NO	NAME	SUBMISSION	APPLICANT COMMENTS	COUNCIL COMMENTS / RECOMMENDATION
1.	Department of Food and Agriculture WA (DAFWA) 444 Albany Hwy Albany WA 6330	i) Questions the demand for additional small rural lifestyle lots.	No comment made	NOTED The recently adopted Local Planning Strategy identifies the site as a composite zone, intended to allow for the development of light industries or home business and rural residential living to co-locate. This is a different product than straight rural conservation lots, of which it is clear that Hopetoun has an oversupply. It is unusual that DAFWA should comment on this aspect of the proposal but not object to this aspect of the local Planning Strategy recently referred to them.
		ii) No objection to proposed rezoning of "Prime Development Area"	Noted	NOTED
		iii) Department doesn't support the Rural Conservation precinct 2 (vegetated area) and recommends that this be retained as a conservation area; retained for landscape resilience and aesthetic value. The soil types in this area are sandy and prone to erosion, the retention of the remnant vegetation (in good to better condition) would assist in buffering prevailing winds.	Disagree The proposed rezoning can serve to retain and safeguard amenity values The draft LPS identifies the subject land for rural conservation. The flora assessment found no Declared, Rare Priority species or Communities and no vegetation or taxa listed under Commonwealth legislation.	UPHOLD Modifications recommended: 1. Remove the areas of good standard vegetation from the scheme amendment proposal. The vegetation along the southern boundary of Lot 8 has been identified of good or better standard. Retaining this vegetation would have benefits for the wider landscape. It retention is supported by the EPA.

NO	NAME	SUBMISSION	APPLICANT COMMENTS	COUNCIL COMMENTS / RECOMMENDATION
		iv) Buffers are required to existing sand extraction on the site that comply with the generic EPA buffer distances.	Noted The proposed Special Provisions and relevant statues provide adequate controls. Noted, however not relevant as the subject land does not adjoin rural land. It is surrounded by Rural Residential lots, Reserves and Lots 10 and 11 that are used for waste water treatment and power generation	UPHOLD IN PART Modifications recommended: 1. Ensure that all building envelopes on a site are located more than 200m from the sand resource. Whilst the generic buffer recommended by the EPA is 300m it is accepted that lesser distances are common to sand extraction with no processing on site. The only offsite impact of sand extraction is the reversing beepers and some minor dust. This slight reduction to the generic buffer can be addressed through memorials on the title at the time of subdivision.
		v) Further investigation into surface water run-off is required to ensure drainage flows do not scour or damage road infrastructure and adjacent land.	No specific comment made	NOTED Refer to DoW comments (iii)
2.	Department of Water (DoW) 5 Bevan Street Albany WA 6330	i) They note that any modifications need to be mediated between the local government and the Department of Water.	No specific comment made	Noted
		ii) Subject land is not within the Hopetoun Water Reserve so there are no DoW restrictions on lot size or land use	Noted	Noted

NO	NAME	SUBMISSION	APPLICANT COMMENTS	COUNCIL COMMENTS / RECOMMENDATION
		iii) The DoW raises many and varied concerns with the Local Water Management Strategy presented including: • Lack of engineering input and calculations; • Lack of late winter ground water testing; • No catchment modelling; • Flood risk inadequately assessed; • Adequacy of existing culverts and drain questioned without modelling;	Subject to minor revisions the LWMS is appropriate and adequate. It confirms that the subject land is suitable and capable of supporting Rural Living lots / development as set out on SGP. Detailed engineering and stormwater design is typically contained in the UWMP. UWMP to be required as a condition of subdivision.	UPHELD IN PART 1. Late winter testing of the ground water levels should be provided prior to final approval of the scheme amendment. The applicant and landowner have provided more information and numerous site visits conducted immediately after storm events have shown that the site can be effectively drained with works at the subdivision stage. Large lot development can be quite forgiving as it has large lots and plenty of scope to dispose of stormwater. The large drain that bisects the subject site serves to drain the entire catchment to the north and west of the subject site and this has functioned adequately in recent storm events. There are areas of the site that require attention including: • A part of the western portion of the site that currently holds water would need to be drained at the time of subdivision; • The crossing of Hopetoun-Ravensthorpe Road needs to be improved to allow water to move away from the site; • A central point on the northern boundary of the subject site where multiple drains meet will need particular attention to ensure that drainage basins are correctly sized; and • The road network will need to be designed to cater for the 1:100 year storm events.

