

## Local Planning Policy 35 – Hatch Court Light Industrial Area

Submitter # Refer to Confidential Attachment	Comment	City Response
1	<p><b>Do not Support -</b></p> <p>We are residents of Hillview Lifestyle Village and we strongly oppose the above. It will have an impact on our ingress and egress of Kalamunda Road, the noise from heavy vehicles and pollution.</p> <p>We cannot see the purpose or logic of this proposed road when Stirling Crescent (which badly needs upgrading) is adjacent and can lead to Adelaide Street as in the case now without the impact of this new proposal. Please lodge our strongest objection to the proposal.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>It is acknowledged that the inclusion of an indicative future road alignment in Figure 1 of LPP35 has created a perception that the future road has been established through LPP35.</p> <p>The road alignment shown in Figure 1, represents one of a number of access scenarios currently being considered.</p> <p>Importantly, LPP35 does not determine final development outcomes or infrastructure locations, i.e. the preferred road alignment. Instead, it is intended to ensure that any development that may occur in the short term does not prevent or limit future planning once the Local Structure Plan is completed for the HCLIA.</p> <p>As part of the more detailed structure planning process, the City and its consultant team are exploring scenarios for traffic access and movement. The access scenario involving a potential connection to Kalamunda Road has been investigated, including consideration of the need for significant intersection upgrades such as traffic signals or a roundabout. Based on preliminary assessment, the costs of delivering this concept and the required intersection</p>

		<p>infrastructure makes it too cost prohibitive to be pursued further.</p> <p>However, and very importantly, no decisions about road locations have been made. The final approach to access and movement will be determined through the Local Structure Plan, informed by detailed technical studies and community feedback.</p>
2	<p><b>Do Not Support –</b></p> <p>I completely fail to see the purpose of this planned road. As a resident of Hill View Lifestyle Village this proposed road will be a disaster for the hundreds of residents trying to access Kalamunda Road.</p> <p>It is extremely difficult to exit the village onto Kalamunda Road now and putting an intersection and road at our entrance gate will be an unmitigated disaster traffic wise. Why do this when Stirling Crescent already has a road entry to Hatch Court? And Stirling Crescent will be a cul de sac at the Great Eastern Highway bypass end reducing traffic on Stirling Crescent.</p> <p>Why put a road through the manufacturing business opposite us which will split his business into two effectively with yards on both sides of the road.</p> <p>I see this proposal a total waste of money, a total inconvenience to hundreds of exiting residents and simply ridiculous proposal.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Please refer to the City's response to Submission No.1.</p> <p>.</p>

3	<p><b>Do Not Support –</b></p> <p>This proposed Local Planning Policy 35 Hatch Court Light (LPP35) Industrial Area will directly affect the amenity of a quiet, safe retirement of all elderly house owners and residents within Hillview Lifestyle Village such as ourselves.</p> <p>The proposal, which will allow vehicular traffic Classed as RAV 4 up to 27.5 meters long, access to and from Hatch Court, will directly create a very unsafe and unsecure means of resident vehicular access and egress directly opposite the main entrance / exit to Hillview Lifestyle Village.</p> <p>The pedestrian access to the Bus Stop opposite the Village will be very severely compromised. Large vehicles classified under RAV 4 up to 27.5 mtrs long cannot turn safely into and exit such a restricted entry, as proposed within the LLP35.</p> <p>One of the major long-term factors considered, when purchasing our home 16 years ago in Hillview Lifestyle Village, was the safety and livability of the area during our natural ageing process. This proposal LLP35, if proceeded with, will totally void that.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Please refer to the City's response to Submission No.1</p>

4	<p><b>Do Not Support – First Submission</b></p> <p>We have been notified of a proposal to build a new road from Hatch court High Wycombe.</p> <p>We believe this will impact the safety of all residents of Hillview village. Due to the close proximity of the new intersection. There are over 250 houses in the complex most with 1 or 2 vehicles/drivers. The additional heavy vehicle traffic on Kalamunda Road will cause congestion and danger to all road users.</p> <p>There are already many vehicles using Kalamunda Road including buses and school traffic.</p> <p>We would like to know why the new area cannot direct the heavy vehicle traffic to Abernethy Road.</p> <p>We are hoping that serious consideration is given to alternate routes and safety of all residents is considered.</p> <p><b>Second Submission</b></p> <p>Increased heavy traffic on Kalamunda Road will cause congestion and danger to pedestrians, cyclists and cars.</p> <p>There are multiple roads that access Abernathy Road which would be easier to connect to the industrial areas</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Please refer to the City's response to Submission No.1</p>
5	<p><b>Do Not Support –</b></p> <p>As a big picture I don't support further development on this site. I can actually see my house on the map of the plan. That's incredibly close to have increased industrial</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The Hatch Court Industrial Area is zoned for light industrial use. LPP35 and the broader planning framework will</p>

	<p>activity to peoples homes. It's already bad enough with enviro pipes.</p> <p>At another level I'm concerned about traffic on Kalamunda Rd if the plan proceeds, with trucks trying to get in or out of hatch court and lifestyle village people trying to get in and out on virtually the opposite side of the road. Surely a roundabout would be a better option. Covering all access needs . Kalamunda Rd is already quite a challenge to negotiate at times.</p> <p>I also wonder if you've given consideration to the increase in traffic for the lifestyle village as people age in place, and support services come to each person's home. There's over 350 residents. Home delivery is also booming in the village. It all requires good and safe access to and from Kalamunda Rd.</p> <p>.</p>	<p>ensure that development occurs in a coordinated manner and enable development that does not impact on the amenity of the surrounding residential area.</p> <p>In regard, to the matter of road access onto Kalamunda Road, please refer to the City's response to Submission No.1</p>
6	<p><b>Do Not Support –</b></p> <p>I have read your proposal of Local Planning policy 35-Hatch Court Light Industrial Area and do not think that you have done enough research into the effects it will have on traffic on Kalamunda rd.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Please refer to the City's response to Submission No.1</p>

	<p>Kalamunda rd is in no way suitable to sustain the vehicle load that will be coming onto it from the industrial premises. I've lived in the lifestyle village for many years and what you have allowed to happen with the wetlands across the road and now this. Getting out of the village is hard enough these days and now you are planning to make things worse. Where will it end....someone being killed. At least I have put my view across but I know you will not listen!</p>	
7	<p><b>Do Not Support –</b> I believe it will be very dangerous to bring heavy vehicles on to Kalamunda Rd at the point proposed as the road is very narrow and with the intersections of Stirling Crescent, Chullwynne Mews and the National Lifestyle Village entrance all in close proximity it will create congestion and potentially traffic accidents. It can be very difficult to get out of all 3 streets at various times now without adding another road into the mix.</p>	<p>Noted. Please refer to the City's response to Submission No.1</p>
8	<p><b>Do Not Support –</b> My husband and I reside in House [REDACTED] [REDACTED]. The proposed intersection of this new road is located almost adjacent to and in close proximity to the main entrance of our Village.</p>	<p>Noted. Please refer to the City's response to Submission No.1</p>

