

### Schedule of Submissions

#### Proposed 'Reception Centre' and 10 Tourist Accommodation (Eco Tents) at 43 Horse Hill Road, Bremer Bay

No.	Submitter	Verbatim Submission	Officer Comments	Recommendation
1.	P & M Brown	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Presuming that the Shire will apply all the appropriate guidelines in running this sort of business, on a rural block, within the Point Gordon natural environment-</li> <li>2. Peter and I support the proposed reception centre and tourist accommodation, for 10 Eco Tents, and wish the proprietors all the best in their new business.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Note – all planning requirements will be applied in the determination of this application</li> <li>2. Note - Support</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Noted</li> <li>2. Noted</li> </ol>
2.	David Harder	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. I have no objection to this development Project in its current form.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Note - Support</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Noted</li> </ol>
3	David Harder	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. I am writing to formally withdraw the support I previously expressed regarding the proposed development at Salt Cove by Isaac Baum.</li> <li>2. At the time I provided my initial response, I had only been given one page of the proposal and was not provided with the full scope of the planned development. I have since become aware that the project includes the development of caravan sites, which was not disclosed to me earlier.</li> <li>3. This additional information places the proposal in direct conflict with my own interests.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Note</li> <li>2. Dismiss – this application does not propose any caravan bays</li> <li>3. Dismiss – this application does not propose any caravan bays and as such is not in conflict</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Noted</li> <li>2. Dismissed</li> <li>3. Dismissed</li> </ol>

		4. As such, I do not support the development, and I wish to have it officially noted that I rescind all support previously given.	4. Dismiss – the objection is based on a misinterpretation of what development is proposed on the site.	4. Dismissed
4	Daniel Hill and Sarah Hall – Head Chefs and Company Directors The Local Native Catering Company	<p>1. I am writing to you on behalf of 'The Local Native Catering Company' a local Bremer Bay based catering business to express our full support for the Wedding Venue Salt Cove owned by Issac and Brodie Baum and for their low impact, eco-friendly glamping accommodation proposed development</p> <p>2. Over the past two years we have been privileged to cater several beautiful weddings and events at Salt Cove, and we have firsthand seen the positive contribution the venue makes to our small coastal tourist town. The proposed addition of sustainable glamping accommodation for wedding couples and their guests is, in our view a thoughtful and well aligned enhancement to the already existing offers. Also, a great opportunity to showcase our beautiful coats line and promote this rare, beautiful, untamed south coastal town that we call home.</p> <p>3. As a local business, we also recognise the wider economic benefits. Weddings, functions and retreats bring valuable year-round</p>	<p>1. Note – Support</p> <p>2. Note – Support</p> <p>3. Note – Support</p>	<p>1. Noted</p> <p>2. Noted</p> <p>3. Noted</p>

		<p>trade to our town, supporting caterers and other food business not just us plus businesses like florists, photographers, accommodation providers and many other local suppliers By strengthening the venue's appeal through sustainable overnight options, this development would help maintain and potentially extend the wedding season, supporting stable employment and continued investments in our community.</p> <p>4. Importantly, from our experience working closely at the venue, the management team has demonstrated professionalism, solid environmental awareness, and respect for neighbours and the surrounding landscape We are confident that any development undertaken will be managed responsibly and sensitively.</p> <p>5. In summary we believe this proposal represents a sustainable, low-impact enhancement that will benefit wedding couples, local businesses and the wider community while aligning with the character of our picturesque coastal town.</p> <p>6. We respectfully ask that you give this application favourable consideration.</p>	<p>4. Note – Support</p> <p>5. Note – Support</p> <p>6. Note - Support</p>	<p>4. Noted</p> <p>5. Noted</p> <p>6. Noted</p>
--	--	--	--	---

5.	Elsie Collins and Owen Roberts The Roadhouse Hooked & Cooked	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Roadhouse would like to state that we approve of your business, Hosting Weddings.</li> <li>2. The weddings have brought many more people to town, which means the Roadhouse is busier, during our off season.</li> <li>3. Being notified when weddings are happening, have helped us ensure that we have enough staff on for the weekend and we have enough fuel on hand.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Note – Support</li> <li>2. Note – Support</li> <li>3. Note - Support</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Noted</li> <li>2. Noted</li> <li>3. Noted</li> </ol>
6.	Madeline Joy Bremer Bay Breakaways	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. I am writing to express my full support for Isaac &amp; Brodie Baum and their vision for Salt Cove in Bremer Bay.</li> <li>2. Their plans to host weddings &amp; glamping experiences will bring new visitors to our town and has already further enhanced Bremer Bay's reputation.</li> <li>3. As the owner of Bremer Bay Breakaways, I have already seen the positive effects from the weddings Isaac and Brodie hold, with many guests choosing to stay in local accommodation through my business. Their events generate valuable tourism and support surrounding operators, creating real benefits for the wider community.</li> <li>4. I see their venture as a positive addition to our local tourism, complementing existing accommodation and hospitality businesses while creating</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Note – Support</li> <li>2. Note – Support</li> <li>3. Note - Support</li> <li>4. Note - Support</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Noted</li> <li>2. Noted</li> <li>3. Noted</li> <li>4. Noted</li> </ol>

		<p>opportunities for collaboration across the community.</p> <p>5. I congratulate Isaac and Brodie on their initiative and am fully supportive of their exciting plans for Salt Cove.</p>	5. Note - Support	5. Noted
7.	Mel Joy Director Bremer Bay Resort	<p>1. We are writing to formally express our strong support for Isaac and Brodie Baum and their exciting vision for Salt Cove Bremer Bay.</p> <p>2. As the owners of The Bremer Bay Resort, we understand firsthand the importance of quality tourism experiences to the sustainability and growth of our town. Isaac and Brodie's plan to host weddings, glamping experiences, and other wellness activities at Salt Cove represents an important and valuable addition to the Bremer Bay community.</p> <p>3. Salt Cove Bremer Bay offers a truly exceptional setting, with its breathtaking ocean views and natural surroundings providing a first-class venue for weddings and intimate gatherings. Their intention to also host health and wellness programs and events, and other immersive experiences will attract a diverse range of visitors seeking meaningful and nature-based escapes.</p> <p>4. This venture will bring new visitors to Bremer Bay, extend length of stay, and further strengthen our reputation as a premium regional destination.</p>	<p>1. Note – Support</p> <p>2. Note – Support</p> <p>3. Note – Support</p> <p>4. Note – Support</p>	<p>1. Noted</p> <p>2. Noted</p> <p>3. Noted</p> <p>4. Noted</p>

		<p>Their business will work to complement our business. While Salt Cove will provide a unique event and retreat space, The Bremer Bay Resort offers motel accommodation, dining facilities, and a bottleshop that can support guests and event attendees. We see this as a collaborative opportunity that benefits not only our respective businesses but the broader community, including local suppliers, trades, hospitality providers, and property owners.</p> <p>5. Our residence (Gneiss Hill Road) is located close to Salt Cove, we are fully supportive of their plans and confident that Isaac and Brodie will operate their venue responsibly and with great care for the environment and community.</p> <p>6. We congratulate Isaac and Brodie on their initiative, vision, and commitment to enhancing Bremer Bay's tourism offering. We wholeheartedly support their proposal and wish them every success with this exciting venture.</p>	<p>5. Note - Support</p> <p>6. Note - Support</p>	<p>5. Noted</p> <p>6. Noted</p>
8.	Zane Mitchell Bremer Bay Brewing Company	<p>1. We are happy to supply this letter of support for Isaac and Brodie in relation to their wedding venue on Point Henry in Bremer Bay. As the owners of Bremer Bay Brewing Co we believe that their venture compliments many other businesses in our growing town. It does so by bringing in larger</p>	<p>1. Note – Support</p>	<p>1. Noted</p>

		groups who spend at all the businesses in town while they are here. This is trade we would not have if the weddings were held in another tourist town.		
9.	Narelle Wessling Bremer Bay General Store	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. I am writing as a local business owner within the Shire of Jerramungup to express my support for Isaac and Brodie Baum in their proposal to establish a wedding venue at Salt Cove, Bremer Bay, incorporating eco glamping accommodation.</li> <li>2. As a business operating in Bremer Bay, I recognise the significance of developments that attract visitors to the area, provided they respect the natural environment and bolster the local economy. This proposal is a well-thought-out opportunity to enhance sustainable tourism and diversify the town's offerings, all while maintaining the environmental values and character that both residents and visitors cherish in this unique part of the south coast.</li> <li>3. The proposed wedding venue and eco glamping tents will encourage event guests to extend their stays within the Shire. This, in turn, will increase patronage of local businesses, including catering services, accommodation providers, retail outlets, and hospitality venues. Destination-based tourism of this nature is especially valuable for</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Note – Support</li>   <li>2. Note – Support</li>   <li>3. Note – Support</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Noted</li>   <li>2. Noted</li>   <li>3. Noted</li> </ol>

		<p>regional communities and supports the ongoing economic resilience of the area.</p> <p>4. The eco glamping model offers low-impact, temporary accommodation that complements the local landscape. It minimises the need for permanent infrastructure, reduces environmental disturbance, and allows for effective site rehabilitation if required. On-site accommodation also lessens late-night travel and reduces traffic movements, enhancing safety for both guests and the broader community.</p> <p>5. In my view, this proposal aligns with the Shire of Jerramungup s goals of supporting sustainable development, fostering local employment, and ensuring responsible land use. With suitable management and operating conditions, the wedding venue and eco glamping tents will be a positive and complementary addition to the region.</p> <p>6. I strongly support this application and encourage the Shire to give it favourable consideration.</p>	<p>4. Note – Support</p> <p>5. Note – Support</p> <p>6. Note – Support</p>	<p>4. Noted</p> <p>5. Noted</p> <p>6. Noted</p>
10.	Peter & Elizabeth Tozer	<p>1. This submission to council is to oppose the broad scope of the 'Proposed Wedding &amp; Short-Stay Accommodation Development Application.</p>	<p>1. Note – Oppose</p>	<p>1. Noted</p>

		<p>2. In the Jerramungup TPS(2) it states that an objective of the Rural Residential (RR) Zone at Pt Henry is to Quote:          "to facilitate the creation of <i>quality rural-residential retreats</i> in a scenic coastal area," which I believe should be read in conjunction with this proposal on a rural zoned allocation as it is adjacent to, and would impact on these now developed residential lots, we share a long boundary with lot 112.</p> <p>3. The residents of these RR housing blocks have extra conditions to comply with, i.e.: specific building requirements, prohibits excessive clearing, most commercial/ development activities are excluded, no rural home businesses or rural pursuits. We agreed to these because we wanted to live in the ambience of a quite rural residential setting without the usual noise and bustle of town living.</p> <p>4. About 18 months ago in an initial conversation with the Proposers Isaac and Brodie Baume I indicated I did not have a problem with their proposed wedding reception venue, as this would not <u>include overnight stays</u>. I stand by that comment.</p>	<p>2. Dismiss - the site subject of the application is zoned 'Rural' and not 'Rural Residential'</p> <p>3. Dismiss - the site subject of the application is zoned 'Rural' and not 'Rural Residential'</p> <p>4. Note – support for Reception Centre</p>	<p>2. Dismissed</p> <p>3. Dismissed</p> <p>4. Noted</p>
--	--	--	---	---

		<p>5. Most of the work done by the consultants gathered for the proposal only addresses the wedding venue and Glamping tents, however the envisaged development is a lot bigger than that.</p> <p>6. The expansion in the plans is to also have at least twelve caravan bays, as indicated on the map in the proposal. If and when these bays are constructed, and available for tourists (I believe some bays are already there from previous camping stays on the Lot)</p> <p>7. For an emergency evacuation, (In the Bushfire Management Plan of the Project (BMP) 5.4.1.2 A3.4 and 5.4.1.4) there are tracks that lead onto the Northern firebreak and ultimately Magpie Rise. (The plans on the map show Magpie Rise is to be extended.) There are too many unauthorized vehicles on this firebreak now, even although the Shire and DEFES have tried to discourage it by signage and chains across the entry/exit points. With a potential of 20 to 30 vehicles on the lot at any given time, (10 eco-tents and 12 caravan bays, staff and the</p>	<p>5. Note - the development application only consists of the reception centre, 10 Glamping Tents, Fire Shelter and Toilet Block.</p> <p>6. Dismiss – No caravan bays are proposed as part of the development</p> <p>7. Note – there are only 10 Glamping Tents nor Caravan Bays are proposed.</p>	<p>5. Noted</p> <p>6. Dismissed</p> <p>7. Noted</p>
--	--	--	--	---

		<p>owners) it is an obvious short-cut to Short Beach and beyond.</p> <p>8. The Developer's Bushfire Management Plan 5.3.3 Element 4: <i>"The planning proposal is for a 'camping ground' vulnerable land use development. The required water supply dedicated to firefighting purposes is to be determined at the discretion of the local government and this will be complied with. Evidence is provided of the determined requirements and is presented as an Addendum in this BMP;"</i>  This does not address the fact that; with secluded bays and no line of site from management, it would be impossible to police what should be, a definite NO open flame policy. I cannot see a no fire (no open flame) policy in the proposal. I have smelt smoke from these campsites when campers have been onsite previously.</p> <p>9. The precedent of this planned development will have an impact on the whole of Point Henry, and its future development, not just the adjoining landholders who have been made aware of it.</p> <p>10. There is potential with this large 40ha site, to significantly expand the</p>	<p>8. Note –the Glamping Tents are considered a 'camping ground' No open fires will be permitted on the site</p> <p>9. Note – advertising was undertaken in accordance with Scheme requirements</p> <p>10. Dismiss - any expansion of the uses on the site</p>	<p>8. Noted</p> <p>9. Noted</p> <p>10. Dismissed</p>
--	--	--	--	--

		<p>development, with no guarantee that the number of Eco-tents or caravan bays will not increase in future - Or that the site will not be subdivided/wholly sold, to another developer, with permissions already in place, to construct even more caravan bays to make the venture a worthwhile investment.</p> <p>11. Further to the above, there are more rural lots available here, one adjacent to the current project, and I would not wish to see others viewing this as a precedent, and so consider more inbuilding/development/commercial investments on a similar or larger scale, thereby changing the dynamics of what was designed to be an alternative to town living, and a tree change on larger lots moulded into the beautiful surrounds of Point Henry</p> <p>12. I support the couple <i>in principle</i> in their endeavour to create a wedding venue and eco-tent, meditation tourist venue if all relevant Liquor and by-laws can be satisfied.</p>	<p>would be subject to another Development Application.</p> <p>11. Note – the development of any of the other rural lots will be the subject of a Development Application.</p> <p>12. Note - support</p>	<p>11. Noted</p> <p>12. Noted</p>
11.	Jennifer Yeo	<p>1. The subject land is zoned Rural under the Shire of Jerramungup Local Planning Scheme No. 2 (LPS2). A Reception Centre is not a use</p>	<p>1. Note -Reception Centre is an unlisted use and is dealt with under Clause 4.4.2 of Local Planning Scheme No. 2, Tourist</p>	<p>1. Noted</p>

