sources such as animal troughs throughout the paddocks, and the close proximity to a large lake (the presence of a nearby water source is an important feature for a black-cockatoo roost locations)</p>	<p>the south-eastern portion of the Site does not classify as Closed Banksia Woodland.</p> <p>VT2 is dominated by <i>Kunzea glabrescens</i>, which does not constitute a foraging species for black cockatoo. Certain areas in the east and north of the MRS Amendment area that have been assessed as VT2 by Anders (2023), were assessed as Melaleuca woodland (VSA3) providing low foraging value (score 2) by Bamford (2023). Fringing areas of VT2 were assessed as Closed or Open Banksia Woodland (VSA1 and VSA2) by Bamford (2023). This could be due to transition zones between vegetation units, where <i>Banksia</i> species start to become present and progressively increase in numbers.</p> <p>While the VT2 may overall be assessed as ‘Closed’ due to high vegetation cover, there is a chance that the density of foraging species, in particular <i>Banksia</i> sp., is lower than in VT1. Therefore, VT2 is likely to provide lower value foraging habitat than VT1.</p> <p>It is therefore recommended that an additional Targeted Black Cockatoo Habitat Assessment is undertaken over the Site at the local structure planning stage to determine the presence and accurate extent of breeding, foraging and/or roosting habitat within the Site.</p>
Other Potential Constraints		
<p>Public Drinking Water Source Areas & Wellhead Protection Zone</p>	<p>The EAR identifies a Wellhead Protection Zone (WHPZ) located over the Site.</p> <p>The MRS Amendment area is located within a Priority 2 (P2) Public Drinking Water Source Area (PDWSA). For the purpose of the proposed</p>	<p>In accordance with Water Quality Protection Note (WQPN) 25 the land uses in WHPZs should be guided by the underlying priority area (DWER, 2021). However, within WHPZ best management practices for the planned land use should be applied (DWER, 2021).</p>

Issue	Results from EAR (Coterra, 2023)	WEPL Audit Outcome
	MRS Amendment the EAR assumes that the area will be reclassified from P2 to P3* as part of the MRS Amendment process.	

Advice on Development Potential of the Site

Given that MRS Amendment No. 1426 proposes the underlying zoning of the Site to be 'Urban' and 'Urban Deferred', the Amendment provides a general planning framework for future development and therefore potential clearing of the Site.

Potential for EPA Assessment

It is noted that the EPA's rationale for the decision not to assess the proposed MRS Amendment was significantly based on the submitted draft Concept Plan (Urban Plan, 2023), which identifies the Site as a vegetation retention area.

The EAR further identifies 3.49 ha of high value foraging habitat for Carnaby's black cockatoo as present within the Site. Carnaby's black cockatoo are listed as Endangered under the EP Act. The EPA has previously made strong comments around the significance of any impact to black cockatoo habitat.

Assumptions and Exclusions

This report was prepared based on desktop investigations only. No further site assessment was undertaken.

Advice regarding offsets have been based on estimations only and are therefore indicative in nature. No exact quantification can be provided at this stage. Further biological surveys would be required during future planning processes.

Conclusions and Recommendations

WEPL has found that the representation of the Site within the Coterra (2023) EAR overall accurate.

WEPL however found discrepancies between the vegetation type and fauna habitat mapping. There is a potential that the extent of high value Carnaby's black cockatoo foraging habitat within the Site has been exaggerated. WEPL recommends that an additional Targeted Black Cockatoo Habitat Assessment is undertaken over the Site to assess whether development should be pursued.

If development of the Site is to be pursued, the following environmental issues/constraints will need to be considered at subsequent stages of the planning process (i.e. local scheme amendment, local structure planning and subdivision processes):

- The loss of up to 3.5 ha of Banksia Woodland TEC and up to 3.5 ha of black cockatoo habitat will require formal referral under the EPBC Act.
- High likelihood for formal assessment under the EPBC Act, including requirements for offsets.
- Further ecological surveys will be potentially required, including a Targeted Black Cockatoo Habitat Assessment.
- Potential for further environmental approvals to be required in relation to WHPZ and NVCP.



This report should be read in conjunction with the Schedule - Statement of Limitations. Should you have any queries regarding the above, please contact the undersigned on (08) 6162 8980.

