

Landowner Deputation to Public Agenda Briefing 10 February 2026	Response
<b>Rod Sully</b>	
Table 4 of LPS3 does not state any requirement for a road connection from Hatch Court to Kalamunda Rd, or any part thereof such a road.	The reference to traffic management in Table 4 of LPS3, does not preclude the City from considering various access/movements options under a structure plan, provided they are consistent with the four principal points that are listed under Point (a) of Table 4.
<p>With the section of the future road proposal through lot 15 and lot 200 now being deemed</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. too cost prohibitive; and</li> <li>2. no clear Need &amp; Nexus being demonstrated for any part of the southern section of this future road; I request the City make the clear justified amendments requested in my Planning Solutions submission (amendments requested are in brief, to limit the road and associated easements to Lot 9000 and Lot 13 only)</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The cost of an intersection onto Kalamunda Road from a road through lot 15 and lot 200 is cost prohibitive as noted in paragraph 31 of the officer report to public agenda briefing. The cost of a section of road through lot 15 has not however at this stage been deemed to be prohibitive. If anything, an early cost estimate from the LSP process indicates that the cost of a short section of road through Lot 15 might be something to pursue through the LSP. This however is to be tested and interrogated further through the separate LSP process, which will properly assess the costs and other implications of a section of road through lot 15 and whether or not this is pursued.</li> <li>2. LPP 35 is an interim planning measure. The modified draft LPP 35 attached to the officer report to the public agenda briefing does not contain express reference to a road connection through Lot 15.X Please refer to paragraph 6(d) of the modified draft which notes that “development plans must....Illustrate the proponent’s preferred alignment of that future road”. The separate LSP process will consider road modelling options as part its detailed traffic</li> </ol>

	<p>analysis/feasibility (including need and nexus) which will determine whether the option of the road alignment through Lot 15 should be pursued.</p>
<p>In regards to the road infrastructure, why is the city proposing a potential future cul-de-sac of Hatch Court at the Stirling Crescent intersection when cul-de-sacs are not deemed suitable for industrial areas and it creates further unnecessary costs for the precinct?</p>	<p>This question hinges on an opinion expressed in the question that cul-de-sacs are not deemed suitable for industrial areas, but does not elaborate as to why or in what circumstances this is thought to be the case. If this is a reference to clause 3.5.4 of ‘Development Control Policy 4.1: Industrial Subdivision’, that policy includes a statement that cul-de-sacs should ‘generally’ be avoided. This is not an absolute prohibition on cul-de-sacs and would allow for consideration of cul-de-sacs where necessary, having regard to appropriate justification such as the land use and movement context specific to the precinct.</p> <p>The draft LPP35 does not expressly provide for a future cul-de-sac at the Stirling Crescent intersection.</p> <p>The separate LSP process will consider road options.</p> <p>Consideration to the inclusion of a cul de sac on Hatch and Stirling is consistent with the traffic management provisions identified in Table 4 of LPS3.</p>
<p>With 63% of the precinct land now having an approved DA in place by successfully demonstrating developments adequately follow proper planning principles, utilising the existing planning framework, how can the City suitably demonstrate the Need and Nexus for the LSP and its associated cost?</p>	<p>Of the 16 lots within the LPP35 policy precinct, 6 have development approval for industrial development. Utilising land area, approximately 19 hectares have development approvals associated with industrial development, within the approx. 33-hectare precinct.</p> <p>The final part of this statement contains a question which relates to the separate LSP process, which covers a larger area</p>

than LPP 35. The City has written to landowners and offered one on one meetings with officers to discuss that process. The LSP process will be subject to public consultation and further consideration by Council.

In the meantime, the following are noted with regard to the separate matter of an LSP :-

The Local Planning Scheme ('Scheme') provisions trigger the establishment of an LSP. The issues referenced in the Scheme together with the land use context and challenges remain relevant despite approvals having been issued. The developments have followed valid pathway enabled under provisions of the Planning and Development Local Planning Schemes Regulations 2015. These provisions establish a test for proposals to proceed only where they do not prejudice a future structure plan. Applicants and decision makers have given regard to the need for a future LSP, and reinforced elements required to be addressed (eg. access and interface). No decisions have established a position that the LSP is not required. Continuation of development in the precinct in the absence of a LSP would not represent orderly and proper planning for the area, not address the fundamental infrastructure and land use coordination challenges, and would continue to place a greater burden on later developers to deliver and fund the required infrastructure.

The provision of a LSP for the HCLIA will deliver a coordinated planning land use outcome for the majority of lots which require a road connection to Adelaide Street.