		<p>contemplated as permitted or discretionary in the Rural zone under the LPS2 Zoning Table. It is, in effect, a prohibited use ('X') in this zone. Tourist Accommodation may be considered discretionary ('A') only if it is clearly ancillary to an active rural or primary production use on the land. No such rural enterprise is evident from the application materials.</p> <p>2. The objectives of the Rural zone under LPS2 are to protect agricultural land, maintain rural character, and prevent inappropriate land use conflicts. The proposed development, which includes a reception/function centre capable of hosting weddings and events, together with 10 short-stay glamping-style eco tents, is a high-intensity, visitor-facing commercial enterprise that is fundamentally inconsistent with these objectives.</p>	<p>Accommodation is a 'D' use rather than the 'A' use specified.</p> <p>2. Uphold - the subject lot is zoned 'rural' but it has not been developed for agricultural activity.</p> <p>The objectives of the 'rural' zone are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- To ensure the continuation of broad-hectare farming as the principal land use in the district and encouraging where appropriate the retention and expansion of agricultural activities where the land is capable of such development</li> <li>- To consider non-rural uses where they can be shown to be of benefit to the district and not detrimental to the natural</li> </ul>	<p>2. Upheld – reason for refusal – A Reception Centre is not considered consistent with the objectives of the 'rural' zone.</p>
--	--	--	---	--

			<p>resources or the environment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- To allow for facilities for tourists and travellers, and for recreation uses.</li><li>- To help protect rural land from land degradation and further loss of biodiversity by:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• minimising clearing of remnant vegetation</li><li>• encouraging retention and protection of remnant vegetation</li><li>• encouraging development and protection of vegetation corridors</li><li>• encouraging development of sustainable surface and sub-surface drainage works</li><li>• encouraging rehabilitation of salt-affected land</li><li>• encouraging soil conservation through land</li></ul></li></ul>	
--	--	--	---	--

		<p>3. The majority of properties on the Point Henry Peninsula, including those adjoining or near the subject site, are zoned Rural-Residential. Owners in this zone have a reasonable expectation of low-intensity, lifestyle-compatible land uses in the surrounding area. The proposed development would generate the following unacceptable amenity impacts.</p> <p>Noise from events, functions, music, and gatherings at the Reception</p>	<p>management measures</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• encouraging identification and protection of wetlands</li> </ul> <p>– To promote the sustainable management of natural resources, and the prevention of land degradation.</p> <p>The proposed use as a reception centre as an unlisted use is not consistent with the objectives for the ‘rural’ zone.</p> <p>3. Uphold – given the low density of surrounding development that activities on the site would have a negative impact on the amenity of adjoining properties.</p>	<p>3. Upheld The scale of the development is considered to have a negative impact on adjoining properties.</p>
--	--	---	---	--

		<p>Centre, particularly during evenings and weekends;</p> <p>4. Increased traffic volumes on Horse Hill Road, a rural road not designed to accommodate large numbers of event vehicles, buses, or caravans;</p> <p>5. With 40 car parking bays proposed, the development will generate a substantial volume of vehicle movements on Horse Hill Road and the surrounding road network. A venue of this scale — accommodating guests arriving and departing for functions, as well as 10 overnight accommodation units — could reasonably be expected to generate in excess of 40 vehicle entries and exits per day, with multiple movements occurring throughout the day and into the evening. Horse Hill Road is a narrow, unsealed rural road that is wholly unsuited to this level of traffic intensity. No traffic impact assessment has been provided with the application, and the Shire should require one before any approval is considered;</p>	<p>4. Uphold – large numbers of vehicles and buses may be associated with events. If Magpie Rise is constructed to connect to the site, the flow of additional traffic down this road would have a negative impact on amenity.</p> <p>5. Uphold - No traffic impact assessment has been provided with the application and as such there is insufficient information to determine the application.</p>	<p>4. Upheld – the increased traffic volumes would have a negative impact on the amenity of adjoining lots.</p> <p>5. Upheld – further information is required for a traffic impact assessment, and the application cannot be determined until this is satisfied.</p>
--	--	---	---	---

		<p>6. The application proposes an entrance via Magpie Rise, a residential street that connects to Short Beach — one of the most valued and heavily used community amenities on the Point Henry Peninsula. Routing commercial event and tourist traffic along Magpie Rise is wholly inappropriate. It would significantly increase traffic volumes on a quiet residential street, create safety concerns for pedestrians and families walking to Short Beach, and degrade the amenity of both the street and the beach precinct. Short Beach is used daily by local residents and visitors for swimming, walking, and recreation, and the introduction of a steady stream of event vehicles and tourist traffic along the access road to the beach would have a serious and lasting negative impact on the character and safety of this area;</p> <p>7. Light pollution from event lighting, vehicle headlights, and signage at night in what is currently a dark, rural coastal landscape;</p> <p>8. Loss of residential amenity and peaceful enjoyment for neighbouring property owners;</p>	<p>6. Uphold - If Magpie Rise is constructed to connect to the site, the flow of additional traffic down this road would have a negative impact on safety and amenity.</p> <p>7. Uphold – Light pollution would have a negative amenity impact on the surround area.</p> <p>8. Uphold - the nature of the development could impact residential amenity and peaceful</p>	<p>6. Upheld – the increased traffic volumes would have a negative impact on the safety and amenity of adjoining lots</p> <p>7. Upheld - Light pollution would have a negative amenity impact on the surround area.</p> <p>8. Upheld - the nature of the development could impact residential amenity and peaceful enjoyment for</p>
--	--	---	---	--

		<p>9. The proposed car parking of 40 bays and a bus bay is indicative of significant commercial-scale patronage entirely out of character with the rural-residential neighbourhood.</p> <p>10. The Point Henry Peninsula is a bushfire-prone area. The proposal involves placing 10 eco tent structures and a function venue with large public gatherings in a vegetated coastal landscape. Eco tents are fabric-based, semi-permanent structures that are inherently vulnerable in bushfire conditions.</p> <p>11. The site is not connected to reticulated sewerage. A Reception Centre hosting functions and 10 tourist accommodation units will generate significant volumes of wastewater. The plans show multiple</p>	<p>enjoyment for adjoining property owners.</p> <p>9. Uphold – whilst the lot is zoned 'Rural' it is surrounded by lots zoned 'Rural Residential' and the proposed car parking of 40 bays and a bus bay is of a scale that is out of character with the adjoining land zoned 'Rural Residential'.</p> <p>10. Uphold – The eco tents are all located at the extremity of the site and the ability to evacuate these if a fire is approaching would be difficult. Eco tents are inherently vulnerable in bushfire conditions.</p> <p>11. Uphold – the site is not connected to reticulated sewerage and the provided and the Site Classification Report provide as part of the application is not related</p>	<p>adjoining property owners</p> <p>9. Upheld - whilst the lot is zoned 'Rural' it is surrounded by lots zoned 'Rural Residential' and the proposed car parking of 40 bays and a bus bay is of a scale that is out of character with the adjoining land zoned 'Rural Residential'</p> <p>10. Upheld - The eco tents are all located at the extremity of the site and the ability to evacuate these if a fire is approaching would be difficult. Eco tents are inherently vulnerable in bushfire conditions.</p> <p>11. Upheld - the site is not connected to reticulated sewerage and the provided and the Site Classification Report provide as part of the application</p>
--	--	---	---	--

		<p>leach drain systems, but I am concerned that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) The soil and drainage conditions on the Peninsula may not support adequate on-site effluent disposal at the scale proposed;</li> <li>b) Proximity to Salt Cove and the coastal marine environment creates a risk of nutrient and contamination run-off;</li> <li>c) The application does not appear to include a formal wastewater management report demonstrating compliance with Department of Health requirements.</li> </ul> <p>12. LPS2 Clause 5.13 requires the Shire to consider the visual impact of development near the coast. Salt Cove and the surrounding coastal vegetation are environmentally and visually significant. A commercial facility with 40 car parks, a bus bay, signage, function buildings, 10 accommodation tents, toilet blocks, and associated infrastructure would have a visible and irreversible impact on this sensitive coastal landscape.</p>	<p>to the application as it only deals with and ancillary unit and a 2 bedroom dwelling not the proposed development and as such it had not demonstrated that the site can accommodate the proposed development specifically the toilet block and the eco tents and should not be supported.</p> <p>12. Uphold – Local Planning Scheme No. 2 Clause 5.13 states that the local government is to have regard to the visual impact of and land use or development for land adjacent to the coast. The scale of the development with 40 car parks, a bus bay, signage, function building, 10 eco tents, toilet blocks and associated development will be visible and may</p>	<p>is not related to the application as it only deals with and ancillary unit and a 2 bedroom dwelling not the proposed development and as such it had not demonstrated that the site can accommodate the proposed development specifically the toilet block and the eco tents and should not be supported.</p> <p>12. Upheld - Local Planning Scheme No. 2 Clause 5.13 states that the local government is to have regard to the visual impact of and land use or development for land adjacent to the coast. The scale of the development with 40 car parks, a bus bay, signage, function building, 10 eco tents, toilet blocks and associated</p>
--	--	--	---	--

		<p>13. The master plan submitted with the application shows extensive 'possible future stage' development including additional caravan rows and a central facilities building. This indicates the applicant's intention to develop a much larger tourist park and events venue over time. The Shire should consider this cumulative intent, not just the immediate footprint, when assessing the proposal's impact on the Rural zone and its neighbours.</p> <p>14. For the reasons outlined above, I respectfully but firmly object to Planning Application P26-006. The proposed Reception Centre and Tourist Accommodation are inconsistent with the Rural zone objectives, the character of the Point Henry Peninsula, and the amenity of neighbouring Rural-Residential properties. The application raises unresolved concerns regarding bushfire safety, wastewater management, and coastal environmental impact.</p> <p>15. I request that the Shire refuse this application. In the alternative, if the</p>	<p>impact the sensitive coastal landscape.</p> <p>13. Dismiss - any expansion of the uses on the site would be subject to another Development Application.</p> <p>14. Uphold - The application raises unresolved concerns regarding bushfire safety, wastewater management, and coastal environmental impact.</p> <p>15. Note – request to refuse.</p>	<p>development will be visible and may impact the sensitive coastal landscape</p> <p>13. Dismiss</p> <p>14. Upheld - The application raises unresolved concerns regarding bushfire safety, wastewater management, and coastal environmental impact.</p> <p>15. Noted</p>
--	--	---	--	--

		Shire is minded to approve the application, I request the opportunity to be heard at any Council meeting at which this matter is determined, and that I be notified of the outcome.		
12.	Withheld	<p>1. I request that my name, contact details, and the contents of this submission remain confidential and are not disclosed to the owners of Salt Cove or to any other parties outside the relevant departments of the Shire of Jerramungup.</p> <p>This submission is provided on the understanding that my personal information will be protected and used solely for the purpose of assessing the proposed development.</p> <p>2. When initially approached by the proponent, Mr Isaac Baum, I was provided with only a single-page document. Based on that limited information, I indicated that I had no objection to the proposal.</p> <p>3. It has since become clear that this was not the full or accurate scope of the development.</p>	<p>1. Note – contact details withheld from schedule and redacted from submission.</p> <p>2. Note – advice of discussion with proponent.</p> <p>3. Dismiss - any expansion of the uses on the site would be subject to</p>	<p>1. Noted</p> <p>2. Noted</p> <p>3. Dismissed</p>

		<p>4. A facility of this nature would be more beneficial to the Bremer Bay community if the existing Sports Club were further developed and more fully utilised, with fewer operational restrictions limiting its use. Strengthening an established community asset would provide broader and more equitable benefit while avoiding the need to introduce new facilities in environmentally and strategically sensitive locations.</p> <p>5. I am also concerned about the environmental implications of the proposal, particularly in relation to the clearing of large areas of vegetation, the presence of rare plant species, and the established fauna corridors that traverse the site. These elements form an important part of the ecological character of the area and contribute to the broader environmental values of Point Henry.</p>	<p>another Development Application.</p> <p>4. Dismiss – an alternative proposal cannot be substituted for the current application. The current application must be determined.</p> <p>5. Uphold – The proposal will be required to clear large areas to achieve appropriate BAL ratings for the fire shelter, the access roads for the eco tents as well as clearing for the ATU’s disposal fields. This is not consisted with the objectives of the ‘Rural’ zone specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- To consider non-rural uses where they can be shown to be of benefit to the district and not detrimental to</li> </ul>	<p>4. Dismissed</p> <p>5. Upheld - The proposal will be required to clear large areas to achieve appropriate BAL ratings for the fire shelter, the access roads for the eco tents as well as clearing for the ATU’s disposal fields. This is not consisted with the objectives of the ‘Rural’ zone.</p>
--	--	--	--	---

		<p>6. Wastewater and effluent disposal are also a concern given the proximity of the proposed development to the ocean. The sensitivity of the coastal environment means that any failure, overload, or poorly designed system could have direct impacts on marine water quality, dune ecology, and nearby recreational areas.</p>	<p>the natural resources or the environment.</p> <p>and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- To help protect rural land from land degradation and further loss of biodiversity by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. minimising clearing of remnant vegetation</li> <li>b. encouraging retention and protection of remnant vegetation</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>6. Uphold – the provided Wastewater and the Site Classification Report provided as part of the application is not related to the application as it only deals with an ancillary unit and a 2 bedroom dwelling not the proposed development and as such it had not demonstrated that the site can accommodate the proposed development specifically</p>	<p>6. Upheld - the provided Wastewater and the Site Classification Report provided as part of the application is not related to the application as it only deals with an ancillary unit and a 2 bedroom dwelling not the proposed development and as such it had not demonstrated that the site can</p>
--	--	--	--	---