	<p>The current traffic on Kalamunda Road is particularly heavy Monday to Friday making entering or exiting the Village from and onto Kalamunda Road difficult at times. We believe the increased industrial traffic with trucks of the size proposed entering onto Kalamunda Road at this location will no doubt cause more vehicle congestion and safety issues for Homeowners entering and exiting the Village.</p> <p>For safety reasons as stated we are extremely opposed to this proposed planning project being approved.</p>	
9	<p><b>Do Not Support –</b></p> <p>I have lived in this village and experienced increased traffic problems with entering and exiting the property for 17 years and I believe the proposed project would increase the difficulty to the extreme. Therefore I must express my concern and disapproval of the project. It would seem to me that Abernethy road would be the better place for the entry/exit of the proposed road.</p> <p>sent 30/12/25.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Please refer to the City's response to Submission No.1</p>
10	<p><b>Do Not Support –</b></p> <p>My husband and I live in the Lifestyle Village and the junction of this new road with Kalamunda road will be almost opposite to the village entrance. Kalamunda road is already a very busy road and, especially at certain times, almost impossible to turn right into it. We feel that extra traffic, possibly large trucks, turning into and out of</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Please refer to the City's response to Submission No.1</p>

	<p>this new road, almost opposite our access road would make entering and leaving the village very hazardous. We, like many other residents of the village are elderly and therefore this extra heavy traffic would affect us badly. Please consider upgrading Stirling Crescent instead, surely this would do the same job and be more efficient and cheaper.</p>	
11	<p><b>Do Not Support –</b>  I have studied the Proposal for the Hatch Court light industrial area and my main concern is the proposed road between Adelaide St and Kalamunda Rd. My thoughts are that having this road exiting on to Kalamunda road is asking for problems and is an accident waiting to happen. As Stirling crescent already exits close by and the entrance to the Hillview Lifestyle village is virtually opposite it would make far more sense to just have the section between Hatch Ct and Adelaide Street and up grade the Junction to Abernethy Rd, especially as the connection from Stirling Cr and the bi pass is due to be closed. Major heavy trucks could then use Adelaide St from the industrial area instead of exiting on to Kalamunda Rd which is essentially a residential road.</p>	<p>Noted.   Please refer to the City's response to Submission No.1</p>
12	<p><b>Do Not Support –</b>  Will impede the entry/exit of emergency vehicles into and out of our village, hold up traffic and Kalamunda road is the path for people from the kalamunda region</p>	<p>Noted.   Please refer to the City's response to Submission No.1</p>

	<p>to get to great eastern highway for work each day and carries much traffic am and pm.</p> <p>Trucks were not wanted in the past hence the roundabout at High Wycombe shopping centre.</p> <p>Abernethy road has regular stoppages to allow oversize mining equipment movements as well.</p> <p>Not a worthy planning change at all.</p>	
13	<p><b>Do Not Support –</b></p> <p>With regard to the above, I strongly oppose the proposal.</p> <p>I live in Hillview Lifestyle Village, and, at the present time we deal with a lot of traffic on Kalamunda Road, and a new road, close to the entrance to our village, would cause a lot of traffic problems. I'm wondering how a truck of 27.5 meters in length would turn into the proposed road, especially coming off Abernethy Road and onto Kalamunda Road. I feel this will cause major hold ups and maybe accidents.</p> <p>I also feel that this proposal will not only affect our village but also the lives of the people whose homes it would take away, how on earth could these people be compensated after living in their homes for so long?</p> <p>Then we have Enviropipes, whose business covers the area from Abernethy Road down to Stirling Crescent, so the intentional proposal is for a road to cut right through</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Please refer to the City's response to Submission No.1</p>

	<p>their business ?????, I never thought I would ever hear of something so ridiculous!!!</p> <p>I hope all the submissions of opposition to this proposal are given the attention they deserve.</p>	
14	<p><b>Do Not Support –</b></p> <p>I find it hard to find any logic to this proposal, other than causing more chaos to traffic on Kalamunda Rd.</p> <p>1st you want to construct a road, running parallel with, Abernathy Rd.</p> <p>The new road will be less than 200 metres from the Kalamunda Rd / Abernathy Rd traffic lights.</p> <p>Adelaide St runs from Abernathy Rd to Stirling Crescent. Where is the logic?</p> <p>Kalamunda Rd was never built to handle large Trucks. Abernathy Rd is the Truck route.</p> <p>Upgrades of Abernathy Rd and Great Eastern highway by-pass were completed, a few years ago To allow trucks to enter the Industrial area, or continue to Roe Highway. And decrease congestion at that intersection.</p> <p>The right hand turn, at the traffic lights on Abernathy Rd to Kalamunda Rd would cause congestion and it would need to be upgraded.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Please refer to the City's response to Submission No.1</p>

	<p>Trucks can continue either way on Abernathy rd, and turn right or left into Adelaide St</p> <p>Trucks can also enter the industrial area from the bypass of Great Eastern highway, into Stirling Crescent</p> <p>Trucks leaving the area can exit via Adelaide St Turning left or right onto Abernathy Rd Trucks can also turn left from Adelaide St to the Great Eastern highway bypass</p> <p>You have no regard for the cars exiting, Hillview Lifestyle Village. There is 266 houses in the Village. We all pay our rates, same as every house in Kalamunda Shire, but you treat us with contempt. Turning right onto Kalamund Rd in peak hours is not easy, I know, I work and exit, turning right, Mon to Fri. Now you want make it harder to exit, by introducing Trucks, to turn left on new Rd, when they can proceed to Adelaide St via Abernathy Rd</p> <p>You want to slice through the middle of Eco Pipes Which will reduce their holding space by half, and make them cross the road to reach the far side.</p> <p>I agree there is congestion at the intersection of Stirling Crescent and Kalamunda Rd, with Trucks taking a short cut to Abernathy Rd. Trying to turn right with two or</p>
--	--