Yours sincerely,
Western Environmental Approvals Pty Ltd



Dale Newsome
Director

Schedule

- Statement of Limitation

Appendices

- Appendix A: Screenshots from Google Street View Assessment



Statement of Limitations

Copyright Statement

© Western Environmental Approvals Pty Ltd (WEPL). All rights reserved. No part of this work may be produced in any material form or communicated by any means without the permission of the copyright owner. The unauthorised copying or reproduction of this report or any of its contents is prohibited.

Scope of Services

This environmental report (“this report”) has been prepared for the sole benefit and exclusive use of the Client for the purpose for which it was prepared in accordance with the agreement between the Client and WEPL (“the Agreement”). However, in addressing the requirements of the Contaminated Sites Act 2003, an Accredited Contaminated Sites Auditor may be engaged by the Client to undertake review of this report, prior to its submission to the DWER. The report shall be made available and can be relied upon for the purposes of the Contaminated Sites Act.

WEPL disclaims any and all liability with respect to any use of or reliance upon this report for any other purpose whatsoever.

In particular, it should be noted that this report is based on a scope of services defined by the Client, and is limited by budgetary and time constraints, the information supplied by the Client (and its agents) and, in some circumstances, access and/or site disturbance constraints.

The scope of services did not include any assessment of the title to or ownership of the properties, buildings and structures referred to in this report, or the application or interpretation of laws in the jurisdiction in which those properties, buildings and structures are located.

Reliance on Data

In preparing this report, WEPL has relied on data, surveys, analyses, designs, plans and other information provided by the Client (or its agents), other individuals and organisations (“the data”).

Except as otherwise stated in this report, WEPL has not verified the accuracy or completeness of the data. WEPL does not represent or warrant that the data is true or accurate, and disclaims any and all responsibility or liability with respect to the use of the data.

To the extent that the statements, opinions, facts, information, conclusions and/or recommendations in this report (“conclusions”) are based in whole or part on the data, those conclusions are contingent upon the accuracy and completeness of the data.



WEPL does not accept any responsibility or liability for any incorrect or inaccurate conclusions should any data be incorrect, inaccurate or incomplete or have been concealed, withheld, misrepresented or otherwise not fully disclosed to WEPL.

The conclusions must also be considered in light of the agreed scope of services (including any constraints or limitation therein) and the methods used to carry out those services, both of which are as stated or referred to in this report.

Environmental Conclusions

In accordance with the scope of services, WEPL has conducted environmental field monitoring and/or testing in the preparation of this report. The nature and extent of monitoring and/or testing conducted is described in this report.

On all sites, varying degrees of non-uniformity of vertical and horizontal conditions in media (soil, water, air, waste or other media as described in the report) are encountered. Hence no monitoring, common testing or sampling technique can eliminate the possibility that monitoring or testing results/samples are not totally representative of media conditions encountered. The conclusions are based on the data and the environmental field monitoring and/or testing actually undertaken, and are therefore merely indicative of the environmental condition of the site at the time of preparing this report, including the presence or otherwise of contaminants or emissions. It should be recognised that site conditions, including the extent and concentration of contaminants, can change.

Within the limitations imposed by the scope of services, the monitoring, testing, sampling and preparation of this report have been undertaken and performed in a professional manner, in accordance with generally accepted practices and using a degree of skill and care ordinarily exercised by reputable environmental consultants under similar circumstances. To the maximum extent permitted by law, no other warranty, express or implied, is made.

Report for Benefit of Client

This report is confidential. Neither the whole nor any part of this report, or any copy or extract thereof, may be disclosed or otherwise made available to any third party without the prior written approval of WEPL.

WEPL accepts no liability or responsibility whatsoever in respect of any use of or reliance upon this report, by any person or organisation who is not a party to the Agreement. Reliance on this report by any person who is not a party to the Agreement is expressly prohibited. Any representation in this report is made only to the parties to the Agreement.

WEPL assumes no responsibility and disclaims any and all liability to any other person or organisation for or in relation to any matter dealt with or conclusions expressed in this report, or for any loss or damage suffered by any other person or organisation arising from matters dealt with or conclusions expressed in this report (including without limitation matters arising from any negligent act or omission of WEPL or for any loss or damage suffered by any other party using or relying on the matters dealt with or conclusions expressed in this report, even if WEPL has been advised of the possibility of such use or reliance).