		<p>7. Given the clear limitations placed on developing my own property, the approval of a caravan park at Salt Cove would appear inconsistent with established planning expectations for this area.</p> <p>8. There is a history of non-compliance at Salt Cove, with numerous complaints and comments previously raised by community members.</p> <p>9. I request to be kept informed of all updates, submissions, and opportunities for input relating to this proposal. As an affected landowner, I wish to ensure that all future decisions are made transparently and with full consideration of the planning constraints and community concerns.</p> <p>10. In closing, the proposal presents significant concerns across environmental, commercial, and</p>	<p>the toilet block and the eco tents and should not be supported.</p> <p>7. Dismiss - any expansion of the uses on the site would be subject to another Development Application.</p> <p>8. Note – this application is retrospective with elements of new development included.</p> <p>9. Note – request to stay informed of all updates relating to the site and the application.</p> <p>10. Uphold - the proposed development presents concerns with environmental,</p>	<p>accommodate the proposed development specifically the toilet block and the eco tents and should not be supported</p> <p>7. Dismissed</p> <p>8. Noted</p> <p>9. Noted</p> <p>10. Upheld - the proposed development presents concerns</p>
--	--	--	---	--

		<p>safety domains that make it unsuitable for this location.</p> <p>The development would compete directly with existing accommodation providers outside peak periods, while offering less community benefit than further investment in established facilities.</p> <p>The environmental impacts of clearing, and the risks associated with wastewater near the coast pose avoidable threats to the area's ecological character.</p> <p>Fire-risk issues remain substantial.</p> <p>DFES has previously advised that development is not supported on Point Henry Peninsula due to the locality's fire-risk profile.</p>	<p>commercial, and safety domains and as such should be refused.</p>	<p>with environmental, commercial, and safety domains and as such should be refused.</p>
13.	Lyons Architects on behalf of Hillboi Nominees Pty Ltd	<p>1. Please accept this <b>OBJECTION</b> on behalf of <b>Hillboi Nominees Pty Ltd</b> to this proposed commercial development on the neighbouring Rural lot that adjoins their southern</p>	<p>1. Note – objection.</p>	<p>1. Noted</p>

		<p>boundary and shares approximately 700 metres of that boundary.</p> <p>The applicant intends to build a commercial access road along this boundary for almost the entire length without any landscape buffer and without sealing the road or the ability to fence this road off resulting in additional noise, dust, loss of privacy and increased risk of fire without any consultation with the affected neighbour.</p> <p>2. The <b>Applicant</b> has applied for approval for Land Use of 'Reception Centre' and 'Tourist Accommodation'.</p> <p>3. 'Reception Centre' is not a permitted or considered Use in the Shire of Jerramungup Local Planning Scheme No.2</p> <p>In this situation, the Shire would need to determine that the use of the property is <b>consistent with the objectives of the Rural zoning</b> before approving application.</p>	<p>2. Note – description of proposed development.</p> <p>3. Uphold - the subject lot is zoned 'rural' but it has not been developed for agricultural activity.</p> <p>The objectives of the 'rural' zone are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- To ensure the continuation of broad-hectare farming as the principal land use</li> </ul>	<p>2. Noted</p> <p>3. Upheld - The proposed use as a 'reception centre' as an unlisted use is not consistent with the objectives for the 'rural' zone.</p>
--	--	--	---	--

		<p>The Applicant has <b>not</b> sufficiently demonstrated that the proposed use is consistent with the Objectives of the Rural Zone</p>	<p>in the district and encouraging where appropriate the retention and expansion of agricultural activities where the land is capable of such development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- To consider non-rural uses where they can be shown to be of benefit to the district and not detrimental to the natural resources or the environment.</li><li>- To allow for facilities for tourists and travellers, and for recreation uses.</li><li>- To help protect rural land from land degradation and further loss of biodiversity by:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• minimising clearing of remnant vegetation</li><li>• encouraging retention and protection of remnant vegetation</li></ul></li></ul>	
--	--	---	--	--

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• encouraging development and protection of vegetation corridors</li><li>• encouraging development of sustainable surface and sub-surface drainage works</li><li>• encouraging rehabilitation of salt-affected land</li><li>• encouraging soil conservation through land management measures</li><li>• encouraging identification and protection of wetlands</li></ul> <p>– To promote the sustainable management of natural resources, and the prevention of land degradation.</p> <p>The proposed use as a reception centre as an unlisted use is not consistent with the</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

		<p>4. The planning report also fails to mention a required very large 45-49m bushfire asset protection zone (APZ) around the proposed bushfire shelter (converted existing shed). This represents over 10,000m<sup>2</sup> of cleared bushland.</p> <p>Future proposed uses (chalets, cleared lawn area/stage, level caravan sites etc) shown on the plans submitted with the application will further degrade the natural environment of the site.</p> <p>When assessing the application, the Shire will need to consider the main principles underlying the Shire's Local Planning Strategy for Rural Zoned Lots i.e...."to protect sensitive and significant environmental areas" with "no adverse impacts on the surrounding land and rural activities". The proposal does not comply as there are obvious adverse impacts.</p> <p>The proposal is applying for approval for an intensive commercial use of a</p>	<p>objectives for the 'rural' zone.</p> <p>4. Uphold – The proposal will be required to clear large areas to achieve appropriate BAL ratings as well as access roads for the eco tents and effluent disposal areas for ATU's. This is not consisted with the objectives of the 'Rural' zone specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- To consider non-rural uses where they can be shown to be of benefit to the district and not detrimental to the natural resources or the environment.</li> </ul> <p>and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- To help protect rural land from land degradation and further loss of biodiversity by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. minimising clearing of</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>4. The proposal will be required to clear large areas to achieve appropriate BAL ratings as well as access roads for the eco tents and effluent disposal areas for ATU's. This is not consisted with the objectives of the 'Rural' zone.</p>
--	--	---	--	---

		<p>property zoned for low-intensity Rural use only.</p> <p>Approval for this proposal would create a significant higher risk of adverse impact on the site environment, Rural character and amenity of the adjacent properties than would be expected from a single holiday home (which requires a Property and Guest Management Plan) or a Rural Home Business</p> <p>5. The second Use being applied for is 'Tourist Accommodation'. This is a <b>Discretionary</b> use within the Shire of Jerramungup Local Planning Scheme No.2, and planning approval must be obtained.</p> <p>However, while the Shire seeks to actively encourage high quality short term accommodation proposals, they must be at 'appropriate densities suited to the site location'...which 'assist in attracting more tourists into the area during off-peak times'...and 'provided that no land use or environmental conflicts arise'.</p>	<p>remnant vegetation</p> <p>b. encouraging retention and protection of remnant vegetation</p> <p>5. Uphold – the proposed 'tourist accommodation' may have unsatisfactory environmental impacts due to clearing for roads and effluent disposal areas.</p>	<p>5. Upheld – the proposed 'tourist accommodation' may have unsatisfactory environmental impacts due to clearing for roads and effluent disposal areas.</p>
--	--	---	---	--

		<p>The application report Part 4.2 Operational Details identifies that the main season for events will be during the warmer months, and therefore the associated accommodation occupancy connected to these events will <u>not</u> provide additional accommodation during <u>off peak</u> times.</p> <p>The respondent is familiar with the Eco tent accommodation type proposed and due to their lack of insulation they are only comfortable for guests during a narrow summer season when the weather is not inclement. The viability of the development for off peak and off-grid general tourist accommodation is very questionable and not sustainable during off peak times.</p> <p>6. The Applicant has omitted a number of critical documents and studies in their Development Application and does not appear to have a detailed understanding of the site topography and site conditions in terms of manageable site access, construction and safety.</p>	<p>6. Uphold - The Applicant has omitted a number of critical documents and studies in their Development Application. There are question related to the site topography and site conditions in</p>	<p>6. Upheld - The Applicant has omitted a number of critical documents and studies in their Development Application. There are question related to the site topography and site</p>
--	--	---	--	--

		<p>The Local Planning Strategy for Area 17 (Point Henry Peninsula), requires all proposals for development on the Rural-zoned lots must be considered against the Point Henry Limited Rural Strategy 1991, and comprehensively address issues such as environmental assessment, land capability, visual impact, effluent disposal capability, water management and drainage, servicing...etc.</p> <p>7. The Point Henry Limited Rural Strategy indicates that the 'Rural' zoned Lots were environmentally sensitive and should not be used for anything more than low intensity uses.</p> <p>8. The Applicant does not provide any detailed assessment of the flora and fauna on the site. There is no vegetation study provided.</p> <p>There is also only a cursory reference to Fauna under Part 2.3 with 'no wildlife observed other than transitory birds'. A casual walk in the area reveals kangaroos, other mammals, lizards</p>	<p>terms of manageable site access, construction and safety.</p> <p>7. Uphold – The Point Henry Limited Rural Strategy identified the subject lots as being highly constrained and as such was excluded from 'Rural Residential' development.</p> <p>8. Uphold – A vegetation study or fauna study was not provided and the comment in Part 2.3 stating that no wildlife has been observed on site other than transitory birds demonstrates that the fauna on the site has not been adequately surveyed.</p>	<p>conditions in terms of manageable site access, construction and safety.</p> <p>7. Upheld – The Point Henry Limited Rural Strategy identified the subject lots as being highly constrained and as such was excluded from 'Rural Residential' development.</p> <p>8. Upheld - – A vegetation study or fauna study was not provided and the comment in Part 2.3 stating that no wildlife has been observed on site other than transitory birds demonstrates that the fauna on the site has not been</p>
--	--	--	--	---

		<p>and other reptiles, territorial birds and many insects.</p> <p>9. No detailed site survey with accurate contours (at 0.5 M minimum) has been provided with the application and the site contours (at 10 M) shown on the location plan D2 do not represent the actual site topography, when referenced against the Landgate resources. Some parts of the eastern corner of the site have a gradient of approx 1:3 (potentially requiring massive civil works or a bridge to provide the proposed access roadway to service the proposed Eco Tents).</p> <p>10. There is insufficient information provided about the design of the proposed buildings and structures and therefore to ensure that the development is of 'high quality'.</p> <p>The proposed toilet block (described as a 'demountable' in the applicant's</p>	<p>The lack of details does not make the development supportable.</p> <p>9. Uphold – given the topography of the site as identified in the Point Henry Limited Rural Strategy a detailed site survey with accurate contours has not been provided with the application. Given the slopes that occur towards the coast where the Eco tents are proposed can be up to the 1:3 gradient it will make constructing roads to service these difficult.</p> <p>10. Uphold – there is insufficient information design of the proposed buildings and structures and therefore to ensure that the development is of 'high quality'</p>	<p>adequately surveyed. The lack of details does not make the development supportable.</p> <p>9. Upheld - given the topography of the site as identified in the Point Henry Limited Rural Strategy a detailed site survey with accurate contours has not been provided with the application. Given the slopes that occur towards the coast where the Eco tents are proposed can be up to the 1:3 gradient it will make constructing roads to service these difficult.</p> <p>10. Upheld - there is insufficient information design of the proposed buildings and structures and therefore to ensure that the development is of 'high quality'</p>
--	--	--	--	---

		<p>report) is non compliant in terms of DDA (wheelchair) access and Building Construction Code compliance.</p> <p>11. Point Henry is a known high-fire risk area, with only one access road in and out of the peninsula which makes it a dangerous location for the congregation of large groups such as weddings.</p> <p>Both a BEP and LMP are required Fire Planning documents for vulnerable land uses.</p> <p>While a Bushfire Management Plan (BMP) has been provided with the application, the Bushfire Evacuation Plan (BEP) is referenced in the BMP but has not been provided. A Landscape Management Plan (LMP) has also not been provided.</p> <p>The BEP should address risk to life resulting from the current proposal and cover the known risks and considerations:</p>	<p>The proposed demountable toilet block does not show how a wheelchair would access the facility as it is raised from the ground.</p> <p>11. Uphold - Point Henry is a known high-fire risk area, with only one access road in and out of the peninsula which makes it a dangerous location for the congregation of large groups such as weddings.</p> <p>The Shed which is being converted into a fire shelter would need to comply with the following:</p> <p>While closure and early evacuation are recommended in the first instance, the following conditions should be imposed on a</p>	<p>The proposed demountable toilet block does not show how a wheelchair would access the facility as it is raised from the ground.</p> <p>11. Upheld - - Point Henry is a known high-fire risk area, with only one access road in and out of the peninsula which makes it a dangerous location for the congregation of large groups such as weddings.</p> <p>The Shed which is being converted into a fire shelter would need to comply with the following:</p> <p>While closure and early evacuation are recommended in the first instance, the following conditions should be imposed</p>
--	--	---	--	---

			<p>development approval where on-site shelter in a building is proposed:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The on-site shelter must be designed and constructed in accordance with the Building Code of Australia and the ABCB Design and Construction of Community Bushfire Refuges Handbook (2014). The design must be undertaken by a suitably qualified fire engineer with fire risk assessment expertise, accredited with Engineers Australia.</li> <li>b. Prior to occupation of the development, a final inspection of the on-site shelter must be undertaken by a suitably qualified fire engineer with fire risk assessment expertise, accredited with Engineers Australia. The fire engineer should</li> </ol>	<p>on a development approval where on-site shelter in a building is proposed:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The on-site shelter must be designed and constructed in accordance with the Building Code of Australia and the ABCB Design and Construction of Community Bushfire Refuges Handbook (2014). The design must be undertaken by a suitably qualified fire engineer with fire risk assessment expertise, accredited with Engineers Australia.</li> <li>b. Prior to occupation of the development, a final inspection of the on-site shelter must be</li> </ol>
--	--	--	--	---

			<p>provide certification, to the satisfaction of the local government, that the works have been completed in accordance with the requirements of the BCA and the ABCB Design and Construction of Community Bushfire Refuges Handbook (2014).</p> <p>c. Prior to occupation of the development, an on-site shelter maintenance plan must be prepared by a suitably qualified fire engineer with fire risk assessment expertise, accredited with Engineers Australia, and must include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. details of maintenance requirements;</li> <li>ii. and details of annual testing requirements for operational compliance.</li> </ul>	<p>undertaken by a suitably qualified fire engineer with fire risk assessment expertise, accredited with Engineers Australia. The fire engineer should provide certification, to the satisfaction of the local government, that the works have been completed in accordance with the requirements of the BCA and the ABCB Design and Construction of Community Bushfire Refuges Handbook (2014).</p> <p>c. Prior to occupation of the development, an on-site shelter maintenance plan must be prepared by a</p>
--	--	--	---	--