<p>three trucks in front of you, can take some time and be very frustrating</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Why do Trucks continue through the residential part of Sterling Crescent? Turning right to reach Abernathy Rd, when they could have turned into Adelaide St, and reached the same destination.</li><li>• Why did Kalamunda Shire not make Sterling Crescent a local traffic only Rd, a few years ago, knowing the growth in the Industrial area and increase in Trucks</li><li>• I'm bewildered!</li></ul> <p>Your proposal will cause so much chaos, I fail to see your logic</p> <p>I also believe the new Rd will not be used as you expect it to be, and will be a total waste of money</p> <p>My suggestion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Stirling Crescent: from Kalamunda Rd to Adelaide St, make this a local traffic only Rd with slow points. This will make Trucks use Adelaide St, where they can turn left or right onto Abernathy Rd. Or turn left from Adelaide St to the Great Eastern highway by-pass</li><li>• There will then be no increased congestion on Kalamunda Rd and Stirling Crescent.</li><li>• There will be no increased chaos for cars leaving Hillview Lifestyle Village</li></ul>	
--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•There will be no need to run a Rd parallel with Abernathy Rd.</li> </ul> <p>I cannot understand why you have come up with a proposal that will be a logistical nightmare, for every user on Kalamunda Rd</p>	
15	<p><b>Do Not Support –</b></p> <p>Why is it necessary for a road to go right across the whole block from Adelaide St to Kalamunda Rd? It could end just on Enviro Pipes corner block of Abernethy and Kalamunda roads. Where this proposed road currently meets Kalamunda Rd is almost opposite entrance to village. In the village there are about 370 homes each with a vehicle that would be used almost daily, many residents still go to places of work. There is a constant movement of traffic in and out of village with residents, trades people, aged care services, delivery trucks etc. It is currently quite difficult to turn east or west on Kalamunda Rd, which needs a reduction in speed now to make it more suitable to residential use. Abernethy and GEH Bypass are the main roads for trucks and should be kept as such. The increase in noise will be huge for the residents living in houses that border Kalamunda Rd. There needs to be much more discussion and planning with the local community before this is approved.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Please refer to the City's response to Submission No.1</p>
16	<p><b>Do Not Support –</b></p>	<p>Noted.</p>

	<p>I am concerned about how the proposed plan will impact the main entrance/exit of this village. All I can tell for the information I have found in your website is a note that access to Kalamunda Road will be restricted. However, there is a red line marked in your map indicating an exit/entry to Kalamunda Road almost opposite the main entrance to the Hillview Lifestyle Village.</p> <p>How will this impact our access to Kalamunda Road?    How will this impact noise levels for those near the Kalamunda side of the village?    These things are quite concerning.</p> <p>I am also concerned that the information given to us by Village management, although well intended, is inaccurate making locating the plan on your website very difficult. I am concerned that a number of the village residents may not be able to locate this plan even if they are computer users. I believe that many residents are not able to use computers and will only be aware of what is happening via information from the Village office.</p>	<p>Please refer to the City's response to Submission No.1</p>
17	<p><b>Do Not Support –</b></p> <p>A road access in front of our village will be dangerous for some of the elderly in our village. Also it will be difficult for villagers to enter and exit the village and also it will mean the bus service on Kalamunda Road will be disrupted.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Please refer to the City's response to Submission No.1.</p>

18	<p><b>Do Not Support – Submission 1</b></p> <p>Local Planning Policy 35 (LPP35) to develop the Hatch Court Precinct as a Light Industrial Area is not supported in its current form.</p> <p>While the concept of developing the precinct is not opposed, the proposed access to the precinct and in particular access via Kalamunda Road is most definitely opposed.</p> <p>Currently, in a distance of only 200 metres, there are 3 entrances/exits on Kalamunda Road. Two of the three are used by: e e 273 households in the Hillview Lifestyle village; and Approximately 90 households in the Waldin Grove enclave. The third is a very busy Stirling Crescent currently used by heavy vehicles as well as general traffic including that from Hillview village, Waldin Grove and other surrounding residents and businesses. In its current form, LPP35 adds an additional entry/exit for Kalamunda Road in this 200 metre section of the road which will be used by heavy vehicles up to 27 Metres in length. When the existing Bus Stop in this same 200 metres is taken into account, (requiring residents to cross Kalamunda Road for access) LPP35 will create what can only be considered an extremely hazardous</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Please refer to the City's response to Submission No.1.</p>
----	--	--

<p>and unsafe traffic situation for the residents and businesses mentioned above.</p> <p>It is inconceivable that the entry/exit on Kalamunda Road is being considered as a reasonable solution to access the Hatch Court Precinct. Our opposition is Twofold: e e First, the inordinately increased danger to residents in crossing Kalamunda Rd to access the Bus Stop on foot and the increased danger of collision introduced by the additional intersection; Second, the serious degradation of lifestyle caused by increased congestion and inherent noise, exhaust fumes and risk in negotiating the proposed traffic situation.</p> <p>Separate representations have been made to a Council official seeking information on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ the process that will be followed should the proposal be approved by council,</li><li>▪ any estimates of traffic flows along the proposed road, any vehicle profiling that has been done,</li><li>▪ any alternate routes considered and why they were rejected,</li><li>▪ any Health and Safety studies performed in relation to the new road</li><li>▪ and any environmental studies performed in relation to the proposal.</li></ul> <p><b>Submission 2</b></p> <p>As it currently stands, Kalamunda Road is not wide enough to cater safely for current traffic flow, in particular peak hour traffic with little space to enable</p>	
---	--

	<p>sufficient widening to meet current, let alone anticipated requirements particularly given the projected need for trucks to enter/access the project area. Requiring a wide swing. (Just yesterday 15/1/25) some sort of roadwork was happening at the junction of Stirling and K. Rd causing a bank up of traffic as far as the Coles shopping Complex.</p> <p>It becomes a safety issue for those choosing to enter/exit the village entry point.</p> <p>Increased noise, fumes etc - all having an adverse on the environment as well as the resident within the region.</p> <p>There are many issues which give rise for concerns, not the least of which is the apparent fact that this project has been 'in the works' for many years, only now made known to the public and then immediately before xmas when people are away/busy/preoccupied with festivities and only given 3 weeks to respond. This implies secrecy and feeds distrust within the wider community.</p>
19	<p><b>Do Not Support –</b></p> <p>Poor roadworks, bottle necks at intersections on Stirling crescent at both Kalamunda Rd and GEH Bypass, new warehouses have now increased an already heavy 'truck corridor' in our residential area</p> <p>There is no clear split between residential and industrial.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Please refer to the City's response to Submission No.1.</p>