Other parties should not rely on this report or the accuracy or completeness of any conclusions contained in this report, and should make their own enquiries and obtain independent advice in relation to such matters.

If an Auditor is engaged by the Client to undertake review of this report, it shall be made available subject to the terms and conditions of the agreement between the Client and WEPL and the caveats in this statement.

Other Limitations

This report is intended to be read in its entirety, and sections or parts of this report should therefore not be read and relied on out of context.

WEPL will not be liable to update or revise this report to take into account any events or circumstances or facts becoming apparent after the date of this report.



References

Anders Environmental Consulting (Anders). (2023). Flora and Vegetation Survey. Lyon and Kinley Road Precinct Aubin Grove. Report prepared for Coterra Environment.

Bamford Consulting Ecologists (Bamford). (2023). Aubin Grove Fauna Assessment. Report prepared for Coterra Environment.

City of Cockburn. (2024). Metropolitan Region Scheme Amendment 1426 (Complex Amendment), Lyon and Kinley Roads, Banjup. Amendment Report.

Coterra Environment. (2023). Environmental Assessment Report. Various Lots, Lyon and Kinley Roads, Banjup. Report prepared for QUBE Property. (referred to as EAR)

Department for Water and Environmental Regulations (DWER). (2021). Water Quality Protection Note (WQPN) 25: Land use compatibility tables for public drinking water source areas. Retrieved on 26 February 2025 from <https://www.wa.gov.au/system/files/2022-04/Land-use-compatibility-tables-for-public-drinking-water-source-areas.pdf>.



APPENDIX A – Screenshots from Google Street View Assessment



Plate 1: Lyon Road, NW corner of the Site – Banksia Woodland visible



Plate 2: View from Lyon Road, centre west – Banksia Woodland





Plate 3: View from Rowley Road, south-western corner of the Site – VT1 with Eucalypts, Banksia visible



Plate 4: View from Rowley Road, centre south – Kunzea shrubland with some Banksia present, potentially transition zone





Plate 5: View from Rowley Road, south-eastern corner of the Site – Kunzea shrubland with Kunzea dominating





Attachment Four

Email Communication regarding Extension of Time

Claire Richards

From: Region Planning Schemes <regionplanningschemes@dplh.wa.gov.au>
Sent: Monday, 24 February 2025 1:25 PM
To: Claire Richards
Cc: Zoë Chalwell-James
Subject: RE: Metropolitan Region Scheme Amendment 1426 (Complex) - Lyon and Kinley Roads, Banjup - Advertising Dates (10011) [Filed 24 Feb 2025 13:29]
Categories: Filed by Mail Manager

OFFICIAL

Hi Claire,

To confirm close of advertising is still the 3 March 2025 as advertised but if you wish to submit a submission the day after this will not be an issue.

Kind regards

Marija Bubanic
Senior Planning Support Officer | Land Use Planning
Department of Planning, Lands and Heritage
140 William Street, Perth WA 6000
W: wa.gov.au/dplh | P: 6551 9427



The Department of Planning, Lands and Heritage acknowledges Aboriginal people as the traditional custodians of Western Australia. We pay our respects to the Ancestors and Elders, both past and present, and the ongoing connection between people, land, water, and community. We acknowledge those who continue to share knowledge, their traditions and culture to support our journey for reconciliation. In particular, we recognise land and cultural heritage as places that hold great significance for Aboriginal people. Learn more about our [Reconciliation Action Plan](#).

Disclaimer: this email and any attachments are confidential and may be legally privileged. If you are not the intended recipient, any use, disclosure, distribution or copying of this material is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender immediately by replying to this email, then delete both emails from your system.

From: Claire Richards <Claire.Richards@rowegroup.com.au>
Sent: Monday, 24 February 2025 1:06 PM
To: Region Planning Schemes <regionplanningschemes@dplh.wa.gov.au>
Cc: Zoë Chalwell-James <Zoe.Chalwell@dplh.wa.gov.au>
Subject: RE: Metropolitan Region Scheme Amendment 1426 (Complex) - Lyon and Kinley Roads, Banjup - Advertising Dates (10011)

OFFICIAL

Thanks Marija

Just to be clear, are you advising that the close of advertising is COB Tuesday 4 March 2025? If you could please confirm by return email, that would be appreciated.

