

Submission Table

Submitter No.	Nature of Submission	Response/Recommended Modifications
<p>1. Department of Planning Lands and Heritage</p>	<p>Comment</p> <p>Good Afternoon, I refer to the enclosed request for comments dated 2 November 2020. It is understood that the amendment will seek to reclassify Crown Reserve 29190 to 'Civic and Community' as well as introduce changes to the Scheme Map legend to facilitate this.</p> <p>Reserve 29190 for the purpose of 'Church Purposes Community and Recreational Facility' as registered over Lot 613 on Deposited Plan 195349 is subject to a vesting order in favour of the Lesmurdie Baptist Church. The land appears vacant and undeveloped.</p> <p>Land Use Management is supportive of the scheme amendment noting that it will seek to better align the future use of the land with the local planning scheme. The development of a community centre on the site will deliver significant community benefits and are considered within the scope of the reserve purpose.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>2. Department of Biodiversity, Conservation and Attractions</p>	<p>Comment</p> <p>To whom it may concern,</p> <p>The Department of Biodiversity, Conservation and Attractions have assessed the above scheme amendment and have no comments to make at this time.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

<p>3. Department of Water and Environmental Regulation</p>	<p>No Objection</p> <p>Good Afternoon,</p> <p>Thankyou for referring the Local Planning Scheme No.3 Amendment No.103 for the Department of Water and Environmental Regulation to consider. The Department has assessed the proposal and has no objection or comments to provide.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>						
<p>4. Department of Fire and Emergency Services</p>	<p>Comment</p> <p>I refer to your email dated 2 November 2020 regarding the submission of a Bushfire Management Plan (BMP) (Revision 0), prepared by Entire Fire Management and dated 7 November 2019, for Local Planning Scheme Amendment.</p> <p>This advice relates only to State Planning Policy 3.7 Planning in Bushfire Prone Area (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 relevant planning policies and building regulations where necessary. This advice does not exempt the applicant/proponent from obtaining approvals that apply to the proposal including planning, building, health or any other approvals required by a relevant authority under written laws.</p> <p>1. Policy Measure 6.3 a) (i) Preparation of a BAL assessment</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="577 1098 1444 1289"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="577 1098 728 1121">Issue</th> <th data-bbox="734 1098 1272 1121">Assessment</th> <th data-bbox="1279 1098 1444 1121">Action</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="577 1126 728 1289">Vegetation classification</td> <td data-bbox="734 1126 1272 1289">Vegetation plots 2, 4 and 6 cannot be substantiated as Class B Woodland with the limited information and photographic evidence available. The BMP should detail specifically how the classification was derived particularly where the potential for revegetation has not been considered (i.e. Class B Woodland as opposed to Class A Forest).</td> <td data-bbox="1279 1126 1444 1289">Modification to the BMP is required at subsequent planning stages.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Issue	Assessment	Action	Vegetation classification	Vegetation plots 2, 4 and 6 cannot be substantiated as Class B Woodland with the limited information and photographic evidence available. The BMP should detail specifically how the classification was derived particularly where the potential for revegetation has not been considered (i.e. Class B Woodland as opposed to Class A Forest).	Modification to the BMP is required at subsequent planning stages.	<p>Noted. The assessment provided by DFES has been provided to the application to make amendments to the BMP prior to approval of the development application for a community centre at 4 Varley Street, Lesmurdie.</p>
Issue	Assessment	Action						
Vegetation classification	Vegetation plots 2, 4 and 6 cannot be substantiated as Class B Woodland with the limited information and photographic evidence available. The BMP should detail specifically how the classification was derived particularly where the potential for revegetation has not been considered (i.e. Class B Woodland as opposed to Class A Forest).	Modification to the BMP is required at subsequent planning stages.						

2. Policy Measure 6.3 c) Compliance with the Bushfire Protection Criteria		
Element	Assessment	Action
Location, and Siting & Design	<p>A1.1 & A2.1 – not demonstrated</p> <p>The BAL ratings cannot be validated for the reason(s) outlined in the above table.</p> <p>Figure 3 <i>Spatial Representation of the Bushfire Management Strategies</i> depicts the proposed APZ for the future development. However, the APZ extends outside the subject lot boundary into neighbouring lots. An APZ should be contained wholly within the subject lot proposed for development.</p>	Modification to the BMP is required at subsequent planning stages.
Water	<p>A4.1 – not demonstrated</p> <p>The BMP states that the '<i>site is provided with a reticulated water supply in accordance with the specifications of Water Corporation</i>'. However, the closest hydrant appears to be approximately 180 metres away on Brady Road. Non-residential and mixed-use areas should have hydrants spaced at 100 metres apart and the maximum distance between a hydrant and the rear of a building envelope, (or in the absence of a building envelope the rear of the lot) should be 120m.</p>	Modification to the BMP is required at subsequent planning stages.
<p><u>Recommendation</u></p> <p>The scheme amendment and BMP have adequately identified issues arising from the bushfire hazard level assessment and considered how compliance with the bushfire protection criteria can be achieved at subsequent stages of the planning process.</p> <p>DFES advice and recommendations are provided in the tables above to enable further consideration at subsequent stages of the planning process.</p> <p>As the modifications will not affect the scheme amendment, DFES recommends the amendment proceed and the applicant be advised that these modifications be undertaken to support subsequent stages of the planning process (structure plan, subdivision & development applications).</p>		