	<p>Each intersection off Stirling crescent is an accident waiting to happen between heavy traffic off the bypass and impatient heavy haulage.</p>	
20	<p><b>Do Not Support –</b></p> <p>I am writing to provide feedback on the proposal to permit RAV-4 heavy vehicle access on Kalamunda Road, particularly in relation to the recently advertised Draft Local Planning Policy 35 – Hatch Court Light Industrial Area (LPP35). I wish to express my concerns respectfully but firmly, as the proposal has significant implications for the safety and wellbeing of residents at Hillview Lifestyle Village.</p> <p>Hillview Lifestyle Village is home to a large number of older residents who rely on safe, predictable road conditions for walking, mobility scooter use, and vehicle access. The village has a single entry and exit point directly onto Kalamunda Road, and many residents have reduced reaction times or use mobility aids. Any increase in heavy vehicle traffic in this location poses a heightened safety risk.</p> <p>The draft LPP35 indicates that a new industrial access road—designed specifically for RAV-4 vehicles—is proposed to connect directly into Kalamunda Road in close proximity to the village entrance. This raises several concerns:</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Please refer to the City's response to Submission No.1.</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ <b>Safety Risks:</b> RAV-4 vehicles have longer stopping distances, larger blind spots, and greater crash severity. Their presence near a senior living community significantly increases the risk for residents entering or exiting the village.</li><li>▪ <b>Public Transport Access:</b> A Transperth bus stop located approximately 200 metres from the village is heavily used by residents travelling to Midland and the High Wycombe Train Station. Increased heavy vehicle movements will make it more difficult and potentially unsafe for seniors to access this stop, particularly those using mobility aids.</li><li>▪ <b>Traffic Impact:</b> The Transport Impact Assessment notes an additional 198 heavy vehicle movements per day. In practical terms, this equates to one heavy vehicle every few minutes during operating hours, creating constant pressure on residents attempting to safely turn onto Kalamunda Road.</li><li>▪ <b>Amenity and Noise:</b> Increased heavy vehicle traffic will result in higher noise and vibration levels, which will directly affect the health, comfort, and quality of life of nearby residents.</li><li>▪ <b>Lack of Mitigation Measures:</b> The draft policy does not address how these impacts will be managed or mitigated for the vulnerable population living adjacent to the proposed RAV-4 route.</li></ul> <p>Given these concerns, I respectfully request that the City reconsider permitting RAV-4 access on this section of</p>	
--	--

	<p>Kalamunda Road and ensure that the safety and wellbeing of Hillview Lifestyle Village residents are prioritised in all planning decisions. I also ask that the City provide clarity on what assessments have been undertaken to evaluate the risks to older residents and public transport users.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback. I would appreciate confirmation that this email has been received and will be considered as part of the consultation process</p>	
21	<p><b>Do Not Support –</b></p> <p>This is My Own Personal Submission Against Your Proposal to Build a New Major Road in the Hatch Court Light Industrial Area named LPP 35.</p> <p>I am one of the many people who live in Hillview Village which is opposite where this new road is proposed. Our main entrance is very near to the proposed entrance and exit of this new road.</p> <p>There are 273 houses in this village, some of which are occupied by two people, meaning that there are approximately 344 people living in the village. Added to this, there are many people who work here, such as Serenitas' head office staff, gardeners, cleaners and so on. Many of the people living here are retired, have health issues and need support workers who come in and out regularly. We see ambulances coming in and</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Please refer to the City's response to Submission No.1.</p>

out daily and I have seen as many as 3 in one day. This all shows just how important this village entrance is and how important it is especially for ambulances to have quick and easy access in and out.

I can only imagine the chaos that would occur if this proposed major road was built there. Very large trucks coming in and out causing traffic to stop, queues to form and villagers unable to be on time for medical appointments and if the movements of ambulances are restricted, deaths could even occur. Even if this road was only used 30% of the time, these problems would still occur. We also have a bus stop in that area of Kalamunda Road, which services our village and crossing over to it could become dangerous as well.

I haven't yet heard why this road is even needed? These very large trucks would not be allowed to come on to Kalamunda Road, so it would have to be widened, causing more chaos. Why can't Abernethy Road be used? It is only a very short distance from our village entrance down to the lights and if you turn right there, the road is wide and can be used by large trucks taking them up to the Great Eastern Highway Bypass. Why can't Adelaide Street be used for any large vehicles to go in and out of that Hatch Court area and on to Abernethy Road; widening Adelaide Street and using it, wouldn't affect anywhere near as many people. We already have a new airport runway to put up with, when it opens in a

	<p>couple of years' time; more noise and more fumes. You would also be devaluing our homes.</p> <p>Many years ago we were promised a new road that was to be built coming from Abernethy Road, cutting through and ending up at Runnings, where that large roundabout was built to receive it. That road would have greatly decreased the queueing that we have to put up with every day, as we come from this area to go to Runnings or Midland Gate shopping Centre or even the hospital. The worst queues are on Clayton Street and Lloyd Street, where the queueing is continual. Military Road and Great Eastern Highway are often as bad. I doubt if there are many other roads as busy as these, in and around Perth. This is all bad enough and now you want to make our lives even worse with this dreadful proposal.</p>	
22	<p><b>Do Not Support –</b>  I'm writing to object most strongly to this silly dangerous idea.</p> <p>The main entrance to the village is opposite the entry/exit to this new road. This is one of only two exit and entry points to the village. The other road is on the side of the village and is only one way. Ther is no access from this exit to Midland or Pert. To gain access to either is very round about.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Please refer to the City's response to Submission No.1.</p>

	<p>It is a very dangerous idea to have the people who live in the village and their visitors to have to cope with huge trucks trundling down the road.</p> <p>Why is Stirling or Abernethy not being used as Abernethy is a wide road that can accommodate large trucks.</p> <p>I am fearful and very worried about what the impact of this road will have on my life.</p>	
23	<p><b>Do Not Support –</b></p> <p>There are a number of issues specific to the residents of Hillview Lifestyle Village (the Village) regarding the proposed road rated for RAV4 vehicles intended to link Adelaide St to Kalamunda Rd opposite the main entrance to the Village:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Emergency vehicle access to the Village - <u>this is vital</u>, as ambulances regularly attend the Village to provide care and/or transport for residents</li> <li>▪ Access for home care providers to offer assistance to residents to ensure they are able to remain in their own homes while receiving needed care services</li> <li>▪ Transport service providers facilitating transport for residents to medical appointments and similar services also access the Village on a regular basis</li> </ul>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Please refer to the City's response to Submission No.1.</p> <p>As part of the traffic analysis, the need for a road connection has already been established. Whilst the future road alignment has yet to be determined, it is evident that the alignment will impact Lot 13 Hatch Court and Lot 9000 Adelaide Street due to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The City has acquired Lot 13, with the expressed intent to deliver a road connection through to Adelaide Street.</li> <li>▪ The owners of Lot 9000, have already constructed the road reservation in accordance with WAPC subdivision approval (WAPC Ref: 210974)</li> </ul> <p>The traffic analysis for the Local Structure Plan has recommended that the new and existing road (Hatch</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Delivery services require safe access to the Village, as many residents utilise these services when they are unable to access shops, etc. under their own power</li> </ul> <p>Doesn't a RAV4-rated road directly opposite Hillview Lifestyle Village fly in the face of Local Structure Plan 3 (Table 4.1), which states that traffic management planning for LPP35 will ensure that "vehicular access to Kalamunda Road does not reduce existing levels of access for adjacent properties"?</p> <p>As Kalamunda Rd between Abernethy Rd and Stirling Cres is not currently rated for use by <u>any</u> class of Restricted Access Vehicle, how is the council proposing that vehicles of RAV4 class will be able to gain access to the proposed new road transecting Lot 200 Kalamunda Rd (Enviropipes)?</p> <p>If there are changes made to the vehicle rating for Kalamunda Rd to permit use by RAVs, including widening the road, how will this impact the current infrastructure in place – power lines, telecommunications access, public transport, etc. and how will this affect pedestrian access and the current sidewalks? How close would such widening bring the road to the border of the Village?</p> <p>The impact of heavy vehicles on this section of road will be an increase in traffic on Kalamunda Rd and will create a bottleneck where the new intersection is proposed to</p>	<p>Court) be classified as RAV4, which is necessary to deliver freight logistics land use outcome in the HCLIA.</p>
---	---