		<p>12. Surprisingly, given the risk and non-compliances, there is no apparent reference to consultation with the local 'on the ground' emergency services regarding the proposed development.</p>	<p>This has not been stipulated in the application.</p> <p>12. Dismiss - local 'on the ground' emergency services; have advised that in the event of a fire in Point Henry they will not be accessing the area rather they will be placing road blocks to let people out and prevent others from getting in.</p>	<p>suitably qualified fire engineer with fire risk assessment expertise, accredited with Engineers Australia, and must include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- details of maintenance requirements;</li> <li>- and details of annual testing requirements for operational compliance.</li> </ul> <p>This has not been stipulated in the application.</p> <p>12. Dismissed</p>
--	--	---	--	---

		<p>13. The boundaries of the Lots in the area are required to remain unfenced due to emergency evacuation requirements and control of fire, and gates are to be unlocked. This coupled with the proposed site plan and peripheral driveways reduces the amenity of neighbouring properties.</p> <p>The applicant has addressed concerns about site vehicle access via Magpie Rise by saying that they would chain off that roadway – which would suggest that the safety requirements for an already vulnerable site could be compromised by the venue operations. Seems to be an unachievable assurance by the applicant to deflect neighbour concerns.</p> <p>14. While a detail of the proposed signage for the site has been provided, the locations of these are not shown on the submitted plans.</p>	<p>13. Uphold – under Local Planning Scheme No. 2 Cl 5.24.3 o) Boundary fences are not to be erected on lots with coverage of more than 80% natural vegetation which would mean the boundaries adjacent the ‘rural residential’ zoned land should not be fenced.</p> <p>Access to the site by Magpie Rise would need to remain unchained and provide an alternative access to the site.</p> <p>14. Note – the proposed signage will be located on site on the entry points to the site.</p>	<p>13. Upheld - under Local Planning Scheme No. 2 Cl 5.24.3 o) Boundary fences are not to be erected on lots with coverage of more than 80% natural vegetation which would mean the boundaries adjacent the ‘rural residential’ zoned land should not be fenced.</p> <p>Access to the site by Magpie Rise would need to remain unchained and provide an alternative access to the site.</p> <p>14. Noted</p>
--	--	---	---	--

		<p>15. There are a number of references to restricted water supply and potential shortages in local planning documents including Section 6.2 of the Point Henry Limited Rural Strategy 1991 and Section 6.16.2 (c) of the Shire of Jerramungup Local Planning Strategy</p> <p>16. Potable water supply is noted to be supplied via roof capture which is impossible from the Eco Tents as they do not have gutters and are a significant distance from any hard-roofed structures) - with water cartage being proposed to top up the tanks when water levels are low. This is not a sustainable water source</p> <p>17. The water use expected from 240+ persons on site will be significant, but there is no detailed water use (occupancy numbers and water usage per day etc) and associated supply/rainfall analysis provided with the application for the existing buildings and the proposed toilet block and additional 10x Eco Tents and other buildings. This is particularly important as the main</p>	<p>15. Note – there is no reticulated water on the site.</p> <p>16. Note – Potable water is to be supplied by water tanks, to be pumped/gravity-fed rainwater, and topped up by carted water if required. Given that the eco-tents don't have gutters the water tanks for then will be required to be carted.</p> <p>17. Uphold in part – the proposal is outlined as a wedding venue for up to 120 people including the 10 Eco tents. No detailed water usage per day has been provided with the application.</p>	<p>15. Noted</p> <p>16. Noted</p> <p>17. Upheld in part – the proposal is outlined as a wedding venue for up to 120 people including the 10 Eco tents. No detailed water usage per day has been provided with the application.</p>
--	--	--	--	--

		<p>event periods and maximum site occupancy will be during the drier months of the year when rainfall will be at its lowest</p> <p>18. To have minimal environmental impact on the environment and adjacent waterways (including Salt Cove) the applicant should be able to demonstrate that there would not be discharge or runoff from the proposed effluent systems.</p> <p>19. The submitted <i>Appendix A 'Soil and Site Evaluation'</i> is not related to the current application and the proposed effluent disposal locations. It relates to a previous application for an Ancillary Dwelling and Workers Accommodation on the site.</p> <p>20. The submitted <i>Appendix B 'Wastewater Report'</i> is not a report or detailed study based on the Applicant's proposal. It is simply a quotation and proposed product details, without reference to specific</p>	<p>18. Note– Aerobic Treatment Units (ATU) are proposed to be used for the Eco Tents.</p> <p>19. Uphold – Appendix A 'Soil and Site Evaluation' is not related to the current application and the proposed effluent disposal locations. /it relates to an earlier application and is not sufficient to recommend approval for the development.</p> <p>20. Uphold - Appendix B 'Wastewater Report' is not a report or detailed study based on the Applicant's proposal. It is simply a quotation and</p>	<p>18. Noted</p> <p>19. Upheld - Appendix A 'Soil and Site Evaluation' is not related to the current application and the proposed effluent disposal locations. /it relates to an earlier application and is not sufficient to recommend approval for the development.</p> <p>20. Upheld - Appendix B 'Wastewater Report' is not a report or detailed study based on the Applicant's proposal. It is simply a quotation and proposed product</p>
--	--	--	---	---

		<p>locations, lengths of effluent drains etc.</p> <p>21. While individual onsite waste water treatment systems and associated discharge drains are proposed for each building/tent, the site slope contour analysis in the Point Henry Limited Rural strategy 1991, identified that the area proposed for the Eco Tents is located within an area exceeding 14% gradient which was 'too steep to consider' for septic absorption and dwelling purposes.</p> <p>22. There is no detail provided on how vehicles (including delivery and water cartage vehicles) will access the site, or where they will park for the proposed Events and Reception area being applied for.</p> <p>23. Showing 'future development' stages on the application plan is confusing. It is very unclear which</p>	<p>proposed product details and is not sufficient to recommend approval for the development.</p> <p>21. Uphold – given the topography for the Eco – Tents on the eastern boundary runs between 20% and 40% there may be construction issues regarding access and effluent disposal.</p> <p>22. Uphold - No traffic impact assessment has been provided with the application and as such there is insufficient information to determine the application.</p> <p>23. Uphold – confusion over which stages are 'future development'</p>	<p>details and is not sufficient to recommend approval for the development.</p> <p>21. Upheld - given the topography for the Eco – Tents on the eastern boundary runs between 20% and 40% there may be construction issues regarding access and effluent disposal.</p> <p>22. Upheld - No traffic impact assessment has been provided with the application and as such there is insufficient information to determine the application.</p> <p>23. Upheld - confusion over which stages are 'future</p>
--	--	--	--	--

		<p>roads and parking areas are to be included in the current application to be able to assess the proposal, and the number of parking spaces listed in the Report do not correspond to the Masterplan provided.</p> <p>24. Given that up to 140 guests are accommodated at each event (refer to the wedding packages offered on the Applicant's website), the provision of 12x car bays (as per Report numbers) is insufficient. At 4x occupants per car, this will only allow onsite parking for 48 guests in cars.</p> <p>If guests are expected to park on the perimeter access roads or off-road, this will impact both neighbouring properties, access for emergency services and the natural vegetation.</p> <p>25. The report notes that 'with regard to liquor licencing, advice previously sought...confirmed that liquor licence is not required without the sale or</p>	<p>It is very unclear which roads and parking areas are to be included in the current application to be able to assess the proposal, and the number of parking spaces listed in the Planning Report do not correspond to the Masterplan provided.</p> <p>24. Uphold – up to 140 guests are accommodated at each event (refer to the wedding packages offered on the Applicant's website), and only 40 car bays are proposed although only 12 are for weddings, 3 are ACROD, 5 for delivers 19 for accommodation units and 1 bus bay.</p> <p>25. Uphold - Exemptions for small functions only apply where alcohol is served to</p>	<p>development' It is very unclear which roads and parking areas are to be included in the current application to be able to assess the proposal, and the number of parking spaces listed in the Planning Report do not correspond to the Masterplan provided.</p> <p>24. up to 140 guests are accommodated at each event (refer to the wedding packages offered on the Applicant's website), and only 40 car bays are proposed although only 12 are for weddings, 3 are ACROD, 5 for delivers 19 for accommodation units and 1 bus bay.</p> <p>25. Upheld - Exemptions for small functions only apply where alcohol is served to</p>
--	--	--	---	---

		<p>supply of alcohol'. This may be technically accurate, but alcohol is and will be supplied as part of the proposed wedding/function use. The business's own website advertises 'cocktail weddings' and lists 4 bar staff as part of its packages.</p> <p>Exemptions for small functions only apply where alcohol is served to persons over 18, no earlier than 6am and no later than 10pm, and for a maximum of 2 continuous hours for up to 100 attendees, or 4 continuous hours for up to 75 attendees. The proposed wedding hours of 12 noon to midnight make it virtually impossible for these exemption conditions to be met.</p> <p>26. The Applicant states that the maximum number of occupants on site at any one time will be 120 guests (adults and children), including guests staying in the eco-tents. However, the business's own website advertises wedding packages for up to 140 guests, and there is no undertaking that the eco-tents would be reserved exclusively for event guests. We estimate that total site occupancy could reach up to 240 persons, which</p>	<p>persons over 18, no earlier than 6am and no later than 10pm, and for a maximum of 2 continuous hours for up to 100 attendees, or 4 continuous hours for up to 75 attendees. The proposed wedding hours of 12 noon to midnight make it virtually impossible for these exemption conditions to be met and the appropriate liquor licence should be sought.</p> <p>26. Uphold – the report states a maximum occupancy of 120 guest but the webpage currently advertises packages for up to 140 guests. Whilst it is stated that the Eco tents are to be occupied by wedding guest there is no guarantee that these would be exclusively for event</p>	<p>persons over 18, no earlier than 6am and no later than 10pm, and for a maximum of 2 continuous hours for up to 100 attendees, or 4 continuous hours for up to 75 attendees. The proposed wedding hours of 12 noon to midnight make it virtually impossible for these exemption conditions to be met and the appropriate liquor licence should be sought.</p> <p>26. Upheld - the report states a maximum occupancy of 120 guest but the webpage currently advertises packages for up to 140 guests. Whilst it is stated that the Eco tents are to be occupied by wedding guest there is no guarantee that these would be exclusively for event</p>
--	--	--	---	---

		<p>is well in excess of the 122 figure cited in the report.</p> <p>27. Accessible parking bays are noted in the report, but the proposal does not identify which eco-tent will be configured for guests requiring level or ramped access, or specify internal layouts suitable for wheelchair users. At least one of the 10 proposed tents and the access path from the car bay to that tent must comply with AS 1428.1. The additional footprint required for an accessible tent will necessitate further vegetation clearing.</p> <p>The size and internal configuration of the accessible toilet in the proposed toilet block also does not comply with AS 1428.1. Further site works and clearing would be required to achieve a compliant building design.</p> <p>28. The report describes the closest dwelling as being at a 'considerable distance' of 395 metres. However, the application fails entirely to identify the existing dwelling owned by Hillboi Nominees, which is approximately</p>	<p>guests which would result in more being on site that stated in the report.</p> <p>27. Uphold - Accessible parking bays are noted in the report, but the proposal does not identify which eco-tent will be configured for guests requiring level or ramped access, or specify internal layouts suitable for wheelchair users. At least one of the 10 proposed tents and the access path from the car bay to that tent must comply with AS 1428.1. The additional footprint required for an accessible tent will necessitate further vegetation clearing.</p> <p>28. Uphold – the dwelling in question is the closet to the development and is not shown on the</p>	<p>guests which would result in more being on site that stated in the report.</p> <p>27. Upheld - Accessible parking bays are noted in the report, but the proposal does not identify which eco-tent will be configured for guests requiring level or ramped access, or specify internal layouts suitable for wheelchair users. At least one of the 10 proposed tents and the access path from the car bay to that tent must comply with AS 1428.1. The additional footprint required for an accessible tent will necessitate further vegetation clearing.</p> <p>28. Upheld - the dwelling in question is the closet to the development and is not shown on the plan as it is behind</p>
--	--	---	--	---

		<p>240 metres away. This property does not appear on the application at all.</p> <p>29. The proposed access roads to the perimeter of the site affects the amenity of adjacent residents by bringing vehicles close to the neighbouring properties, contributing to additional noise and dust impacts.</p> <p>30. The proposed management plan for vehicle access to/from the site has not been confirmed – while Horse Hill Road is considered the ‘main entry’ there will be additional vehicle movements via Magpie Rise, particularly for access to Short Beach.</p> <p>31. No fencing or locked gates are permitted to the boundaries due to the high fire risk of the Peninsula. Guests unfamiliar with the site could inadvertently wander onto adjacent properties</p>	<p>plan as it is behind the legend.</p> <p>29. Uphold – having the road along the northern boundary will impact on adjacent dwelling through additional noise and dust impacts</p> <p>30. Uphold - in the absence of a traffic impact assessment there is insufficient information to determine the application.</p> <p>31. Uphold – under Local Planning Scheme No. 2 Cl 5.24.3 o) Boundary fences are not to be erected on lots with coverage of more than 80% natural vegetation which would mean the boundaries adjacent the ‘rural residential’ zoned land should not be fenced.</p>	<p>the legend on one of the maps.</p> <p>29. Upheld having the road along the northern boundary will impact on adjacent dwelling through additional noise and dust impacts</p> <p>30. Upheld - in the absence of a traffic impact assessment there is insufficient information to determine the application.</p> <p>31. Upheld - under Local Planning Scheme No. 2 Cl 5.24.3 o) Boundary fences are not to be erected on lots with coverage of more than 80% natural vegetation which would mean the boundaries adjacent the ‘rural residential’ zoned land should not be fenced.</p>
--	--	--	---	---

		<p>32. The proposed site and Point Henry in general are identified as being subject to high fire risk which is outlined in a number of the Shire's Planning Policies and documents.</p> <p>a) While the applicant notes that the site is zoned 'Rural' and not 'Rural Residential' it IS located in very close proximity to sites that are required to address and comply with the Local Planning Policy LPP18 Point Henry Fire Management Plans.</p> <p>b) Intensifying the occupancy of the site with additional visitors and overnight accommodation significantly raises the risk of potential fire-events occurring that impact the site and the surrounding area. Particularly where guests are likely to be unfamiliar with the area, site and evacuation procedures in a high-stress urgent scenario.</p> <p>c) Therefore a very high level of scrutiny and assessment of the risk of damage and loss of life</p>	<p>32. Uphold – Point Henry is identified as being subject to a high fire risk.</p> <p>a) Note – 'rural residential' zoned land is to comply with LPP18 Point Henry Fire Management Plans</p> <p>b) Uphold – overnight accommodation by additional visitors significantly raises the risk of potential fire-events occurring that impact the site and the surrounding area.</p> <p>c) Note</p>	<p>32. Upheld - Point Henry is identified as being subject to a high fire risk.</p> <p>a) Noted</p> <p>b) Upheld - overnight accommodation by additional visitors significantly raises the risk of potential fire-events occurring that impact the site and the surrounding area</p> <p>c) Noted</p>
--	--	---	--	--