<p>Can the City confirm exactly how the cost of this LSP will be borne, and by whom?</p>	<p>The matter under consideration in this report to Council is draft LLP35. The reference in the question to 'this LSP' should not be confused with the draft LLP 35.</p> <p>This question relates to the separate LSP process. The City has written to landowners and offered one on one meetings with officers to discuss that process. The LSP process will be subject to public consultation and further consideration by Council.</p> <p>At this juncture it is not possible to confirm exactly how the cost of the LSP will be borne and by whom.</p>
<p>In regards to the proposed DCP or Alternative Rating Model Option:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. I request the City adequately demonstrates this for the "Alternative Rating Model" being proposed in lieu of a DCP so that it can be clear.</li> <li>2. I request that the City provides full details for the "Alternative Rating Model", and confirm if pursued, would only be triggered upon development or subdivision of the said lot, to give The affected landowners certainty as required by SPP 3.6.</li> <li>3. I request that the City advises what other alternative funding sources for infrastructure are available to the City for consideration, such as State Government funding.</li> <li>4. For transparency required in accordance with SPP 3.6, I request that the City clearly</li> </ol>	<p>1, 2, 4 &amp; 5. These questions relate to the separate processes such as the LSP and any DCP or other process. The City has written to landowners and offered one on one meetings with officers. The LSP process will be subject to public consultation and further consideration by Council.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Industrial development of largely private commercial landholdings is not typically a focus of State Government funding, compared to community, sporting and recreational projects. The City is not aware of redevelopment of the precinct having been awarded State Government funding, notwithstanding that it is approximately 8 years since the precinct was rezoned for industrial purposes. Any insight that landowners can offer as to any such initiatives since the land was rezoned would be welcomed.</li> </ol>

<p>identifies exactly what infrastructure items the City is proposing to capture in the Alternative Rating Model, and what the expected cost of the rates would be, as this will ultimately have an impact on the saleable value and viable industrial development of the lots.</p> <p>5. Is the City funding the cost of the land on lot 13 and the construction costs of the proposed future road on lot 13?</p>	
<p>I also request the City commence positive engagement with myself and other directly affected landowners throughout this process in line with SPP 3.6.</p>	<p>The City has already engaged through public consultation on LPP35 and other means, including telephone, email and letter correspondence. Landowners have been offered in person meetings with officers at this stage and have been advised re the future LSP consultation process. Further constructive engagement is proposed in the context of the development of the LSP.</p>
<p>I request the City suitably consider and address in writing:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. All items I have raised today;</li> <li>2. Town Planners - Planning Solutions submission;</li> <li>3. My wife's submission;</li> <li>4. My neighbours Town Planners – Rise Urban submission.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. See above;</li> <li>2. Planning Solutions submission. This states objection to draft LPP 35 on grounds (1)-(4). All four of these are addressed in paragraph 38 of the 'LPP35 Submission Response Table' in attachment 10.1.1.3 to the officer report;</li> <li>3. Wife's submission. Please refer to paragraph 25 of the 'LPP35 Submission Response Table' in attachment 10.1.1.3 to the officer report;</li> <li>4. Rise Urban Town Planner's submission. Please refer to paragraph 40 of the 'LPP35 Submission Response Table' in attachment 10.1.1.3 to the officer report;</li> </ol>

<b>Louie Camicelli</b>	
<p>The decision of Council not to progress a local structure plan and developer contribution plan in 2018 when the hatch court area was rezoned to light industry has resulted in the current scenario where 63% of the area has already been approved for development.</p>	<p>Local Planning Policy 28 – Delivery of State and Local Strategies through the Preparation of Structure Plans (LPP 28) establishes that the City generally does not prepare LSPs. The LSP process is typically landowner/developer driven and a precursor to development, and the City’s usual role is to assess the LSP submitted, this is consistent with the situation in 2018.</p>
<p>The extent of developments approved has resulted in inequitable outcome for the remaining landowners who will be required to pay extra in developer contributions.</p>	<p>The City acknowledges that of the 16 lots within the HCLIA LPP 35 Policy precinct, 6 have received development approval for industrial development to date, hence the decision to reevaluate the proposed deferred DCP model that the City can use to equitably fund the infrastructure necessary to achieve a coordinated development of the HCLIA.</p>
<p>There is no requirement for the road alignment to connect through Lots 15 and 200 from a traffic and cost perspective. It will have a commercial impact on the ability of landowners to sell their lots.</p>	<p>The cost of an intersection onto Kalamunda Road from a road through lot 15 and lot 200 is cost prohibitive as noted in paragraph 31 of the officer report to public agenda briefing. The cost of a section of road through lot 15 has not however at this stage been deemed to be prohibitive. If anything, an early cost estimate from the LSP process indicates that the cost of a short section of road through Lot 15 might be something to pursue through the LSP. This however is to be tested and interrogated further through the separate LSP process, which will properly assess the costs and other implications of a section of road through lot 15 and whether this is pursued.</p>