<p>intersect Kalamunda Rd. Has the council weighed up how this will affect traffic flow and volumes? What consideration has been given to the safety of pedestrians attempting to cross Kalamunda Rd, especially regarding access to public transport?</p> <p>In relation to public transport availability and safe access, the map provided by the council indicates that the proposed new road will enter Kalamunda Rd where the bus stop is currently located – what will happen to this stop? Suggesting that residents can “use the next bus stop” along Kalamunda Rd is not viable for those with mobility issues, as approx. 300 metres may not sound like a long walk but would cause serious issues for anyone who requires mobility aids (walking stick, rolling frame, etc.) to walk at all. This was the same issue that was raised when the public transport changes were made in conjunction with the opening of High Wycombe Train Station; submissions by residents of the Village ensured that the current bus stops were maintained to provide ease of access to public transport.</p> <p>As public transport is a vital part of the infrastructure put in place by the WA state government, has the council consulted with the Public Transport Authority WA on the impact of the proposed new road on current and future public transport availability? This will impact not only the residents of the Village, but also those in</p>	
---	--

<p>the surrounding residential streets (such as Chullwynne Mews and its connecting streets).</p> <p>Abernethy Rd is currently rated for vehicles in excess of the desired RAV4 rating. As Abernethy Rd runs parallel to the proposed new road and Adelaide St is accessible in both directions from Abernethy Rd, why is the proposed new road required at all? Additionally, Adelaide St will also remain accessible from Stirling Cres, which also runs parallel to proposed new road.</p> <p>The Department of Planning, Lands and Heritage and the WA Planning Commission's document <u><a href="#">State Planning Policy 3.6 Infrastructure Contributions</a></u> (April 2021) defined the principle of need and nexus as: <i>The need for the infrastructure must be clearly demonstrated (need) and the connection between the development and the demand created should be clearly established (nexus).</i></p> <p>There is currently substantial ongoing development in the vicinity of Adelaide St and along Stirling Cres between Adelaide St and the Great Eastern Highway Bypass, with no changes required to the vehicular ratings of those roads. If a higher rating is not required for the current industrial businesses in this area (including logistics companies, manufacturers, etc.), why is a RAV4 road required at all? Where is the anticipated demand? How does this meet the 'Need and Nexus' test?</p>	
---	--

<p>The council has, according to the minutes of the Ordinary Council Meeting on 25 November 2025, acquired Lot 13 Hatch Court and entered into an agreement with the owner of Lot 9000 Adelaide St to enable future development of a road between Hatch Court and Adelaide St. This should provide the needed access for the HCLIA without the need for an extension of the road to Kalamunda Rd. Additionally, LPP35 includes a reference to converting Hatch Court into a cul-de-sac. Won't this limit access for current and potential future residents? Wouldn't maintaining access to Hatch Court via Stirling Cres provide an additional access point for the HCLIA?</p> <p>Of note, Ward Councillor Lisa Cooper attended a meeting to discuss LPP35 held at Hillview Lifestyle Village on 09 January 2026. In response to questions regarding the intended road as shown on the map provided by the Kalamunda Council in LPP35, Councillor Cooper provided the following information:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. LPP35 is a policy document only.</li><li>2. The road as shown is a "concept" road and will not be built.</li><li>3. The option of extending the road to Kalamunda Rd "was considered some time ago and will not come through to Kalamunda Road".</li></ol>	
--	--

	<p>Given the above issues arising from LPP35 and its potential impact upon residents of the Village, there has been a great deal of uncertainty and agitation about the likely implementation of this plan. Hopefully the Public Agenda Briefing on 10 February 2026 will provide a greater degree of certainty regarding the future of LPP35.</p>	
24	<p><b>Do Not Support –</b></p> <p>Traffic on Kalamunda road is already too congested and makes turning on and off this road very dangerous. I visit the Lifestyle village daily to see my 93-year-old mother and have had many close calls with cars trying to slide down the side of my car to get past.</p> <p>The truck traffic turning off Kalamunda road has increased over the last few years and adds to the danger.</p> <p>Can I ask why Abernethy road and the roads leading off this, further on are not being developed and used instead of pushing more trucks down Kalamunda road?</p> <p>I have lived in High Wycombe for 40 years and have seen the area degrade into an unattractive entry point to the suburb.</p>	<p>Please refer to the City's response to Submission No.1.</p>
25	<p><b>Do Not Support –</b></p> <p>My husband [REDACTED] is the owner of [REDACTED] [REDACTED], so I am therefore directly affected by the</p>	<p>Please refer to the City's response to Submission No.1.</p> <p>In order to clarify the purpose of LPP35, the Policy is intended as an interim measure to guide subdivision and</p>

<p>outcome of this Draft LPP35. I note the previous Draft LPP35 was abandoned in October 2024, yet the COK has created further uncertainty by proposing to re-implement Draft LPP35 in a revised format.</p> <p>The re-introduction of a newly proposed Draft LPP35 has unnecessarily halted further development in the Hatch Court Precinct. It has already been proven by the numerous lots that have achieved development approval (DA) through JDAP or MODAP, forming approximately 70% of the precinct area, that there is no need and nexus for the proposed Draft LPP35.</p> <p>DA's have been successfully approved by following orderly and proper planning principles and existing framework guidelines, and without the need and nexus for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>an additional road connection,</li> <li>a future road provision to Hatch Court,</li> <li>a Local Structure Plan (LSP),</li> <li>a Developer Contributions Plan (DCP).</li> </ul> <p>These are clearly aspirations of the COK only, and not the landowners within the precinct.</p> <p>I object to the Draft LPP35 for the Hatch Court Light Industrial Area as currently proposed, for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Proposed Future Road – no need and nexus, the road is not referenced in Table 4 of LPS3 and 70% of the HCLIA has already been developed without the</li> </ul>	<p>development within the Hatch Court Light Industrial Area (HCLIA) in a manner that does not prejudice or prevent coordinated planning and infrastructure delivery in future through a Local Structure Plan (LSP), Development Contribution Plan (DCP) or alternative infrastructure funding mechanism, and Design Guidelines (Planning Framework).</p> <p>As part of the traffic analysis, the need for a road connection has already been established. Whilst the future road alignment has yet to be determined, it is evident that the alignment will impact Lot 13 Hatch Court and Lot 9000 Adelaide Street due to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The City has acquired Lot 13, with the expressed intent to deliver a road connection through to Adelaide Street.</li> <li>▪ The owners of Lot 9000, have already constructed the road reservation in accordance with WAPC subdivision approval (WAPC Ref: 210974)</li> </ul> <p>The traffic analysis for the Local Structure Plan has recommended that the new and existing road (Hatch Court) be classified as RAV4, which is necessary to deliver freight logistics land use outcome.</p> <p>Without implementation LPP35 and the broader planning framework, there is a significant risk that development and infrastructure delivery will occur in an uncoordinated manner.</p>
---	--