<p>5. St Ives Residents</p>	<p>Objection</p> <p>The residents of St Ives Retirement Village, 17 Sanderson Road, Lesmurdie, would like to express some of our concerns regarding the above proposed development. On July 20, 2020, we belatedly received from St Ives Head Office, a copy of a letter dated June 8, 2020, which had been sent to St Ives from the Planning Department of the City of Kalamunda concerning the above proposed Baptist Church community centre development.</p> <p>Unfortunately, the delay in forwarding correspondence to our Lesmurdie village has meant we missed the public comment period regarding this proposed development. However, your Department kindly has given us permission to express our concerns – which are listed below. These follow consultation with all the village residents and are submitted on their behalf by the village management committee.</p> <p>It needs to be made clear that the various residents of St. Ives Village Lesmurdie are in fact genuine rate payers of the City of Kalamunda; the organization of St Ives being only the vehicle to disseminate rate notices to the residents in the 12 villas.</p> <p>We request that St Ives Head Office and the City of Kalamunda forward any future correspondence directly to our Lesmurdie village management committee.</p> <p>1. The uniform and paramount comment from all residents, and confirmed in the committee meeting, was that we all moved into the village for peace and tranquillity surrounded by the natural environment and the feeling of calmness.</p>	<p>The Head of the Village Management Committee requested the submission from the preliminary advertising period was brought across to the formal advertising period.</p> <p>The concerns submitted by St Ives will be addressed through the development application process where noise impacts, traffic impacts, built form impacts and land use impacts are considered, and amendments are requested accordingly. It should be noted that the 'future proposed shed' has been removed from the proposal and the future half basketball court will be part of a separate development application process in the future where affected landowners will have the opportunity to comment on the proposal.</p>
------------------------------------	--	--

	<p>2. Looking at the proposed plans, having a shed closely abutting the southern boundary of the retirement village may cause undue noise which will disturb the residents living on this boundary.</p> <p>3. The half-court basketball court is proposed to be close to the boundary and again will disturb the residents living along the boundary. Introducing youth into an aged community can bring benefits but all too often it is for the benefit of the youth and detriment of the aged. Loud unexpected noise can be terrifying to us older members of a community. Deep penetrating sounds such as heavy base music or balls being bounced on the ground can be particularly upsetting. As we age many of us suffer with mysophobia and introducing youth into an environment of predominantly aged can seriously aggravate such conditions. The potential flood lighting that could be utilized to enable night use will definitely affect the residents that reside in villas 15 and 17 and most likely villas 19 and 13.</p> <p>4. The increase in traffic flow in and around the development on Brady Road, Sanderson Road and Varley Street, and the potential use of extra foot and vehicular traffic on the fire break adjacent to our village, is also a concern. Should any development go ahead, it is requested that this fire break be securely closed to access by construction vehicles and other traffic using it as informal access.</p> <p>5. Another major concern is the extra traffic coming to and from the proposed development on to the corner of Brady Road and the already busy Lesmurdie Road. It is an accident waiting to happen.</p> <p>6. The proposed development means more people in and around the retirement village, which is a concern regarding both day and nighttime. Security will become an issue for our elderly residents.</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>7. Looking at the plans of the main community centre building, there is a proposal for a café. There is already a café a few minutes walking distance down Sanderson Road at the Lesmurdie Shopping centre which has supported the local community for several years. We need to support that café, as well as the other businesses in the Lesmurdie Shopping Centre, as the shopping centre is very much needed in our wider community.</p> <p>8. Considering there are two parts before this development might be approved, the change in the land titles certificate and the planning approval, the residents of the St Ives Retirement Village ask to be kept informed throughout the processes and have the opportunity to attend any further meetings relating to this proposed development.</p> <p>9. Some residents of the St Ives Retirement Village were invited over a year ago to attend a meeting at the Baptist Church to discuss a proposed development. The organizer of the meeting from the Baptist Church said that we would be made aware of any plans for their future development. The church asked for a contact name for our village and this was provided. At no point since has he been contacted. Any further contact can be thru our village committee. The recent letter from the City of Kalamunda is the first correspondence we have received regarding the proposed development.</p> <p>10. This proposed development will impact residents in the Clarege retirement village on the Varley Street side who would also be exposed to similar problems.</p> <p>11. Aspects of the Community Centre may have some value, but we have considerable concerns over the nature of some of the proposed support services. These potentially could raise issues over proximity to the adjacent children's playground, the Girl Guide hall, the childcare centre, and the elderly living in the several adjacent retirement villages. Our understanding was that after the meeting</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>we had at the Baptist Church over a year ago, the Community Hall was to be used as a multi-purpose Community Centre. Given that several community functions are already available at the present Baptist church facility, the question is why another such development – unless a commercial ‘service’ (such as NDIS) operation is envisioned?</p> <p>12. Why isn't the large vacant block on the immediate west side of the church under consideration on land already under tenure to the church?</p> <p>13. We have concerns that the proposed development is catering for a wider range of ages, which could potentially disrupt the quiet living environment in our village and the surrounding retirement and age care facilities. There is already a large nearby sporting facility, Ray Owen Reserve on Grove Road in Lesmurdie, which provides a wide range of sporting options.</p> <p>In summary, St Ives Village residents are most concerned that the basketball court and Community Hall will bring extra traffic, potential latenight social events, and noise. Also, possible additional outdoor lighting will affect the village houses along the boundary. One of the other major concerns is the security of the area with the influx of other people in and around our village, the Community Centre and along the fire breaks. St Ives village management committee on behalf of its residents.</p>	
--	---	--