Regards,

Claire Richards
Principal Town Planner

Please note, I am not in the office on Fridays.



ROWE
GROUP

T: 08 9221 1991
M: 0423 590 090
E: Claire.Richards@rowegroup.com.au
W: www.rowegroup.com.au
Level 3 369 Newcastle Street, Northbridge WA 6003



Celebrating 10,000 Jobs at Rowe Group

This email and any attachments transmitted with it are intended only for the use by the named addressee. This email is confidential and may contain privileged information. If you receive this email in error, please notify our Office immediately by return email or telephone on 08 9221 1991 and immediately delete it from your system. You must not distribute, copy or use any part of this email if you are not the intended recipient. Rowe Group is not responsible for any unauthorised alterations to this email or attachment to it. This email has been scanned for computer viruses prior to sending. Any recipient should check this email and any attachments for viruses prior to opening. Rowe Group does not accept any loss or damage that is the result of a computer virus or a defect in the transmission of this email or any attachment.

From: Region Planning Schemes <regionplanningschemes@dplh.wa.gov.au>

Sent: Monday, 24 February 2025 12:29 PM

To: Claire Richards <Claire.Richards@rowegroup.com.au>

Cc: Region Planning Schemes <regionplanningschemes@dplh.wa.gov.au>; Zoë Chalwell-James <Zoe.Chalwell@dplh.wa.gov.au>

Subject: RE: Metropolitan Region Scheme Amendment 1426 (Complex) - Lyon and Kinley Roads, Banjup - Advertising Dates (10011)

OFFICIAL

Dear Claire,

Thankyou for your email, please note an additional day of receiving your submission is not an issue and will be counted. Please note you will not be able to submit online after the 3 March instead your submission will need to be sent directly via email to RegionPlanningSchemes@dplh.wa.gov.au .

Please reach out if you have any issues submitting.

Kind regards

Marija Bubanic

Senior Planning Support Officer | Land Use Planning

Department of Planning, Lands and Heritage

140 William Street, Perth WA 6000

W: wa.gov.au/dplh | P: 6551 9427



The Department of Planning, Lands and Heritage acknowledges Aboriginal people as the traditional custodians of Western Australia. We pay our respects to the Ancestors and Elders, both past and present, and the ongoing connection between people, land, water and community. We acknowledge those who continue to share knowledge, their traditions and culture to support our journey for reconciliation. In particular, we recognise land and cultural heritage as places that hold great significance for Aboriginal people. Learn more about our [Reconciliation Action Plan](#).

Disclaimer: this email and any attachments are confidential and may be legally privileged. If you are not the intended recipient, any use, disclosure, distribution or copying of this material is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender immediately by replying to this email, then delete both emails from your system.

From: Claire Richards <Claire.Richards@rowegroup.com.au>
Sent: Monday, 24 February 2025 11:41 AM
To: Region Planning Schemes <regionplanningschemes@dplh.wa.gov.au>
Subject: Metropolitan Region Scheme Amendment 1426 (Complex) - Lyon and Kinley Roads, Banjup - Advertising Dates (10011)

Good morning

We note that advertising of the above MRS Amendment is scheduled to conclude on Monday 3 March 2025 which is a public holiday. Could you please confirm whether an additional day of advertising will be permitted?

Regards,

Claire Richards
Principal Town Planner
Please note, I am not in the office on Fridays.



ROWE
GROUP

T: [08 9221 1991](tel:0892211991)
M: [0423 590 090](tel:0423590090)
E: Claire.Richards@rowegroup.com.au
W: www.rowegroup.com.au
Level 3 369 Newcastle Street, Northbridge WA 6003



Celebrating 10,000 Jobs at Rowe Group

This email and any attachments transmitted with it are intended only for the use by the named addressee. This email is confidential and may contain privileged information. If you receive this email in error, please notify our Office immediately by return email or telephone on 08 9221 1991 and immediately delete it from your system. You must not distribute, copy or use any part of this email if you are not the intended recipient. Rowe Group is not responsible for any unauthorised alterations to this email or attachment to it. This email has been scanned for computer viruses prior to sending. Any recipient should check this email and any attachments for viruses prior to opening. Rowe Group does not accept any loss or damage that is the result of a computer virus or a defect in the transmission of this email or any attachment.