		<p>from fire events should be applied to the application, over and above the LPP18 requirements, which assumes low-intensity development and occupancy numbers on the peninsula (and very-low development on the Rural lots).</p> <p>d) Noting that while a fire shelter is proposed to ameliorate the risk to life for guests and residents on the site, there is minimal information about the proposal to convert the existing shed – which will require a very large cleared area, emergency power (generator) and communications, and mechanical ventilation etc. However, shelters should only be considered as a measure of 'last resort' and the detail of how the site would be managed and fire events dealt with is lacking with the absence of a Bushfire Emergency Plan, DFES and local brigade responses as already noted under 'insufficient information'.</p>	<p>d) Uphold - The Shed which is being converted into a fire shelter would need to comply with the following:</p> <p>While closure and early evacuation are recommended in the first instance, the following conditions should be imposed on a development approval where on-site shelter in a building is proposed:</p> <p>a. The on-site shelter must be designed and constructed in accordance with the Building Code of Australia and the ABCB Design</p>	<p>d) Upheld - The Shed which is being converted into a fire shelter would need to comply with the following:</p> <p>While closure and early evacuation are recommended in the first instance, the following conditions should be imposed on a development approval where on-site shelter in a building is proposed:</p> <p>a. The on-site shelter must be designed</p>
--	--	---	---	---

			<p>and Construction of Community Bushfire Refuges Handbook (2014). The design must be undertaken by a suitably qualified fire engineer with fire risk assessment expertise, accredited with Engineers Australia.</p> <p>b. Prior to occupation of the development, a final inspection of the on-site shelter must be undertaken by a suitably qualified fire engineer with fire risk assessment expertise, accredited with Engineers Australia. The fire engineer should provide certification, to the satisfaction of the local government, that</p>	<p>and constructed in accordance with the Building Code of Australia and the ABCB Design and Construction of Community Bushfire Refuges Handbook (2014). The design must be undertaken by a suitably qualified fire engineer with fire risk assessment expertise, accredited with Engineers Australia.</p> <p>b. Prior to occupation of the development, a final</p>
--	--	--	---	--

			<p>the works have been completed in accordance with the requirements of the BCA and the ABCB Design and Construction of Community Bushfire Refuges Handbook (2014).</p> <p>c. Prior to occupation of the development, an on-site shelter maintenance plan must be prepared by a suitably qualified fire engineer with fire risk assessment expertise, accredited with Engineers Australia, and must include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. details of maintenance requirements;</li> <li>ii. and details of annual testing requirements</li> </ul>	<p>inspection of the on-site shelter must be undertaken by a suitably qualified fire engineer with fire risk assessment expertise, accredited with Engineers Australia. The fire engineer should provide certification, to the satisfaction of the local government, that the works have been completed in accordance with the requirements of the BCA and the ABCB Design and</p>
--	--	--	--	--

			<p>for operational compliance.</p> <p>This has not been stipulated in the application.</p>	<p>Construction of Community Bushfire Refuges Handbook (2014).</p> <p>c. Prior to occupation of the development, an on-site shelter maintenance plan must be prepared by a suitably qualified fire engineer with fire risk assessment expertise, accredited with Engineers Australia, and must include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>i. details of maintenance requirements;</li><li>ii. and details of annual testing requirements</li></ul>
--	--	--	--	--

		<p>33. While the Bushfire Management Plan has identified that the Eco tents are not required to have an APZ (clearance) around each tent as they are considered indefensible assets (i.e. allowed to burn), this does not address the increased risk of a fire event resulting from additional occupancy on the site, particularly by guests potentially unfamiliar with the area and the risk of fire.</p> <p>One recent incident known to the respondent was that a fire at Short Beach was started due to neglect by short-stay guests. This was at a single dwelling with an APZ. The risk of unintended and accidental fire incidents increases with additional site occupancy e.g. generators, lithium batteries, candles, guests smoking etc.</p>	<p>33. Uphold - Whilst the Bushfire Management Plan has identified that the Eco tents are not required to have an APZ (clearance) around each tent as they are considered indefensible assets (i.e. allowed to burn), this does not address the increased risk of a fire event resulting from additional occupancy on the site, particularly by guests potentially unfamiliar with the area and the risk of fire.</p> <p>Intensifying the occupancy of the site with additional</p>	<p>for operational compliance.</p> <p>This has not been stipulated in the application.</p> <p>33. Upheld - Whilst the Bushfire Management Plan has identified that the Eco tents are not required to have an APZ (clearance) around each tent as they are considered indefensible assets (i.e. allowed to burn), this does not address the increased risk of a fire event resulting from additional occupancy on the site, particularly by guests potentially unfamiliar with the area and the risk of fire.</p> <p>Intensifying the occupancy of the site with additional visitors and overnight</p>
--	--	--	---	---

		<p>Intensifying the occupancy of the site with additional visitors and overnight accommodation raises the risk of potential fire-events occurring on the Lot.</p> <p>34. The applicant has only stated in the Planning report that 'it is reasonably foreseeable that this application will comply with the Noise Regs and therefore an Acoustic Report has not been prepared', and that 'noise has also been considered unlikely to be an issue'.</p> <p>Given that the proposed use of the site includes 1 main event per week (up to 140 guests based on the business' advertised wedding packages) 1x 'Wellness Event' per week in summer, 4-5 deliveries per week which could include water trucks, and 10 Ecotents (guests arriving and leaving at various times), the impact on neighbouring residents could be significant. Noise <u>will</u> be generated by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Amplified music and PA</li> <li>• Generator(s)</li> <li>• Guest voices</li> <li>• Vehicles driving on site, particularly on the unsealed</li> </ul>	<p>visitors and overnight accommodation raises the risk of potential fire-events occurring on the Lot.</p> <p>34. Uphold – The development is required to comply with the <i>Environmental Protection (Noise) Regulations 1997</i>. The report states that an Acoustic Report has not been prepared. It is considered that this is a deficiency in the application given the usage of the site including amplified music and a PA and that an Acoustic Report should have been prepared and as such the development should not be approved.</p>	<p>accommodation raises the risk of potential fire-events occurring on the Lot.</p> <p>34. Upheld - The development is required to comply with the <i>Environmental Protection (Noise) Regulations 1997</i>. The report states that an Acoustic Report has not been prepared. It is considered that this is a deficiency in the application given the usage of the site including amplified music and a PA and that an Acoustic Report should have been prepared and as such the development should not be approved.</p>
--	--	---	---	--

		<p>access roads (to the perimeter of the site), including buses and delivery/service vehicles.</p> <p>35. It is also proposed that events could be running until 12:00 midnight, held least 1x per week during the summer season.</p> <p>36. To demonstrate that the development will comply with the minimum Regulations for noise, acoustic testing should be a requirement for consideration of the application. It is insufficient to rely on the applicant's opinion that noise is unlikely to be an issue.</p> <p>37. Additional internal vehicle roads and pedestrian pathways are proposed on the site but will not be sealed. This increases the potential of dust-drift onto neighbouring properties, particularly with the strong winds in the area.</p> <p>38. The site has already been used for wedding functions for up to 3 years as evidenced by the applicants Instagram account. There appears to be an intensive commercial business</p>	<p>35. Note - an Acoustic Report should have been prepared</p> <p>36. Note - an Acoustic Report should have been prepared.</p> <p>37. Uphold – A dust management plan should have been prepared and lodged as part of the application and as such the development should not be approved.</p> <p>38. Uphold – It is noted that this activity has been ongoing for some time and this is the subject of</p>	<p>35. Noted</p> <p>36. Noted</p> <p>37. Upheld - A dust management plan should have been prepared and lodged as part of the application and as such the development should not be approved.</p> <p>38. Upheld - It is noted that this activity has been ongoing for some time and this is the subject of</p>
--	--	--	--	---

		<p>already operating from this Rural site without Shire approvals.</p> <p>39. It is stated in the application that an Ancillary Dwelling and Workers Accommodation (2 bedroom) have already been approved by the Shire (2023/2024?) – but these are yet to be constructed. These two dwellings already represent an intensification of the use of the Rural site, but we assume that the approvals were subject to the same planning, environmental and safety considerations as required to be assessed as 'Additional Dwellings' under Clause 5.25.4 the Local Planning Scheme No. 2.</p> <p>40. The proposed use of dwellings (both existing and proposed) and the lack of a suitable alternative water supply are of concern for any additional dwellings on the site under the Shire's Rural Zone requirements. The additional intensity of use being proposed with the current application is far in excess of this limitation.</p>	<p>ongoing compliance action.</p> <p>39. Uphold - the application that an Ancillary Dwelling and Workers Accommodation (2 bedroom) have already been approved by the Shire on 24/04/2023 this application has lapsed and a building permit was never issued. The approval was for an ancillary dwelling and worker accommodation (unlisted use) therefore outside of Clause 5.25.4 of Local Planning Scheme No. 2.</p> <p>40. Note – the proposed dwellings approval has lapsed.</p>	<p>ongoing compliance action.</p> <p>39. Upheld - the application that an Ancillary Dwelling and Workers Accommodation (2 bedroom) have already been approved by the Shire on 24/04/2023 this application has lapsed and a building permit was never issued. The approval was for an ancillary dwelling and worker accommodation (unlisted use) therefore outside of Clause 5.25.4 of Local Planning Scheme No. 2</p> <p>40. Noted</p>
--	--	---	--	--

		<p>41. The proposed Ancillary Dwelling and Workers Accommodation building locations appear to have been moved to different locations on the site when compared to the plan in the provided site soil condition report included with this application. Does the Shire consider that a change of location of a proposed building would require an amended (or new) planning application?</p> <p>42. The existing 170m<sup>2</sup> dwelling and 216m<sup>2</sup> shed are noted to be 'existing' structures, but no details have been provided in the application. They are identified as not approved and the application notes that these are 'exempt structures of a minor nature <u>formally being claimed</u>'.</p>	<p>41. Note – the proposed dwellings approval has lapsed.</p> <p>42. Uphold – the existing 170m<sup>2</sup> dwelling is unapproved and was renovated without any approvals being issued. The 216m<sup>2</sup> shed is a Class 10 structure which is exempt under Schedule 4 of the <i>Building Regulations 2012</i>.</p> <p>It is noted that the 216m<sup>2</sup> shed is proposed to be converted to a fire shelter.</p> <p>The requirement for a fire shelter are address under point 32 d).</p>	<p>41. Noted</p> <p>42. Upheld - the existing 170m<sup>2</sup> dwelling is unapproved and was renovated without any approvals being issued. The 216m<sup>2</sup> shed is a Class 10 structure which is exempt under Schedule 4 of the <i>Building Regulations 2012</i>.</p> <p>It is noted that the 216m<sup>2</sup> shed is proposed to be converted to a fire shelter.</p> <p>The requirement for a fire shelter are</p>
--	--	---	--	--

		<p>43. From the report 'The property has recently been purchased by the Client, and it is suspected that some development is not reflected in documents from the City'. RP Data reveals that the property was purchased in 2021 which stretches the definition of 'recently'.</p> <p>44. The existing dwelling is referred to in the application as the 'Homestead', 'Old House' etc. – which creates the impression that the dwelling is historical or of some merit. It was in fact marketed by the property sales agent as '<i>an unfinished brick home</i>'. It is therefore highly likely that it was also not issued with a Building Permit and therefore may not meet minimum building standards for safety, energy efficiency, sanitary facilities etc. for a dwelling at the time it commenced construction. Yet the application plans show this dwelling as being the 'reception' or check-in facility (and used for commercial purposes).</p>	<p>43. Note – the property was purchased on 2021 which is not considered recently.</p> <p>44. Uphold - – the existing 170m<sup>2</sup> dwelling is unapproved and was renovated without any approvals being issued.</p> <p>The house was inspected and the following was sent to the real estate agent dealing with the sale:</p> <p>'There are no approvals on Shire records for the property, so the house, sheds, and tanks will require retrospective approval if they are to be continued to be used.</p>	<p>address under point 32 d).</p> <p>43. Noted</p> <p>44. Upheld - the existing 170m<sup>2</sup> dwelling is unapproved and was renovated without any approvals being issued.</p>
--	--	--	--	---

			<p>This will require inspection, assessment, and requirements outlined by a private surveyor/certifier in order for them to issue a Cert of Building Compliance (CBC). This will then form part of an application for Building Approval which is to be lodged with the Shire (can forward a blank application form when ready).</p> <p>The certifier/surveyor will need to determine the specific requirements to gain the CBC though the likely items are to be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Approval (and likely inspection) by a structural engineer<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ The walls appeared ok with some moderate cracking in the internal south eastern walls</li><li>○ The adequacy of footings would</li></ul></li></ul>	
--	--	--	---	--

			<p>require site investigation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ It has been a flagged that the footings below the laundry may not be structurally sufficient (verbal conversation)</li><li>• The existing septic system would need health approval and inspection/approval by a registered plumber</li><li>• The gas system would also need approval from a registered plumber</li><li>• The gap in the external south eastern external wall brickwork to be flashed</li><li>• The roof space was sealed off and could not be inspected</li><li>• No apparent asbestos material,</li></ul>	
--	--	--	--	--

			<p>though this would require verification by material testing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Fireplace to be in accordance with the Building Code</li><li>• Window frames to be properly sealed. South eastern window glazing to be replaced</li><li>• The lighting switches had exposed electrical cabling (sheathed) in the internal brick walls</li><li>• The sheds also require structural engineer certification</li><li>• Following items would likely be needed<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ BAL Assessment &amp; Report</li><li>○ Building would need to meet determined BAL rating (screens to doors/windows, gaps less than</li></ul></li></ul>	
--	--	--	--	--