	<p>need for an additional road and Lot 15 was purchased in 2004, with no encumbrances allowing for full development of the lot.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ RAV 4 Road Requirements – the HCLIA is zoned light industrial and the majority of lots approved DA's do not need RAV 4 vehicle access.</li> <li>▪ Proposed Local Structure Plan – In May 2022, 18 of the lot owners signed a petition against the requirement for a LSP, Clause 27(2) OF THE planning and Development Regulations 2015 enables lots to be developed without the need for a LSP.</li> <li>▪ Proposed DCP – There is no requirement in LSP for a DCP; Implementation of a DCP will prejudice and financially disadvantage the remainder of the lots; the DCP will be inequitable given the majority (70%) of the HCLIA has been approved for development; will impose to much cost onto the remaining landowners.</li> <li>▪ Inequity – Lot 15 will be unfairly and disproportionately burden by the widening of Hatch Court due to its road frontage.</li> </ul> <p>In conclusion, the reintroduction of draft LPP35 does not reasonably reflect or consider the necessary proper planning principles required to be applied, such as, need and nexus, fair and reasonable, equity for land owners, certainty and consistency.</p>	<p>The city is fortunate that development constructed to date has not prejudiced the City's ability to deliver a coordinated development and infrastructure outcome for the HCLIA.</p> <p>It is not evident to date, that there is overwhelming opposition from landowners in the HCLIA to the City progressing the planning framework for the area.</p>
26	Do Not Support –	Noted.

	To Dangerous entering and exiting the driveway of the lifestyle village.	Please refer to the City's response to Submission No.1.
27	<b>Do Not Support –</b> Expensive folly. More residential land urgently required. Road chaos. Totally unfair impost on existing businesses and residences.	Noted.  Please refer to the City's response to Submission No.1.
28	<b>Do Not Support –</b> As an owner of one of the undeveloped properties on Hatch Court, I have serious concerns about this proposed local planning policy.  The two major concerns at this stage are the proposed RAV4 roadway extending from Hatch Court to Kalamunda Road and the unreasonably high development contributions that will be placed on the remaining properties that do not currently have planning approval.  Both proposals will seriously undermine the viability of any future development in the precinct.  The RAV4 road has not been advertised previously, and Hatch Court residents were not consulted. While there is an obvious need for the road extending from Hatch Court to Adelaide Street there is no obvious advantage, considerable cost and serious traffic/safety issues associated with such a large road opening onto Kalamunda Road.	Noted.  Please refer to the City's response to Submission No.1.  Under s7 of LPP35, the Policy seeks a commitment from developers to paying a developer contribution costs once the Scheme has been adopted. However given the level of development that has occurred in the HCLIA to date, the City through its consultant team is currently reevaluating preferred model to fund the infrastructure necessary to facilitate the coordinated development of the land within the HCLIA.

	<p>The proposed development contribution scheme has unfairly landed on the remaining properties in the precinct that do not already have planning approval, further reducing the viability of developing these properties, potentially isolating current landowners, leaving them surrounded by industry and unable to sell. I would also like to highlight the poor timing and short lead time to comment on this proposal. Residents were only notified in mid-December, just prior to Christmas. While we are seeking advice from Town Planners there has been little time to formulate a more formal response.</p>	
29	<p><b>Do Not Support -</b></p> <p>My objection to this LLP35 Hatch Court development is the allowance of a Road thought Lot 15 &amp; Lot 200 which would lead to a new intersection at Kalamunda Road. This would be extremely dangerous for the residence of the Hillview Lifestyle Village. I see no reason why the road has a need to go through lot 15 and lot 200 as all traffic inside the development can use the Adelaide Road route to Abernethy Road route.</p> <p>For this road to be constructed Kalamunda would need to be upgraded to a RAV 4 status. This would require widening and possible extra land.</p> <p>I refer to the Local Planning Scheme3 5.23 Table 4</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Please refer to the City's response to Submission No.1.</p>

	<p>Additional Site and Development Requirements - NO mention is there of Kalamunda RD being upgraded to a RAV 4 standard.</p> <p>I also feel that the Need and Nexus of the future work required for the road extension have not been met. I do not see a reasonable need for the road to continue through lot 15 is required. The nexus that Kalamunda Rd upgrade to a RAV4 standard which not part of our Local Planning Scheme has not been tested.</p> <p>My understanding is that the owners of Lot 200 also oppose this road which sends a clear message that Business and Residential have no hunger for this waste of future budgets being spent on rushed development.</p>	
30	<p><b>Do Not Support –</b></p> <p>As an owner of one of the undeveloped properties on Hatch Court, I have serious concerns about this proposed local planning policy (LPP).</p> <p>The two major concerns at this stage are the unreasonably high development contributions that will be placed on the remaining properties that do not currently have planning approval and the proposed RAV4 roadway extending from Hatch Court to Kalamunda Road. Both proposals will seriously undermine the viability of any future development in the precinct.</p> <p>With Hatch Court now &gt;50% sold for light industry</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Please refer to the City's response to Submission No.1.</p> <p>Under s7 of LPP35, the Policy seeks a commitment from developers to paying a developer contribution costs once the Scheme has been adopted. However given the level of development that has occurred in the HCLIA to date, the City through its consultant team is currently reevaluating preferred model to equitably fund the infrastructure necessary to facilitate the coordinated development of the land within the HCLIA. The analysis will determine the preferred infrastructure funding model to support the LSP.</p>

	<p>development and those with planning approval excluded from the development contribution, the remaining lots will be burdened with unreasonable development contributions, well in excess of typical rates.</p> <p>While there is a long-standing plan for the road connecting Hatch Court to Adelaide Street, there is no obvious requirement for the Hatch Court to Kalamunda Road connection. It will remove a significant portion of Lot 15 from future light industrial development, will further increase the Hatch Court precinct development costs and raise traffic/safety issues associated with such a road entering onto Kalamunda Road.</p> <p>The rationale for a RAV4 requirement is unclear.</p> <p>With Hatch Court now &gt;50% sold for light industry development, with lots being sold singly or in pairs, the remaining residential lots can only be sold in a similar manner. The LPP and LSP in progress needs to be cognizant of this and I encourage a much higher level of engagement with remaining residential landowners (key stakeholders in this process) before the draft LSP is prepared. On the current trajectory of this LPP and LSP, some landowners, such as ourselves, will be left isolated with unsaleable properties surrounded on all sides by industrial development.</p>	<p>With regard to future community engagement The City is currently undertaking a range of technical investigations to support preparation of the Local Structure Plan. The analysis will consider include traffic, environmental and wetland assessments, and infrastructure planning. This work will help identify the most appropriate long-term planning outcomes for the area, including how development is managed, how the precinct interfaces with nearby residential areas, and how environmental values are protected.</p> <p>Once this technical work is complete, a draft Local Structure Plan will be prepared mid-2026 and advertised for public comment. This will provide the community with a further opportunity to review the proposed planning approach, understand the supporting studies, ask questions, and provide feedback.</p>
31	Do Not Support –	Noted.