This email and any attachments to it are also subject to copyright and any unauthorised reproduction, adaptation or transmission is prohibited.

There is no warranty that this email is error or virus free.



Department of
**Primary Industries and
Regional Development**

Your reference: RLS/1124
Our reference: LUP 2058
Enquiries: Louise Murray

Zoë Chalwell-James, Planning Administration Coordinator
Department of Planning, Lands and Heritage
Bunbury Tower, Level 6, 61 Victoria Street, Bunbury WA 6230

Email: regionplanningschemes@dplh.wa.gov.au

Date: 28 February 2025

Dear Sir/Madam

**PROPOSED METROPOLITAN REGION SCHEME AMENDMENT 1426 (COMPLEX) -
LYON AND KINLEY ROADS, BANJUP - RLS/1124**

Thank you for inviting the Department of Primary Industries and Regional Development (DPIRD) to comment on the above proposal. DPIRD notes from the information provided that:

- The proposed amendment is intended to facilitate future residential development of the land.
- The proposal is inconsistent with Western Australian Planning Commission (WAPC) strategic plans for the area (Perth and [Peel@3.5Million](#) and the South Metropolitan Peel Sub-Regional Planning Framework).
- The proposal is inconsistent with State Planning Policy (SPP) 2.3 Jandakot Groundwater Protection Policy and draft SPP 2.9 Water Resources.
- The site is wholly located in the Peel-Harvey Coastal Plain Catchment and subject to SPP 2.1 The Peel-Harvey Coastal Plain Catchment, which is aimed at preventing environmental damage to the Peel Harvey estuary.

DPIRDs advice includes some technical comments, which are intended to prove the importance and relevance of SPP 2.1, and a position, which includes comments on the timing of approvals.

Technical considerations

DPIRD degradation hazard mapping shows the phosphorus export hazard rating across the site is high to extreme. (**Attachment 1**)

Phosphorus export hazard refers to the likelihood that phosphorus (P), usually applied as fertiliser, moves from a given land unit to where it can contribute to eutrophication of surface water.

Phosphorus movement through the landscape is influenced by several factors, including soil and landform, catchment size, drainage density and/or proximity to drains, rainfall/run-off, climate, and the presence or absence of vegetation.

Dominant factors in most situations include total water flow, time of travel and catchment size, hence water movement factors influence P export because when water moves rapidly contact time between soil particles and P is insufficient for sorption.¹

These factors stress the need for well-designed drainage, which is also emphasised in the general policy provisions of SPP 2.1.

DPIRD position

DPIRD does not object to the proposed change of use from 'Rural – Water Protection' to 'Urban', but considers that rezoning to Urban should be deferred until such time as a structure plan has been prepared, which addresses the outstanding policy and information requirements. E.g. how the risks of nutrient export will be addressed, how groundwater will be protected, and how much vegetation clearing is likely to occur.

Deferring the rezoning until a structure plan has been prepared will also address the comments by the Environmental Protection Authority (EPA), which note that the future structure plan will need to be consistent with the draft concept plan (**Attachment 2**) to avoid the requirement for re-referral.

Alternatively, DPIRD would support rezoning of the entire site to 'Urban Deferred', to allow time for the additional planning and technical studies to occur.

For more information, please contact Louise Murray on 0447 324 023 or louise.murray@dpiird.wa.gov.au.

Yours sincerely



Mr Timothy Overheu
**Acting Director Agriculture Resource Management Assessment
Sustainability and Biosecurity**


Attachment 1: DPIRD Soil-Landscape Mapping showing phosphorus export hazard
Attachment 2: Concept Plan (Source: Urban Plan 2023) assessed by EPA

¹ van Gool, D, Tille, P J, and Moore, G A. (2005), Land evaluation standards for land resource mapping : assessing land qualities and determining land capability in south-western Australia. Department of Primary Industries and Regional Development, Western Australia, Perth. Report 298.