		<p>45. Notwithstanding, even if the existing 'shed' is considered by the Shire as an exempt structure, it is now proposed to be the bushfire shelter for the site - which will require planning approval (including APZ/bushfire compliance) and a Building Permit application. The application should not be considered without including the fire shelter as part of the proposal</p>	<p>2mm sealed, sarking to roof cladding etc.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Energy efficiency report (may require new glazing, additional insulation to walls and roof space)</li> <li>○ Registered electrician certificate</li> <li>○ Registered plumbers certificate for sewerage and gas systems</li> <li>○ Termite assessments and possible treatment</li> </ul> <p>There may be work required to be able to satisfy the above points.'</p> <p>45. Note – The bushfire shelter is a key component of the development.</p> <p>The standards that the bushfire shelter is required to comply with is shown at Submission 32. d).</p>	<p>45. Noted</p>
--	--	---	---	------------------

		<p>given it's impact on the existing vegetation.</p> <p>46. The application includes the use for Wedding Receptions as if this is a new development, however it is clear from the Salt Cove website <a href="https://www.saltcovebremerbay.com.au/">https://www.saltcovebremerbay.com.au/</a> that the applicant has been illegally using the site as a wedding venue for "up to 140 Wedding guests" for over 3 years which is confirmed by their Instagram page with wedding events dating back to November 2022.</p> <p>47. It also appears that the site has been cleared in areas for the purpose of camping sites with recent aerial photography showing a number of campsites being utilised which may have required Shire approval and may contravene the <i>Caravan Parks and Camping Grounds Regulation 1997</i>.</p> <p>48. What is being proposed (Reception Centre/Wedding Venue) and planned in the future for the site is <b>NOT</b> low impact development and is <b>NOT</b> retaining and protecting the existing natural environment on the site, as evidenced by the proposed <b>'future</b></p>	<p>46. Noted – the current application contains a number of retrospective elements and there is ongoing compliance with the historic use of the site.</p> <p>47. Noted – the proponent was advised to cease utilising the site as a caravan park and it is understood that this use has stopped.</p> <p>48. Noted - any expansion of the uses on the site would be subject to another Development Application.</p>	<p>46. Noted</p> <p>47. Noted</p> <p>48. Noted</p>
--	--	--	--	--

		<p><b>uses'</b> shown on the current application.</p> <p>49. The number of toilets included in the 'demountable' toilet block, which the applicant notes could allow for up to <b>250 patrons</b>, which is in excess of the capacity of stated guests to be accommodated on site (120 guests maximum, but weddings cater for up to 140 guests). Why are so many toilets being included in this stage if they are capping the guest numbers at 120/140?</p> <p>50. The Shire should at the very least require the applicant to <b>remove all references to future plans</b> for the site (Caravan sites, Central 'facilities', accommodation Chalets) and resubmit <b>to ensure that there is no ambiguity</b> about what is being applied for with this application.</p> <p>51. The standard of the documents submitted by the applicant are of a very poor standard including the very basic 'Master Plan' which has been drawn inaccurately where the scale bar is not in proportion to the plans and would suggest that distances are inaccurate including travel distances for emergency evacuation purposes.</p>	<p>49. Dismiss - the proposal has proposed a toilet block that could cater for 250 people. The required facilities for a number of people is a minimum standard and there are no restriction providing over and above the minimum level of ablutions.</p> <p>50. Uphold – if the development was to be approved all references to future plans will be marked as 'Deleted from this Application'.</p> <p>51. Uphold - a number of the documents were of a poor standard in particular Appendix A and B.</p>	<p>49. Dismissed</p> <p>50. Upheld - if the development was to be approved all references to future plans will be marked as 'Deleted from this Application'</p> <p>51. Upheld - - a number of the documents were of a poor standard in particular Appendix A and B.</p>
--	--	--	---	---

		52. Again, we state that the Shire should reject this application in its entirety.	52. Note – request to refuse application.	52. Noted
14.	Lyn & John Chadwick	1. After phone conversations with Isaac Baum and your office, we have decided that we have no objection to the controlled development of the site. We rely on the Shire, with the oversight of the elected councillors, to make decisions in the best interests of the ratepayers. If the proposal meets the planning requirements, at this stage, we see no reason to challenge the development	1. Noted - Support	1. Noted
15.	Alan & Jacqui Bean	1. strongly opposed to the development next door for the following reasons  a) Suitability of site - we have purchased a special rural block surrounded by other special rural blocks and 2 adjoining rural blocks. As the rural blocks are surrounded by rural residential homes we feel this development will change the peaceful nature of our area. We are aware that rural farms are suitable for chalets or low key campsites but in our opinion the existing businesses such as Tozer's Bush Camp have no close neighbors to impact.	1. Note – opposed to the development.  a) Note	1. Noted  a) Noted

		<p>b) Fire Risk - we feel that having tourists camped in the bush is a recipe for disaster as it only takes one cigarette or an illegally lit fire pit to burn out the neighbours, especially risky with the consumption of alcohol during weddings. Once again, campsites like Tozer's are much more defensible in a bushfire and pose less threat to neighbors. In event of a fire from the north it would be very dangerous to exit the property via Horse Hill Road as fires in coastal heath travel extremely fast. The fire shelter would need to be very large for a wedding and of a very high quality to save lives.</p> <p>We also have concerns with lithium batteries used by the eco tents.</p> <p>c) Traffic - already we have been impacted by camping on this property last summer with continuous traffic all day on the unsealed road in front of our home. Weddings also see traffic from buses, deliveries, workers and maintenance vehicles over a few days each</p>	<p>b) Noted - the proponent was advised to cease utilising the site as a caravan park and it is understood that this use has stopped.</p> <p>The Fire Shelter is a converted outbuilding and it will need to comply with the standards outline in response to Submission 13 32 d).</p> <p>Whilst the site is stated as having limited access to power it is supposition that lithium batteries will be used.</p> <p>c) Uphold - No traffic impact assessment has been provided with the application and as such there is insufficient information to determine the application.</p>	<p>b) Noted</p> <p>c) Upheld - No traffic impact assessment has been provided with the application and as such there is insufficient information to determine the application.</p>
--	--	---	---	--

		<p>time. The proposal mentions possible weddings once a week and yoga retreats as well as short stay tourism. We notice that most guests enter and leave their accommodation at least 3 times per day (60 trips past our house a day) plus staff and deliveries. Weddings bring buses but also many cars.</p> <p>As Horse Hill Road is unsealed we have also experienced major amounts of dust and noise from trucks, trailers and cars on the corrugated road and Lot 112's driveway. Guests leaving at midnight has also bothered us in the past.</p> <p>d) Unsuitable accommodation - we are aware that our area needs more accommodation but eco tents will not be suitable in such a cold windy site for most of the year. Heating would be impossible in winter. Outdoor furniture would blow away. Therefore the proposed eco tents would probably only be rented out during weddings. This does not help the long term need for accommodation in Bremer Bay.</p>	<p>d) Noted – the application documents state that the Eco Tents will only be used by in the numbers of the wedding venue. It should also be noted that in general there are opportunities for further eco-tourism developments however the Shire would particularly encourage accommodations that incorporates facilities</p>	<p>d) Noted</p>
--	--	--	--	-----------------

		<p>e) Rural use - in strategic planning schemes for our area no such tourist development has been mentioned. Purchases of property in our area have been made with the idea that Point Henry would stay rural residential and not commercial/tourism. As lot 112 is not a working farm surely normal uses for rural do not have to apply.</p> <p>f) Possible future Caravan Row - we have already experienced camping on lot 112. This was done with no toilets (BYO), rubbish removal or manager on site. We have had rubbish dumped in our bins on the road, people looking for directions to the campsite, witnessed campers on motorbikes entering with no possibility of a toilet on board. We strongly object to camping on this site.</p> <p>g) Protection of coastal bushland - as far as we can tell there will be substantial clearing of vegetation. As a neighbouring</p>	<p>which can attract visitors in off peak / winter periods.</p> <p>e) Note – the subject site is zoned ‘rural’ and is one of 3 Lots that were left after the subdivision of Point Henry for ‘rural residential’ subdivision and development. Use for rural are permitted limited by the vegetated nature of the site, fire risk and limited servicing.</p> <p>f) Uphold– if the development was to be approved all references to future plans will be marked as ‘Deleted from this Application’.</p> <p>g) Uphold – A vegetation study and fauna study was not provided and the comment in Part 2.3 stating that no wildlife</p>	<p>e) Noted</p> <p>f) Upheld– if the development was to be approved all references to future plans will be marked as ‘Deleted from this Application’.</p> <p>g) Upheld - A vegetation study and fauna study was not provided and the comment in Part 2.3</p>
--	--	---	--	--

		<p>property, we have observed black cockatoos feeding on Lot 112 regularly. On our own property we have kangaroos, echidna, quoll, frogs, monitor lizards and many snakes and small lizards. We also have many species of birds visiting.</p>	<p>has been observed on site other than transitory birds demonstrates that the fauna on the site has not been adequately surveyed. The lack of details does not make the development supportable.</p>	<p>stating that no wildlife has been observed on site other than transitory birds demonstrates that the fauna on the site has not been adequately surveyed. The lack of details does not make the development supportable.</p>
16.	Ken Shaw	<p>1. The development outline provided to me is no more than a cursory, concept plan. As such I find it extremely difficult to make a considered relevant and detailed analysis of the proposal. I would therefore be disappointed should Council approve the application.</p> <p>a) My concerns broadly encompass:  a) Bushfire. Bushfire - Ability to escape. Potential encirclement. Vehicle access for patrons and fire services. Building suitability in high fire risk environment. Provision of cleared buffer adjacent to individual pergodas.</p> <p>b) Patron safety. Will fencing be provided preventing access to</p>	<p>1. Note – insufficient information has been supplied to support this information.</p> <p>a) Note – the site will not be occupied in days with a FDI 75.</p> <p>A fire shelter is also proposed that will need to comply with the standards outlined in the officers comments to Submission 13 32 d)</p> <p>b) Uphold – no safety fencing has been</p>	<p>1. Noted</p> <p>a) Noted</p> <p>b) Upheld - no safety fencing has been</p>

		<p>and potential fall from foreshore cliffs.</p> <p>c) Sanitary. I think but can not be sure that each pergoda has toilet /basin / sink incorporated. Will septic tanks be what will the environmental impact be .</p> <p>d) I can't imagine that patrons will be satisfied with the rudimentary toilet block.</p> <p>e) Future buildings or use as included on the plan. Does the developer expect that Council will provide enduring blanket approval without any detail?</p> <p>f) Environment. What will the footprint be and will it be consistent with zoning and environmental regulations.</p> <p>g) could continue but it will be hypothetical because the legend provided is inadequate and plan</p>	<p>proposed and the lack of detail in respect of this does not make the proposal supportable.</p> <p>c) Note – no facilities are proposed with the oergoda.</p> <p>d) Note – observation</p> <p>e) Uphold – if the development was to be approved all references to future plans will be marked as 'Deleted from this Application'</p> <p>f) Note - there is a general presumption against clearing native vegetation.</p> <p>g) Note – plan is acknowledged as hard to interpret.</p>	<p>proposed and the lack of detail in respect of this does not make the proposal supportable.</p> <p>c) Noted</p> <p>d) Noted</p> <p>e) Uphold – if the development was to be approved all references to future plans will be marked as 'Deleted from this Application'</p> <p>f) Noted</p> <p>g) Noted</p>
--	--	--	--	---

		scale makes sensible interpretation impossible.		
17.	Simon Yeo	<p>1. The subject land is zoned Rural under the Shire of Jerramungup Local Planning Scheme No. 2 (LPS2). A Reception Centre is not a use contemplated as permitted or discretionary in the Rural zone under the LPS2 Zoning Table. It is, in effect, a prohibited use ('X') in this zone. Tourist Accommodation may be considered discretionary ('A') only if it is clearly ancillary to an active rural or primary production use on the land. No such rural enterprise is evident from the application materials.</p> <p>2. The objectives of the Rural zone under LPS2 are to protect agricultural land, maintain rural character, and prevent inappropriate land use conflicts. The proposed development, which includes a reception/function centre capable of hosting weddings and events, together with 10 short-stay glamping-style eco tents, is a high-intensity, visitor-facing commercial enterprise that is fundamentally inconsistent with these objectives.</p>	<p>1. Note -Reception Centre is an unlisted use and is dealt with under Clause 4.4.2 of Local Planning Scheme No. 2, Tourist Accommodation is a 'D' use rather than the 'A' use specified.</p> <p>2. Uphold - the subject lot is zoned 'rural' but it has not been developed for agricultural activity.</p> <p>The objectives of the 'rural' zone are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- To ensure the continuation of broad-hectare farming as the principal land use in the district and encouraging where appropriate the retention and expansion</li> </ul>	<p>1. Noted</p> <p>2. Upheld - The proposed use as a reception centre as an unlisted use is not consistent with the objectives for the 'rural' zone.</p>

			<p>of agricultural activities where the land is capable of such development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- To consider non-rural uses where they can be shown to be of benefit to the district and not detrimental to the natural resources or the environment.</li><li>- To allow for facilities for tourists and travellers, and for recreation uses.</li><li>- To help protect rural land from land degradation and further loss of biodiversity by:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>a. minimising clearing of remnant vegetation</li><li>b. encouraging retention and protection of remnant vegetation</li><li>c. encouraging development and protection of vegetation corridors</li><li>d. encouraging development of sustainable</li></ul></li></ul>	
--	--	--	--	--

		<p>3. The planning report also conspicuously fails to mention the very large 45-49 metre bushfire asset protection zone (APZ) required around the proposed bushfire shelter</p>	<p>surface and sub-surface drainage works</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>e. encouraging rehabilitation of salt-affected land</li> <li>f. encouraging soil conservation through land management measures</li> <li>g. encouraging identification and protection of wetlands</li> </ul> <p>– To promote the sustainable management of natural resources, and the prevention of land degradation.</p> <p>The proposed use as a reception centre as an unlisted use is not consistent with the objectives for the ‘rural’ zone.</p> <p>3. Uphold – The proposal will be required to clear large areas to achieve appropriate BAL ratings as well as access roads for the eco tents. This is</p>	<p>3. Upheld - The proposal will be required to clear large areas to achieve appropriate BAL ratings as well</p>
--	--	---	--	--