NO	NAME	SUBMISSION	APPLICANT COMMENTS	COUNCIL COMMENTS / RECOMMENDATION
		(iii) cont		None of these issues appear to be fatal flaws. Improving the drainage of the subject site will serve to assist with existing drainage issues further up in the catchment.
		iv) The department notes that the site will be connected to the reticulated water supply and that Hopetoun has a restricted supply.	No specific comment made	NOTED Further discussion with Water Corporation has shown that the site cannot be connected to scheme water. See 4 (ii) of this Schedule
		v) Future connection to reticulated water supply noted. Water efficiency measures, such as rainwater tanks for non-potable use, should be enforced	Agree	UPHELD Modifications recommended: 1. Insert Scheme clauses that require: a) Rainwater tanks for residential and industrial uses; b) Development applications to substantiate that they can source enough water to service any proposed industry on the site as part of a future planning application. c) A non-potable supply required for the fire fighting tank.

3.	Environmental Protection Authority (EPA) Lvl 4, The Atrium 168 St Georges Tce Perth WA 6000	i)	Scheme not assessed, advice given .	Noted	Noted
		ii)	Precinct 2 – Rural Conservation area contains ~17ha of remnant vegetation that requires a clearing permit if it is to be cleared as part of further extractive industries.	Detailed checking, based on recent aerial photos confirms that the area of rem veg in 'Good' condition or better is 13.7 ha. This is less than 17% of subject land, which is 81ha. The vegetation across is predominantly classified as Completely degraded, Degraded or Poor. The SGP provides for the retention / protection of at least 4.3ha of rem veg Noted. Estimated 600,000m^3 of BRM (sand) may impact on 11.2ha of vegetation	UPHELD Modifications recommended: 1. Remove the areas of good standard vegetation from the scheme amendment proposal and subdivision guide plan.
		iii)	Fire management measures will require clearing and will result in the clearing of the majority of 1 hectare lots.	Rationalisation of lot configuration possible to minimise vegetation loss.	
		iv)	EPA strongly supports location of building envelopes on cleared land.	Noted. BEs generally located within existing cleared areas and clustered. At least 4.3ha of rem vegetation is to be retained/protected. Parkland clearing and management of fuel loads in HSZ does not necessitate tree removal.	
		v)	EPA strongly supports rehabilitation and revegetation of south-west corner of the site.	Accepted. Scheme provisions and Licence requirements stipulate rehabilitation following BRM extraction and prior to issue of Titles.	NOTED Area to be removed from Scheme Amendment, separate issue to be addressed separately through the Extractive Industry licence process.