Attachment 1: DPIRD Soil-Landscape Mapping showing phosphorus export hazard




DPIRD Soil-Landscape Mapping showing percentage of map unit with 'High' to 'Extreme' Phosphorus Export Hazard



27/02/2025, 2:12:30 pm

- Property_and_Planning - State Planning Policy 2.1 Peel-Harvey Coastal Plain Catchment (DPLH-049)
- MRS AMD 1426 site
- Land Qualities - Phosphorus Export Hazard
- <3% of map unit has a high to extreme hazard
- 3-10% of map unit has a high to extreme hazard
- 10-30% of map unit has a high to extreme hazard
- 50-70% of map unit has a high to extreme hazard
- >70% of map unit has a high to extreme hazard



Attachment 2: Concept Plan (Source: Urban Plan 2023) assessed by EPA




Figure 1: Concept Plan (Source: Urban Plan 2023)



6 March 2025

Department of Planning, Lands and Heritage
Level 5, 140 William Street
PERTH WA 6000

ATTENTION: Anthony Muscara

Dear Anthony

RE: Submission on MRS Amendment 1426 (Complex) – Lyon and Kinley Roads, Banjup

The key purpose of this submission is to ask that the WAPC put forward a recommendation to the Minister for Planning that a Section 126 amendment be supported, concurrently zoning the Amendment 1426 area 'Development' in the City of Cockburn Local Planning Scheme No. 3 (LPS3). This will allow the development of the amendment area to progress directly to structure planning, thereby removing an unnecessary local scheme amendment process that would simply add 12 months to the delivery of much-needed housing in the Perth metropolitan area.

This request follows the advice received from the EPA Chair that the environmental values of the amendment area can be protected at structure planning and subdivision stages.

Background

Amendment 1426 comprises 17 individual residential lifestyle lots, measuring approximately 56ha, currently zoned 'Rural – Water Protection' and 'Resource' zones in the MRS and City's LPS3 respectively.

This submission does not look to reiterate all the arguments in favour of Amendment 1426, but it should be noted that the site is extremely well situated, presenting itself as a logical extension of Aubin Grove with the Aubin Grove Primary School abutting the northern edge with roads and services easily connected to the broader network. Located only 6km south of Cockburn Central and train station, 2km south of the Aubin Grove train station and the Kwinana Freeway a mere 300m to the west, Amendment 1426 is genuinely seeing the 'rounding off' of undeveloped land, making it highly suitable for urban development.

This suitability for urban development was acknowledged by the WAPC, with Amendment 1426 initiated for an 'Urban' zoning at its meeting on 29 May 2024.

EPA Assessment

Following initiation by the WAPC, Amendment 1426 was subsequently referred to the EPA with the EPA Chair determining that Amendment 1426 did not require assessment under the *Environmental Protection Act 1986* (decision dated 31 October 2024), instead offering advice that all environmental values of the amendment area could be protected at structure planning and subdivision stages.

Critically, there was no part of the EPA Chair's advice that suggested the need for any local planning scheme provisions meaning that we believe there is strong merit in a Section 126 amendment to LPS3, recognising that the land is suitable for urban development.

In considering our request for a Section 126 amendment, we would strongly encourage that the WAPC seek confirmation from the EPA Chair that local scheme provisions are unnecessary and that the environmental values of the amendment area can and should be addressed as part of structure planning and subdivision as these are the most appropriate instruments given their spatial nature.

Section 126 Amendment

As set out above, the primary purpose of this submission is to request the WAPC support a Section 126 amendment, concurrently zoning the amendment area 'Development' in the City of Cockburn LPS3. This will facilitate the timelier structure planning of the land. No textual changes are required to LPS3, meaning the Section 126 pathway can be introduced.

To clarify, the Section 126 amendment will comprise amending the LPS3 map to show the subject land as 'Development' zone.

Clause 3.2.1(j) of LPS3 sets out that the purpose of a 'Development' zone is:

To provide for future residential, industrial or commercial development to be guided by a comprehensive Structure Plan prepared under the Scheme.

LPS3, by way of Note 3 of Table 1 (Zoning Table) reads:

Development and use of land is to be guided by an approved Structure Plan prepared and adopted under clause 22 of the Deemed Provisions.