		<p>(a converted existing shed). That APZ alone represents over 10,000m<sup>2</sup> of cleared bushland.</p> <p>4. The assessment of this application must weigh the main principles underlying the Shire's Local Planning Strategy for Rural Zoned lots, specifically "to protect sensitive and significant environmental areas" and</p>	<p>not consisted with the objectives of the 'Rural' zone specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- To consider non-rural uses where they can be shown to be of benefit to the district and not detrimental to the natural resources or the environment.</li> </ul> <p>and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- To help protect rural land from land degradation and further loss of biodiversity by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) minimising clearing of remnant vegetation</li> <li>b) encouraging retention and protection of remnant vegetation</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>4. Uphold – the local planning strategy states 'an overriding consideration is that there should be no adverse impacts on the</p>	<p>as access roads for the eco tents. This is not consisted with the objectives of the 'Rural' zone.</p> <p>4. Upheld - the local planning strategy states 'an overriding consideration is that there should be no adverse impacts on</p>
--	--	--	--	---

		<p>the requirement for "no adverse impacts on the surrounding land and rural activities". The proposal plainly fails on both counts.</p> <p>5. This application is seeking approval for an intensive commercial operation on land zoned for low-intensity Rural use only. Approving it would create a significantly higher risk of adverse impacts on the site environment, the Rural character and the amenity of adjoining properties than would ordinarily be expected from a single holiday home or a Rural Home Business under the Shire of Jerramungup Local Planning Scheme No. 2.</p>	<p>surrounding land and rural activities.' The proposed development does not meet this standard.</p> <p>5. Uphold - the subject lot is zoned 'rural' but it has not been developed for agricultural activity.</p> <p>The objectives of the 'rural' zone are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- To ensure the continuation of broad-hectare farming as the principal land use in the district and encouraging where appropriate the retention and expansion of agricultural activities where the land is capable of such development</li> <li>- To consider non-rural uses where they can be shown to be of benefit to the district and not detrimental to the natural resources or the environment.</li> </ul>	<p>the surrounding land and rural activities.' The proposed development does not meet this standard.</p> <p>5. Upheld - The proposed use as a reception centre on tourist accommodation creates a scale of development that is not consistent with the objectives for the 'rural' zone</p>
--	--	---	---	--

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- To allow for facilities for tourists and travellers, and for recreation uses.</li><li>- To help protect rural land from land degradation and further loss of biodiversity by:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>a. minimising clearing of remnant vegetation</li><li>b. encouraging retention and protection of remnant vegetation</li><li>c. encouraging development and protection of vegetation corridors</li><li>d. encouraging development of sustainable surface and sub-surface drainage works</li><li>e. encouraging rehabilitation of salt-affected land</li><li>f. encouraging soil conservation through land management measures</li></ul></li></ul>	
--	--	--	--	--

		<p>6. Tourist Accommodation is a Discretionary use under the Shire of Jerramungup Local Planning Scheme No. 2, meaning planning approval must be obtained. The Shire's own policy is to actively encourage high quality short term accommodation proposals, but only where they are at 'appropriate densities suited to the site location', which 'assist in attracting more tourists into the area during off-peak times', and 'provided that no land use or environmental conflicts arise'.</p>	<p>g. encouraging identification and protection of wetlands</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- To promote the sustainable management of natural resources, and the prevention of land degradation.</li> </ul> <p>The proposed use as a reception centre on tourist accommodation creates a scale of development that is not consistent with the objectives for the 'rural' zone.</p> <p>6. Uphold – the proposed 'tourist accommodation' may have unsatisfactory environmental impacts due to clearing for roads and effluent disposal areas.</p>	<p>6. Upheld - the proposed 'tourist accommodation' may have unsatisfactory environmental impacts due to clearing for roads and effluent disposal areas.</p>
--	--	---	---	--

		<p>7. Noting that the application report (Part 4.2 Operational Details) identifies the warmer months as the main season for events, the accommodation tied to those events will do nothing to increase visitor numbers during off-peak periods. The eco-tent accommodation type proposed is well known to the respondent: due to a complete lack of insulation, eco-tents are only genuinely comfortable during a narrow summer window when conditions are favourable. Their viability for off-peak or off-grid tourist accommodation is, in our view, very questionable and not financially or operationally sustainable outside the peak season.</p> <p>8. The Applicant has omitted a number of critical documents and studies from the Development Application and</p>	<p>7. Note - the Shire seeks to actively encourage high quality short term accommodation proposals, they must be at 'appropriate densities suited to the site location'...which 'assist in attracting more tourists into the area during off-peak times'...and 'provided that no land use or environmental conflicts arise'.</p> <p>The application report Part 4.2 Operational Details identifies that the main season for events will be during the warmer months, and therefore the associated accommodation occupancy connected to these events will not provide additional accommodation during off peak times.</p> <p>8. Uphold - The Applicant has omitted a number of critical documents and</p>	<p>7. Noted</p> <p>8. Upheld - The Applicant has omitted a number of critical</p>
--	--	--	--	---

		<p>does not appear to have a thorough understanding of the site topography and conditions in terms of manageable access and construction.</p> <p>9. The Local Planning Strategy for Area 17 (Point Henry Peninsula) requires all proposals for development on Rural-zoned lots to be assessed against the Point Henry Limited Rural Strategy 1991, and to comprehensively address issues such as environmental assessment, land capability, visual impact, effluent disposal capability, water management and drainage, and servicing. This significant planning document has not been referenced or considered in the Town Planning Report submitted, and the specific issues it requires to be comprehensively addressed have simply not been assessed in any meaningful detail.</p> <p>10. The Shire will need to determine whether the site is actually suitable for</p>	<p>studies in their Development Application. There are question related to the site topography and site conditions in terms of manageable site access, and construction</p> <p>9. Uphold – The Point Henry Limited Rural Strategy 1991 identified the subject lots as being highly constrained and as such was excluded from ‘Rural Residential’ development.</p> <p>The Point Henry Limited Rural Strategy 1991 was not considered in the application and as a consequence the proposal cannot be supported.</p> <p>10. Uphold - the proposed development presents</p>	<p>documents and studies in their Development Application. There are question related to the site topography and site conditions in terms of manageable site access, and construction</p> <p>9. Upheld - The Point Henry Limited Rural Strategy 1991 identified the subject lots as being highly constrained and as such was excluded from ‘Rural Residential’ development.</p> <p>The Point Henry Limited Rural Strategy 1991 was not considered in the application and as a consequence the proposal cannot be supported.</p> <p>10. Upheld - - the proposed</p>
--	--	--	---	--

		<p>the intensive commercial uses being proposed. The absence of basic information that could materially affect the site and adjoining neighbours should, in our submission, be grounds enough to reject this application outright.</p> <p>11. The Point Henry Limited Rural Strategy makes clear that the Rural-zoned lots in this area are environmentally sensitive and should not be used for anything beyond low-intensity purposes. Despite this, the Applicant has provided no detailed assessment of the flora and fauna present on the site and no vegetation study whatsoever. The only fauna reference in the report appears under Part 2.3, noting 'no wildlife observed other than transitory birds'. A casual walk through the area regularly reveals kangaroos, other mammals, lizards, reptiles and a variety of insects.</p> <p>12. There is a passing reference to a 'Veg Mgt Study' (not provided), but no environmental report of any kind has been commissioned for this site. The site contains vegetation communities with federal protection status, and without a detailed environmental report</p>	<p>concerns with environmental, commercial, and safety domains and as such should be refused.</p> <p>11. Uphold – A flora and fauna study was not provided and the comment in Part 2.3 stating that no wildlife has been observed on site other than transitory birds demonstrates that the fauna on the site has not been adequately surveyed. The lack of details does not make the development supportable.</p> <p>12. Uphold – a vegetation management study was not provided. The lack of details does not make the development supportable.</p>	<p>development presents concerns with environmental, commercial, and safety domains and as such should be refused</p> <p>11. Upheld - A flora and fauna study was not provided and the comment in Part 2.3 stating that no wildlife has been observed on site other than transitory birds demonstrates that the fauna on the site has not been adequately surveyed. The lack of details does not make the development supportable.</p> <p>12. Uphold – a vegetation management study was not provided. The lack of details does not make the development supportable.</p>
--	--	---	---	---

		<p>the Shire will not be in a position to ensure those communities are not adversely impacted by the proposed development.</p> <p>13. No detailed site survey has been provided. The site contours shown on location plan D2 do not accurately represent the actual topography when cross-referenced against Landgate resources. Parts of the eastern corner of the site have a gradient of approximately 1:3, which could require either massive civil engineering works or a bridge to deliver the proposed access road serving the eco-tents. Furthermore, the Point Henry Limited Rural Strategy specifically identified this part of the site as inappropriate for development because of steep gradients, exposure to strong winds and serviceability challenges, as well as a high bushfire risk. The proposed eco-tents are located within what has been assessed as a Flame Zone.</p> <p>14. Insufficient information has been provided about the design of the proposed buildings and structures to allow any proper assessment of whether the development would be of 'high quality'. The proposed toilet block (described as a 'demountable' in the</p>	<p>13. Uphold - – given the topography of the site as identified in the Point Henry Limited Rural Strategy a detailed site survey with accurate contours has not been provided with the application. Given the slopes that occur towards the coast where the Eco tents are proposed can be up to the 1:3 gradient it will make constructing roads to service these difficult.</p> <p>14. Uphold – there is insufficient information design of the proposed buildings and structures and therefore to ensure that the development is of 'high quality'</p>	<p>13. Upheld - given the topography of the site as identified in the Point Henry Limited Rural Strategy a detailed site survey with accurate contours has not been provided with the application. Given the slopes that occur towards the coast where the Eco tents are proposed can be up to the 1:3 gradient it will make constructing roads to service these difficult.</p> <p>14. Upheld - there is insufficient information design of the proposed buildings and structures and therefore to ensure</p>
--	--	---	---	---

		<p>applicant's report) is non-compliant in terms of DDA access and Building Code requirements.</p> <p>15. Point Henry is a well-documented high fire risk area, served by a single access road in and out of the peninsula. That physical reality alone makes it a dangerous location in which to congregate large groups such as wedding parties.</p>	<p>The proposed demountable toilet block does not show how a wheelchair would access the facility as it is raised from the ground.</p> <p>15. Uphold - Point Henry is a known high-fire risk area, with only one access road in and out of the peninsula which makes it a dangerous location for the congregation of large groups such as weddings.</p> <p>The Shed which is being converted into a fire shelter would need to comply with the following:</p> <p>While closure and early evacuation are recommended in the first instance, the following conditions should be imposed on a</p>	<p>that the development is of 'high quality'</p> <p>The proposed demountable toilet block does not show how a wheelchair would access the facility as it is raised from the ground.</p> <p>15. Upheld - Point Henry is a known high-fire risk area, with only one access road in and out of the peninsula which makes it a dangerous location for the congregation of large groups such as weddings.</p> <p>The Shed which is being converted into a fire shelter would need to comply with the standards outlined under Submission 13 recommendation 32 d)</p>
--	--	--	--	---

			<p>development approval where on-site shelter in a building is proposed:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>a. The on-site shelter must be designed and constructed in accordance with the Building Code of Australia and the ABCB Design and Construction of Community Bushfire Refuges Handbook (2014). The design must be undertaken by a suitably qualified fire engineer with fire risk assessment expertise, accredited with Engineers Australia.</li><li>b. Prior to occupation of the development, a final inspection of the on-site shelter must be undertaken by a suitably qualified fire engineer with fire risk assessment expertise, accredited with Engineers Australia. The fire engineer should</li></ol>	
--	--	--	---	--

			<p>provide certification, to the satisfaction of the local government, that the works have been completed in accordance with the requirements of the BCA and the ABCB Design and Construction of Community Bushfire Refuges Handbook (2014).</p> <p>c. Prior to occupation of the development, an on-site shelter maintenance plan must be prepared by a suitably qualified fire engineer with fire risk assessment expertise, accredited with Engineers Australia, and must include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>i. details of maintenance requirements;</li><li>ii. and details of annual testing requirements for operational compliance.</li></ul>	
--	--	--	--	--

		<p>16. Both a Bushfire Evacuation Plan (BEP) and a Landscape Management Plan (LMP) are required fire planning documents for vulnerable land uses. While a Bushfire Management Plan (BMP) has been included with the application, the BEP is referenced within the BMP but has not been provided. The LMP is also absent.</p> <p>17. The BEP, when it is produced, will need to grapple seriously with several significant risks:</p> <p>a) The single access road from the peninsula, which could need to handle the evacuation of 240+ persons from the site</p>	<p>This has not been stipulated in the application.</p> <p>16. Uphold - a Bushfire Evacuation Plan (BEP) and a Landscape Management Plan (LMP) are required fire planning documents for vulnerable land uses were not lodged with the application.</p> <p>17. Note</p> <p>a) Uphold – the report states a maximum occupancy of 120 guest but the webpage currently advertises packages for up to 140 guests. Whilst it is stated that the Eco tents are to be occupied by wedding guest there is no guarantee that these would be exclusively for event guests which would result in more being</p>	<p>16. Upheld - a Bushfire Evacuation Plan (BEP) and a Landscape Management Plan (LMP) are required fire planning documents for vulnerable land uses were not lodged with the application.</p> <p>17. Noted</p> <p>a) Upheld - the report states a maximum occupancy of 120 guest but the webpage currently advertises packages for up to 140 guests. Whilst it is stated that the Eco tents are to be occupied by wedding guest there is no</p>
--	--	---	---	--

		<p>b) The extended distance of over 1 kilometre and difficult terrain that guests would need to traverse to reach the proposed fire shelter (a converted shed), potentially through actively burning vegetation, without any familiarity with the site or surroundings</p> <p>c) Evacuation of guests with mobility limitations, which has not been addressed</p>	<p>on site that stated in the report.</p> <p>b) Noted – Not a fire shelter is proposed on site.</p> <p>c) Uphold – whilst the documents lodged with the application show accessible bays and toilets there is no consideration how a person with mobility issues will evacuate the site. This means the application cannot be supported</p>	<p>guarantee that these would be exclusively for event guests which would result in more being on site that stated in the report.</p> <p>b) Noted</p> <p>c) Upheld - whilst the documents lodged with the application show accessible bays and toilets there is no consideration how a person with mobility issues will</p>
--	--	---	---	---