	Total disregard for local residents.	
32	<p><b>Do Not Support –</b></p> <p>The proposed new road alignment from Hatch Court through Lot 15 Hatch Court, and Lot 200 to Kalamunda Road in unnecessary. Any references to the this proposed future section of road should be deleted from the Draft LPP35 and all subsequent documents.</p> <p>As per the City's Local Planning Scheme No: 3, there is no requirement for a Road through Lot 15 Hatch Court, and Lot 200 to Kalamunda Road.</p> <p>The proposed road will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ introduce another intersection on to Kalamunda Road, in the vicinity of the Lifestyle village, and the 2 bus stops, reducing existing levels of access.</li> <li>▪ Create further noise, fumes and increased danger to residents living in the area and anyone who uses this section of Kalamunda Road.</li> <li>▪ Produce further unwanted industrial traffic onto Kalamunda Road.</li> </ul> <p>Given the above all traffic from within the Hatch Court Precinct should be directed northwards to Adelaide Street or via Stirling Crescent, as this should be all that is required for such a small industrial precinct.</p> <p>I therefore request the City of Kalamunda amend Draft LPP35 and all subsequent documents to remove the proposed new road section from the Hatch Court cul-de-sac through Lot 15 Hatch Court, and Lot 200 to Kalamunda Road.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Please refer to the City's response to Submission No.1.</p>

33	<p><b>Do Not Support –</b></p> <p>The proposed new road alignment from Hatch Court through Lot 15 Hatch Court, and Lot 200 to Kalamunda Road in unnecessary. Any references to the this proposed future section of road should be deleted from the Draft LPP35 and all subsequent documents.</p> <p>As per the City's Local Planning Scheme No: 3, there is no requirement for a Road through Lot 15 Hatch Court, and Lot 200 to Kalamunda Road.</p> <p>The proposed road will;</p> <p>introduce another intersection on to Kalamunda Road, in the vicinity of the Lifestyle village, and the 2 bus stops, reducing existing levels of access.</p> <p>Create further noise, fumes and increased danger to residents living in the area and anyone who uses this section of Kalamunda Road.</p> <p>Produce further unwanted industrial traffic onto Kalamunda Road.</p> <p>Given the above all traffic from within the Hatch Court Precinct should be directed northwards to Adelaide Street or via Stirling Crescent, as this should be all that is required for such a small industrial precinct.</p> <p>I therefore request the City of Kalamunda amend Draft LPP35 and all subsequent documents to remove the proposed new road section from the Hatch Court cul-de-sac through Lot 15 Hatch Court, and Lot 200 to Kalamunda Road.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Please refer to the City's response to Submission No.1.</p>
----	---	--

34	<p><b>Do Not Support –</b></p> <p>The proposed new road alignment from Hatch Court through Lot 15 Hatch Court, and Lot 200 to Kalamunda Road in unnecessary. Any references to the this proposed future section of road should be deleted from the Draft LPP35 and all subsequent documents.</p> <p>As per the City's Local Planning Scheme No: 3, there is no requirement for a Road through Lot 15 Hatch Court, and Lot 200 to Kalamunda Road.</p> <p>The proposed road will;</p> <p>introduce another intersection on to Kalamunda Road, in the vicinity of the Lifestyle village, and the 2 bus stops, reducing existing levels of access.</p> <p>Create further noise, fumes and increased danger to residents living in the area and anyone who uses this section of Kalamunda Road.</p> <p>Produce further unwanted industrial traffic onto Kalamunda Road.</p> <p>Given the above all traffic from within the Hatch Court Precinct should be directed northwards to Adelaide Street or via Stirling Crescent, as this should be all that is required for such a small industrial precinct.</p> <p>I therefore request the City of Kalamunda amend Draft LPP35 and all subsequent documents to remove the proposed new road section from the Hatch Court cul-de-sac through Lot 15 Hatch Court, and Lot 200 to Kalamunda Road.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Please refer to the City's response to Submission No.1.</p>
----	---	--

35	<p><b>Do Not Support –</b></p> <p>I have tried to contact the council about some concerns regarding this proposal. I have left a message and not had a reply.</p> <p>This vote of no support may have been different if I could have clarified some matters.</p> <p>First - The proposal is vague and confusing. I know its a draft but the different groups of people/businesses are lumped together and it doesn't clearly explain how existing residents, existing businesses and prospective new businesses are affected.</p> <p>Perhaps some information on how each group will be affected would have been helpful? And in plain English.</p> <p>Second - At 7.2 (a) It mentions land being ceded free of cost to the crown for the widening of Hatch Court and the formation of the cul-de-sac at Stirling Crescent end. Will that mean that existing residences and businesses will lose a section of their land without compensation for that loss? Will the council buy that land from us? Whom bears the cost of the necessary realignment of the services? ie power, water, gas, phone.</p> <p>Third - At 7.3 (c) This section mentions sharing the cost equally among all landowners. Does this mean we as</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The intent of LPS35 is to introduce planning controls for the HCLIA so that subdivision and development applications occurring prior to the City adopting a structure plan and infrastructure funding mechanism can occur without affecting the coordinated planning outcome required.</p> <p>Only landowners wishing to develop their land will be subject to the provisions of LPP35.</p> <p>The ceding of land for development purposes and all associated works is a normal development cost, and typically will be applied at the time when the landowner submits a development/subdivision application for their land.</p> <p>If your land is affected by the future new road alignment then all development costs associated with the construction of the road are recoverable through a future DCP Model.</p> <p>Under a DCP model, developer contributions are only triggered at the development or subdivision stage of the planning process. If you have no intention of developing</p>
----	---	---