This is a critical link between LPS3 and the Deemed Provisions because LPS3 submits the approval process of a structure plan to the Deemed Provisions with LPS3 only mandating the need for an approved structure plan prior to development.

In our opinion, this is where any local scheme amendment can and should end, meaning only the LPS3 map needs to be amended, allowing for a Section 126 concurrent amendment.

Special Control Areas

Historically, it has been the adopted practice within LPS3 to create a corresponding Special Control Area for every 'Development' zone, but we wish to make it clear this practice does not need to occur. This practice was seemingly undertaken to cement certain requirements within LPS3 (to be done at a subsequent planning phase) but we would suggest that this practice pre-dates the Deemed Provisions which now establishes all requirements.

To summarise, it appears to have been common practice to show a corresponding Special Control Area (Development Area) on the LPS3 map for every 'Development' zone, with Clause 5.1 of LPS3 then stating that the Development Area *needs to be shown on the Scheme map as a DA number and included in Table 9*. A review of Table 9 shows that most of the Development Areas read along the lines of *an approved structure plan, together with all approved amendments, shall be given due regard in the assessment of subdivision, land use and development in accordance with Clause 27(1) of the Deemed Provisions*.

If this approach is taken, a Section 126 amendment is not possible because of the necessary text changes to Table 9 but in our opinion, this is the superfluous layering of scheme provisions and a Special Control Area is not required because it's simply reiterating what LPS3 already mandates (as discussed above) – and redundancies in this approach become more apparent when you consider Clause 27(1) of the Deemed Provisions reads:

A decision-maker for an application for development approval or subdivision approval in an area that is covered by a structure plan that has been approved by the Commission is to have due regard to, but is not bound by, the structure plan when deciding the application.

The reason we set this all out is to highlight that with the Deemed Provisions coming into effect in 2015, this practice of creating a Special Control Area (Development Area) for no other purpose other than to stipulate the need for a structure plan (which the underlying zone already mandates) is outdated, redundant and only results in an unnecessary local scheme amendment process which comes with a significant time delay.

Land Use Control

There is merit in setting out future land use control for the amendment area, particularly in context of the Jandakot groundwater resource, once again demonstrating that a Special Control Area is unnecessary as this is adequately controlled by subsequent structure planning.

The site is currently zoned 'Resource' which is for the *protection of the Perth Metropolitan underground water resource*, with Note 1 of Table 1 (Zoning Table) in LPS3 currently deferring to Clause 4.10.11 for land use. Clause 4.10.11 then sets out criteria for assessing land use within a 'Resource' zone but essentially it refers to the *relevant State Planning Policy for water*, which has been taken as being the Department of Water and Regulation (DWER) 'Water Quality Protection Note 25: Land use compatibility tables for public drinking water source areas'; however, once land is zoned 'Development' then an approved structure plan controls land use, as outlined above.

As part of the MRS Amendment Request, draft State Planning Policy 2.9: Planning for Water (SPP2.9) was accepted as being the authoritative policy, notwithstanding that its status remains 'draft'. Both the District Water Management Strategy and Public Drinking Water Risk Assessment (Pentium Water) which underpinned Amendment 1426 were prepared referencing draft SPP2.9 meaning the water management and monitoring framework has been benchmarked using the most contemporary practices available which will now guide the subsequent Local Water Management Strategy and Urban Water Management Plan(s).

While it is acknowledged that draft SPP2.9 recommends that for Priority 3 and Priority 3* areas, that a *Special Control Area (or equivalent) be established in the local planning scheme*, the 'or equivalent' is important as a Special Control Area does not need to be established solely for this purpose. SPP2.9 also states that in the priority areas, structure plans (and in some cases subdivisions) must be referred to DWER for its advice prior to their approval. This immediately ensures that DWER will be a key stakeholder in these following planning phases. This is further reinforced by clause 16 of the Deemed Provisions which lists what information must be set out in a structure plan, including aspect relating to the natural environment. The WAPC's 'Manual Guidance for Structure Plans' elaborates again, listing Environmental Assessment and Management Strategies and a Local Water Management Strategies as technical work to be undertaken, to guide and support structure planning.

In short, with the Deemed Provisions now operative and having statutory weight through their automatic application via all local planning schemes, and SPP2.9 requiring DWER's advice for any structure plans, the need to establish a Special Control Area simply to control land use is heavy handed and outdated.