4.	Water Corporation Planning & Capability Group 629 Newcastle Street Leederville 6007	i) No objection however they noted that the water reticulation network will require upgrading to service this proposal.	Noted	Noted
		ii) On further investigation, the subject land is beyond the service area identified in the Water Corporation's 2008 forward planning. iii) An internal assessment was undertaken and the Corporation's Planning Branch has evaluated the possibility to extend a potable water supply (extension from the current Scheme) to the proposed development area. This would effectively mean enlarging the Scheme including many components from source to end supply point, and also a recalculation of the full notional cost of the Scheme and hence also cost to the developer. The high land in the development area would either require a tank or a booster. After all matters considered, the Corporation has concluded that it will not offer a potable water supply service to the proposed development area.	Request for consideration of non-potable water supply [for fire, irrigation and industrial land uses] to complement the self-sufficient/individual rainwater tanks. Perhaps from groundwater or treated waste water (given the plant is so close by). Although less conventional, there may also be scope for supplementary supplies and innovative solutions [e.g. Kendenup and Wellstead where there is a domestic/rainwater tank supplemented by partial retic/top up or slow fill. Even without mains water, the proposal would accord with WAPC Policy. Obviously we need to justify/confirm an alternative water source (i.e. rainwater tanks – with min roof area/tank size) – as this has been done for adjoining rezoning/subdivisions.	UPHELD. Modifications recommended: 1. Modify the scheme provisions for both Special Use zone 16 and Rural Conservation Area 9 to require proposed land uses to substantiate that there is a sustainable water supply for the proposed land uses 2. Require the preparation of a Bushfire Management Plan at the time of subdivision which addresses adequate on site water supply for fire fighting purposes and how the water tanks for the development will kept full from a local non-potable supply such as a bore.

5.	Main Roads WA 2-6 Kelly Street Albany WA 6330	i)	No objection in principle.	Noted	NOTED
		ii)	Objects to the proposed new road and any lots shown on the Subdivision Guide Plan gaining access from Hopetoun-Ravensthorpe Road.	Lot is currently serviced by crossover onto main road. Preference is for retention of this access point for future subdivision. SGP notes “access to be limited”. One lot with sole frontage to main road to be redesigned and serviced by internal road.	UPHELD Modification required: 1. Amend the Subdivision Guide Plan to remove both the road and lot access to Hopetoun-Ravensthorpe Road and increase strength of statements ion the SGP to indicate that no access is available from Hopetoun-Ravensthorpe Road to the development. Main Roads WA have the ability to remove existing crossovers and access points and have indicated that they are not supportive of the road or crossover despite the existing crossover.
6.	Department of Mines and Petroleum (DMP) 100 Plain St East Perth WA 6004	i)	Acknowledges a significant resource of deep yellow sands on the site.	Noted	Noted
		ii)	DMP recommends 500m separation distance from margins of sand extraction pits, therefore only northernmost section of Rural Conservation zone is considered suitable for residential development.	Disagree 100m setback from margin of pit is appropriate/typical.	UPHELD IN PART Modifications required; 1. Remove the sand extraction area

		iii) No objections to proposed Special Use zone (Composite Rural Living/Rural Enterprise) provided there is no further development of residential dwellings within the 500m separation area.	Additional written information provided by consultant. Sand extraction is intermittent and low impact. Adjoining Rural Residential subdivision on adjoining lot to the south is within 300m of existing sand pit. No evidence of complaints. Recommend additional provisions to: 1. preclude subdivision and/or housing/sensitive land uses within 150m-200m of margins of active sand pits, and 2. Require Notifications on Titles of any lots within 200m of active sand pits.	from the Scheme Amendment; 2. Setback all building envelopes to the sand extraction area by a minimum of 200m. 3. Require Notifications on Titles of any lots within 200m of active sand pits. 4. Increase the number of Special Use zoned sites (composite zone). This would result in most of the proposed lots adjacent to the sand extraction being zoned 'Special Use', a zone that allows for more industrial type uses in conjunction with residential activity. By their nature these sites will be less sensitive to noise. Many sand pits operate with setbacks of 150-200m elsewhere in the state, as supported by further information provided by the applicant.
		iv) DMP supports the principle of sequential land use for Lot 8, after extraction of raw materials but considers rezoning premature given potential land use conflict within 500m buffer.	Disagree. Extraction is low impact. Examples of on-going low impact BRM sand pits within Rural Living zones along south coast (City of Albany and Shire of Esperance) serve as a precedent.	See (iii) above.
7.	Department of Aboriginal Affairs	i) No listed heritage sites are present and if activity is limited away from the south west corner of the site then there is minimal risk of disturbance of any potential sites.	Noted	NOTED