	<p>residents and landowners will be required to contribute to the redevelopment/road works? We are not doing any development on our land and would not benefit from any of this work. Quite the contrary. We have already had to deal with noise, dust and considerable vibrations from previous building work in the area.</p>	<p>your land then you are not required to pay the developer contribution.</p> <p>Given the level of development that has occurred in the HCLIA to date, the City through its consultant team is currently reevaluating the preferred DCP model.</p> <p>The analysis will therefore identify the DCP and rating options that the City can deploy to equitably fund the infrastructure necessary to facilitate the coordinated development of the land within the HCLIA. The analysis will determine the preferred infrastructure funding model to support the LSP. Accordingly, It is recommended that all text in LPP35 referring to the DCP be modified to reflect the above.</p>
36	<p><b>Do Not Support –</b></p> <p>I oppose upgrading the roads to Class RAV4 as none of the surrounding roads are to this rating. Further this is in keeping with the "Light Industrial" zoning &amp; not "General Industrial" use. Hatch Court upgrade should not be part of this LPP35.</p> <p>The access from Adelaide Street should terminate at Hatch Court and not continue to Kalamunda Rd. This</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Please refer to the City's response to Submission No.1.</p>

	would be more appropriate as LPS3 Amendment 80 Clause 5.23.1 Table 4. Reject Clauses 7.1(a) & 7.2 (a) of LPP35	
37 – petition with 200 signatories lodged with this submission	<b>Do Not Support –</b> Whilst the concept of developing the HCLIA is not opposed, the proposed access to the precinct and in particular access via Kalamunda Road is most definitely opposed.	Noted. Please refer to previous response to the intent of LPP35 and the indicated road located shown on Figure 1 of the Policy.
38	<b>Do Not Support –</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The proposed new road alignment will have an unnecessary impact on the subject site. The road connection is unnecessary and will introduce further industrial traffic to Kalamunda Road.</li> <li>▪ There is no clear need or nexus for the proposed connection for RAV4 vehicles through to Kalamunda Road (south east of Abernethy Road).</li> <li>▪ The proposed controls are not aligned with the existing planning framework and requirements under Local Planning Scheme No. 3 (LPS3).</li> <li>▪ Development contributions, lack of certainty, and disproportionate impact on a small number of landowners, for significant and unnecessary works.</li> </ul>	Noted. LPP35 does not determine final development outcomes or infrastructure locations. Instead, it is intended to ensure that any development that may occur in the short term does not prevent or limit future planning once the Local Structure Plan is completed.  The need and nexus for the preferred road alignment will be determined through the traffic analysis being prepared to support the proposed local structure plan design.  It is understood that the primary vehicle access point to the HCLIA will be via Adelaide Street, however the traffic modelling will consider a number of options as to whether a secondary point entry/exit point is also warranted.  The traffic modelling will determine the preferred road alignment through the local structure plan process, which

		will have regard to inter alia costs which will inform the DCP outcomes.
39	<p><b>Do Not Support –</b></p> <p>Our client strongly objects to the identification of any future road alignment that would traverse, encumber, reserve, or otherwise constrain the use and development of Lot 200.</p> <p>The inclusion of such an alignment within Draft LPP35 would unreasonably prejudice an established and lawfully operating industrial landholding, impose an inequitable infrastructure burden on a single landowner, and effectively pre-empt outcomes that should properly be resolved through a future, comprehensive structure planning and infrastructure assessment process.</p> <p>Removing the proposed road alignment insofar as it affects Lot 200 would ensure that Draft LPP35 performs its intended interim planning role without placing unnecessary or unjustified limitations on the ongoing and future use of the subject site.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Please refer to the City's response to Submission No.1.</p>
40	<p><b>Do Not Support –</b></p> <p>It is not possible for a fair, equitable, certain and consistent DCP to be prepared for the HCLIA, given approvals have already been issued in the HCLIA with no</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Please refer to the City's response to Submission No.1.</p>



<p>conditions requiring arrangements to be made to secure payment of a development contribution.</p> <p>The southern leg of the proposed road connection is unnecessary.</p> <p>However, acknowledging that the City is attempting to enable development to occur while it undertakes the necessary strategic planning, we would be prepared to support LPP 35 if the City made the following changes all four numbered changes in this and abandoned its plans to prepare a DCP.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Delete clauses 3b), 3d), 7.1a), 7.2d) and 7.3c);</li> <li>▪ Delete the reference to the Development Contribution Plan in clause 7.3b).</li> <li>▪ Deletes the southern leg of the proposed road between Hatch Court and Kalamunda Road from Figure 1;</li> <li>▪ Removes references to a cul-de-sac at the Stirling Crescent / Hatch Court intersection from provisions 6.1c), 7.1b) and 7.2a), as that intersection will remain necessary if the southern leg is not constructed.</li> </ul> <p>These four requested changes will better align draft LPP35 with its intended purpose, prevent landowners from becoming liable to inequitably contribute towards</p>	<p>Given the level of development that has occurred in the HCLIA to date, the City through its consultant team is currently reevaluating the preferred DCP model.</p> <p>The analysis will therefore identify the DCP and rating options that the City can deploy to equitably fund the infrastructure necessary to facilitate the coordinated development of the land within the HCLIA. The analysis will determine the preferred infrastructure funding model to support the LSP. Accordingly, It is recommended that all text in LPP35 referring to the DCP be modified to reflect the above.</p>
---	--

	<p>road infrastructure that appears to be flawed and unnecessary, and protect the interests of the landowners while longer-term strategic planning is undertaken.</p>	
41	<p><b>Comment Only –</b></p> <p>We appreciate that this LPP 35 is an interim document, bridging the gap until a Local Structure Plan has been prepared and approved. It is our clients intention to lodge a more detailed submission on the LSP when that is made available for public comment. This submission on LPP 35 is made to ensure that critical items that are yet to be tested are not assumed as "givens" in the LSP. These include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Hatch Court closure at Stirling Crescent;</li> <li>▪ Extent and implementation of common infrastructure contributions;</li> <li>▪ and Wetland impacts</li> </ul>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The City through its consultant team are currently reviewing its traffic access and movement options which will support the design outcome under the LSP.</p>
42	<p><b>Comment Only –</b></p> <p>The draft policy has been assessed against applicable regulations, policies and guidelines.</p> <p>Perth Airport does not have any objections to the policy as a whole. Assumed land uses are Acceptable under SPP 5.1</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>All development applications in the HCLIA will be referred to Perth Airport as a matter of course,</p>

	<p>Future office employees should be protected from the high levels and frequencies of aircraft noise. Perth Airport emphasises the importance to refer future development applications to allow for an assessment and the opportunity to recommend site specific conditions.</p>	
43 Public Transport Authority	<p><b>Comment Only –</b> The PTA has no comment regarding this application.</p>	Noted.
44 Water Corporation	<p><b>Comment Only –</b> Whilst it is acknowledged this proposal pertains to a Local Planning Policy, please note that any development proposals will require approval by our Building Services section prior to the commencement of works. Infrastructure contributions and fees may be required to be paid prior to approval being issued. The developer is expected to provide all water and sewerage reticulation if required. A contribution for Water, Sewerage and Drainage headworks may also be required. In addition, the developer may be required to fund new works or the upgrading of existing works and protection of all works associated with the Water Corporation. The Water Corporation may also require land being provided for works.</p>	Noted.
45 Department of Water and	<p><b>Non Objection</b></p>	Noted

Environmental Regulation		
-----------------------------	--	--