Instead, a structure plan can be prepared for the amendment area, considering all the site's features and values, and then be assessed and approved considering all relevant State and local government schemes, policies and other relevant instruments. Draft SPP 2.9 is a State Planning Policy (albeit in draft) which will be considered in this assessment process, meaning that land use permissibility can and should still correspond with those permissible land use listed in DWER's Water Quality Protection Note 25 by virtue of its reference in this state planning policy.

Development Contribution Area

For additional context, the amendment area is already a Special Control Area (Development Contribution Area 13), which requires contributions for a range of community infrastructure. This is important as a development contributions scheme is already in place to fund the provision of regional, sub-regional and local community facilities meaning that structure planning and subdivision phases can progress without the City of Cockburn Council raising concerns that contribution to this needed community infrastructure may be avoided.

In closing, we trust that this submission sets out why a Section 126 amendment can and should be undertaken and that it poses no erosion to ongoing protection of any environmental values on the site, including land use control over the Jandakot groundwater protection area.

On this basis and considering the decision and advice of the EPA's Chair, we would respectfully ask that a Section 126 amendment to LPS3 be supported as part of Amendment 1426, to expedite development of the land and to circumvent the need for a costly and time consuming separate local scheme amendment.

Should you have any queries regarding this letter, please contact Steve Carter on (08) 9386 8080 or alternatively via email at stephen@qubeproperty.com.au.

Yours sincerely



Steve Carter
DEVELOPMENT MANAGER



Department of
Education

Your Ref: RLS/1124
Our Ref: D25/0229183
Enquiries: Joshua Gould

Western Australian Planning Commission
Department of Planning, Lands and Heritage

Email: regionplanningschemes@dplh.wa.gov.au
Cc: Anthony.Muscara@dplh.wa.gov.au

Attention: Anthony Muscara
Principal Planner

Dear Sir / Madam

Proposed Metropolitan Region Scheme Amendment 1426 (Complex) – Lyon and Kinley Roads, Banjup – RLS/1124

Thank you for your email on 24 December 2024 providing the Department of Education (the Department) with the opportunity to comment on the proposed Metropolitan Region Scheme (MRS) Amendment on the subject site.

The proposed Amendment area falls within the student intake area of Aubin Grove Primary School (Primary School) and Hammond Park Secondary College. Currently, the Primary School is operating under significant student enrolment pressure, well beyond its permanent built capacity with the number of temporary accommodation on-site being amongst the highest in the State. The Primary School is not able to accommodate the anticipated additional students from a residential development of this scale and an additional public primary school site would be required to support the increased student population.

It should be highlighted that every new residential development or intensification of residential density create demand for, or on, public schools. This requires careful planning consideration to ensure that the anticipated student demand balances with the provision of public schools in the locality.

The Amendment area was never originally contemplated to be considered as an area generating significant student yield owing to the current 'Rural – Water Protection' zone. In addition, the Perth and Peel @3.5 million's South Metropolitan Peel Sub-regional Planning Framework 2018 retains the rural prospect of this area as a 'Rural Residential' zoned land. However, if further development is contemplated in this area, the Department strongly recommends that a district structure plan (DSP) be prepared over the wider area. The preparation of the DSPs would allow the Department to forward plan for the educational needs of the wider area and identify adequate number of future school sites in accordance with the requirements of the Western Australian Planning Commission's Operational Policy 2.4 – Planning for School Sites.

Hammond Park Secondary College is projected to reach its capacity in the medium to long term and additional/transportable classrooms would likely be required to support the future student population growth from the amendment area.

In view of the above, the Department has no in principle objection to the proposed MRS Amendment subject to new public primary school site being identified through the future local structure plan over the amendment area. It is requested that the local government and/or proponents engage with the Department at future preparation of any development concept plan and/or structure plan for the Amendment area and/or broader locality.

Should you have any questions in relation to the above, please do not hesitate to contact Joshua Gould, Senior Consultant – Land Planning, on (08) 9264 4008 or by email at joshua.gould@education.wa.edu.au.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'M Turnbull', written in a cursive style.

Matt Turnbull
Manager Land and Planning
Infrastructure Strategy and Planning

4 March 2025