		<p>d) Much of the site being unpowered, raising the question of how evacuation routes and paths would be illuminated</p> <p>e) No detail on how site closure will be managed when the fire risk level (FRL) exceeds 75 as required under the BMP. Sending up to 240 guests back to Perth, some of whom will have travelled great distances for a wedding, would simply not be practical</p> <p>f) The period of highest event occupancy directly coincides with the period of highest fire risk</p> <p>11. As a proposed vulnerable use, the BMP is required to be submitted to</p>	<p>d) Note – no details have been provided how evacuation routes and paths would be illuminated.</p> <p>e) Uphold - if approved conditions would need to be placed requiring the Shire to be notified of any events and then the forecast is to be used to establish when the sites needs to be closed down.</p> <p>f) Note – statement of fact.</p> <p>11. Note - local 'on the ground' emergency</p>	<p>evacuate the site. This means the application cannot be supported</p> <p>d) Noted</p> <p>e) Upheld - if approved conditions would need to be placed requiring the Shire to be notified of any events and then the forecast is to be used to establish when the sites needs to be closed down.</p> <p>f) Noted</p> <p>11. Noted</p>
--	--	---	--	---

		<p>DFES for approval. Given the very real risks to both property and life, DFES's formal response should be a central part of the decision-making process, yet it is not included in the application documents. It is also notably absent of any reference to consultation with the local, on-the-ground emergency services.</p> <p>12. Lot boundaries in the area are required to remain unfenced due to emergency evacuation requirements and fire control, and any gates must be kept unlocked. The proposed site plan with its peripheral driveways further reduces the amenity of neighbouring properties.</p> <p>13. The applicant has attempted to address concerns about vehicle access via Magpie Rise by stating they would chain off that roadway. This would suggest that safety requirements for an already vulnerable site could be compromised by the venue's operations. It reads as an unachievable assurance put</p>	<p>services; have advised that in the event of a fire in Point Henry they will not be accessing the area rather they will be placing road blocks to let people out and prevent others from getting in</p> <p>12. Uphold - under Local Planning Scheme No. 2 Cl 5.24.3 o) Boundary fences are not to be erected on lots with coverage of more than 80% natural vegetation which would mean the boundaries adjacent the 'rural residential' zoned land should not be fenced.</p> <p>13. Uphold - Access to the site by Magpie Rise would need to remain unchained and provide an alternative access to the site.</p>	<p>12. Upheld - under Local Planning Scheme No. 2 Cl 5.24.3 o) Boundary fences are not to be erected on lots with coverage of more than 80% natural vegetation which would mean the boundaries adjacent the 'rural residential' zoned land should not be fenced.</p> <p>13. Upheld - Access to the site by Magpie Rise would need to remain unchained and provide an alternative access to the site.</p>
--	--	--	--	--

		<p>forward simply to deflect neighbour concerns.</p> <p>14. The BMP states that 'There are no relevant biodiversity or conservation values identified within the subject site or adjacent that would influence the application of the Bushfire Protection Measures', but also concedes that 'The accuracy of this data...should be confirmed with the relevant local government authority and/or state agency'. This tells us plainly that the requirement to preserve and minimise clearance of remnant vegetation was never factored into the bushfire management assessment for the site. The 10,000m<sup>2</sup> APZ for the fire shelter confirms this.</p> <p>15. Based on inaccurate topographical assumptions, actual site occupant numbers and significant gaps in environmental information, we do not believe the Bushfire Consultant has been provided with adequate information to properly assess the fire risk.</p> <p>16. We also note a number of non-compliances in the BMP that the Shire would effectively be accepting by approving this application,</p>	<p>14. Uphold – A fauna and vegetation study was not provided and the comment in Part 2.3 stating that no wildlife has been observed on site other than transitory birds demonstrates that the fauna on the site has not been adequately surveyed. The lack of details does not make the development supportable.</p> <p>15. Uphold – there are a number of gaps in data and environmental information . Based on tis the proposed development cannot be supported.</p> <p>16. Note</p>	<p>14. Upheld - A fauna and vegetation study was not provided and the comment in Part 2.3 stating that no wildlife has been observed on site other than transitory birds demonstrates that the fauna on the site has not been adequately surveyed. The lack of details does not make the development supportable.</p> <p>15. Upheld - there are a number of gaps in data and environmental information . Based on tis the proposed development cannot be supported.</p> <p>16. Noted</p>
--	--	--	---	--

		<p>including the maintenance of non-compliant access roads. This transfers risk directly to the Shire.</p> <p>17. While detail of the proposed signage has been provided, the locations of the signage are not shown on any submitted plan.</p> <p>18. A number of local planning documents flag restricted water supply and potential shortages in the area, including Section 6.2 of the Point Henry Limited Rural Strategy 1991 and Section 6.16.2(c) of the Shire of Jerramungup Local Planning Strategy. The site has no reticulated water supply.</p> <p>19. The Applicant's report acknowledges under Part 4.7 that 'a series of water issues were raised' and asserts that the development 'complies' with a sustainable water supply, but fails to identify what those issues were or explain how compliance is actually achieved.</p>	<p>17. Note – the proposed signage will be located on site on the entry points to the site.</p> <p>18. Note – there is no reticulated water available on the site.</p> <p>19. Uphold – there is no indication as to water supply is resolved, the two attachments Appendix A Site &amp; Soil Evaluation related to an earlier application for a difference proposal in 2023 and Appendix B is a sales document rather than identification of what will be done on site. Based on these</p>	<p>17. Noted</p> <p>18. Noted</p> <p>19. Upheld - there is no indication as to water supply is resolved, the two attachments Appendix A Site &amp; Soil Evaluation related to an earlier application for a difference proposal in 2023 and Appendix B is a sales document rather than identification of what</p>
--	--	---	--	--

		<p>20. Potable water is stated to be supplied via roof capture, which is physically impossible from the eco-tents as they have no gutters and are located a significant distance from any hard-roofed structures. Water cartage is proposed to top up tanks when levels fall. This is not a sustainable water source. Given existing concerns about fresh water supply for the Bremer Bay townsite itself, regularly carting water to the site cannot be considered sustainable, and it will also increase the frequency and number of large service vehicles travelling to and from the Point.</p> <p>21. The water demand expected from 240+ persons on site at peak times will be considerable. Yet no detailed water use analysis covering occupancy numbers, daily consumption estimates or supply/rainfall modelling has been provided for the existing buildings, the proposed toilet block, the eco-tents or any other new structures. This is</p>	<p>documents the application cannot be supported.</p> <p>20. Note – Potable water is to be supplied by water tanks, to be pumped/gravity-fed rainwater, and topped up by carted water if required. Given that the eco-tents don't have gutters the water tanks for then will be required to be carted.</p> <p>21. Note - the proposal is outlined as a wedding venue for up to 120 people including the 10 Eco tents. No detailed water usage per day has been provided with the application.</p>	<p>will be done on site. Based on these documents the application cannot be supported.</p> <p>20. Noted</p> <p>21. Noted</p>
--	--	--	---	--

		<p>particularly concerning given that the main event season and maximum site occupancy will fall during the driest months of the year.</p> <p>22. For the development to have minimal environmental impact on adjacent waterways, including Salt Cove, the Applicant needs to demonstrate that there will be no discharge or run-off from the proposed effluent systems. The submitted documentation falls well short of this:</p> <p>23. Appendix A (Soil and Site Evaluation) has no relevance to this application. It relates to a previous application for an Ancillary Dwelling and Workers Accommodation on the site.</p> <p>24. Appendix B (Wastewater Report) is not a report or study at all. It is simply a quotation and product specifications, with no reference to specific locations, drain lengths or site conditions.</p>	<p>22. Noted – Aerobic Treatment Units (ATU) are proposed to be used for the Eco Tents</p> <p>23. Uphold – Appendix A ‘Soil and Site Evaluation’ is not related to the current application and the proposed effluent disposal locations. /it relates to an earlier application and is not sufficient to recommend approval for the development.</p> <p>24. Uphold - Appendix B ‘Wastewater Report’ is not a report or detailed study based on the Applicant’s proposal. It is simply a quotation and proposed product details and is not sufficient to</p>	<p>22. Noted</p> <p>23. Upheld - Appendix A ‘Soil and Site Evaluation’ is not related to the current application and the proposed effluent disposal locations. /it relates to an earlier application and is not sufficient to recommend approval for the development.</p> <p>24. Upheld - Appendix A ‘Soil and Site Evaluation’ is not related to the current application and the proposed effluent disposal locations. /it relates to an earlier</p>
--	--	--	--	---

		<p>25. While individual onsite wastewater treatment systems are proposed for each building/tent, the slope contour analysis in the Point Henry Limited Rural Strategy 1991 found that the area proposed for the eco-tents exceeds a 14% gradient, which was identified as too steep to consider for septic absorption and dwelling purposes.</p> <p>26. The masterplan shows overhead and underground power locations, but there is currently no mains power available at the proposed reception area (described as a 'portable' marquee) or at the eco-tents. The method of providing power to the new buildings and structures needs to be confirmed, along with the approach to emergency and wayfinding lighting. Each of the potential options carries its own risks</p> <p>27. There is no detail on how vehicles, including deliveries and water cartage trucks, will access the site or where they will park in connection with the</p>	<p>recommend approval for the development</p> <p>25. Uphold – given the topography for the Eco – Tents on the eastern boundary runs between 20% and 40% there may be construction issues regarding access and effluent disposal.</p> <p>26. Uphold - there is a lack of detail as to how power will be distributed throughout the site. Based on the lack of detail the proposal cannot be supported.</p> <p>27. Uphold – No traffic impact assessment has been provided with the application and as such</p>	<p>application and is not sufficient to recommend approval for the development</p> <p>25. Upheld - given the topography for the Eco – Tents on the eastern boundary runs between 20% and 40% there may be construction issues regarding access and effluent disposal.</p> <p>26. Upheld - there is a lack of detail as to how power will be distributed throughout the site. Based on the lack of detail the proposal cannot be supported</p> <p>27. Upheld - there is a lack of detail as to how power will be distributed</p>
--	--	---	---	---

		<p>proposed Reception area. The inclusion of future development stages on the current application plan is confusing and makes it difficult to assess what roads and parking are actually being applied for at this stage.</p> <p>28. Noting that the applicant's own wedding packages cater for up to 140 guests, the provision of just 12 car bays is plainly insufficient. At 4 occupants per car, 12 bays provides on-site parking for only 48 guests. If remaining guests are expected to park on perimeter access roads or informally in the bush, this will directly impact neighbouring properties, emergency access and the natural vegetation.</p> <p>29. The report notes that 'with regard to liquor licencing, advice previously sought...confirmed that liquor licence is not required without the sale or supply of alcohol'. This may be technically accurate, but alcohol is</p>	<p>there is insufficient information to determine the application</p> <p>If the development was to be approved all references to future plans will be marked as 'Deleted from this Application'.</p> <p>28. Uphold – up to 140 guests are accommodated at each event (refer to the wedding packages offered on the Applicant's website), and only 40 car bays are proposed although only 12 are for weddings, 3 are ACROD, 5 for delivers 19 for accommodation units and 1 bus bay.</p> <p>29. Uphold - Exemptions for small functions only apply where alcohol is served to persons over 18, no earlier than 6am and no later than 10pm,</p>	<p>throughout the site. Based on the lack of detail the proposal cannot be supported</p> <p>If the development was to be approved all references to future plans will be marked as 'Deleted from this Application'.</p> <p>28. Upheld - up to 140 guests are accommodated at each event (refer to the wedding packages offered on the Applicant's website), and only 40 car bays are proposed although only 12 are for weddings, 3 are ACROD, 5 for delivers 19 for accommodation units and 1 bus bay.</p> <p>29. Upheld - Exemptions for small functions only apply where alcohol is served to persons over 18, no earlier than 6am and</p>
--	--	--	---	--

		<p>and will be supplied as part of the proposed wedding/function use. The business's own website advertises 'cocktail weddings' and lists 4 bar staff as part of its packages.</p> <p>Exemptions for small functions only apply where alcohol is served to persons over 18, no earlier than 6am and no later than 10pm, and for a maximum of 2 continuous hours for up to 100 attendees, or 4 continuous hours for up to 75 attendees. The proposed wedding hours of 12 noon to midnight make it virtually impossible for these exemption conditions to be met.</p> <p>30. This inconsistency needs to be resolved as part of the operational details. The risk to adjoining residents and to guest safety from regular alcohol service (at minimum once per week during the summer season) is a genuine and material concern.</p> <p>31. Accessible parking bays are noted in the report, but the proposal does not identify which eco-tent will be configured for guests requiring level or ramped access, or specify internal layouts suitable for wheelchair users. At least one of the 10 proposed tents</p>	<p>and for a maximum of 2 continuous hours for up to 100 attendees, or 4 continuous hours for up to 75 attendees. The proposed wedding hours of 12 noon to midnight make it virtually impossible for these exemption conditions to be met and the appropriate liquor licence should be sought.</p> <p>30. Uphold - as outlined under Officer Comment 29 to this submission the exemption used may be flawed and as such a liquor licence should be sought.</p> <p>31. Uphold - Accessible parking bays are noted in the report, but the proposal does not identify which eco-tent will be configured for guests requiring level or</p>	<p>no later than 10pm, and for a maximum of 2 continuous hours for up to 100 attendees, or 4 continuous hours for up to 75 attendees. The proposed wedding hours of 12 noon to midnight make it virtually impossible for these exemption conditions to be met and the appropriate liquor licence should be sought.</p> <p>30. Upheld - as outlined under Officer Comment 29 to this submission the exemption used may be flawed and as such a liquor licence should be sought.</p> <p>31. Upheld - - Accessible parking bays are noted in the report, but the proposal does not identify which eco-tent will be configured for guests</p>
--	--	---	--	---

		<p>and the access path from the car bay to that tent must comply with AS 1428.1. The additional footprint required for an accessible tent will necessitate further vegetation clearing.</p> <p>The size and internal configuration of the accessible toilet in the proposed toilet block also does not comply with AS 1428.1. Further site works and clearing would be required to achieve a compliant building design.</p> <p>32. The Applicant states that the maximum number of occupants on site at any one time will be 120 guests (adults and children), including guests staying in the eco-tents. However, the business's own website advertises wedding packages for up to 140 guests, and there is no undertaking that the eco-tents would be reserved exclusively for event guests. We estimate that total site occupancy could reach up to 240 persons, which is well in excess of the 122 figure cited in the report.</p>	<p>ramped access, or specify internal layouts suitable for wheelchair users. At least one of the 10 proposed tents and the access path from the car bay to that tent must comply with AS 1428.1. The additional footprint required for an accessible tent will necessitate further vegetation clearing.</p> <p>32. Note– the report states a maximum occupancy of 120 guest but the webpage currently advertises packages for up to 140 guests. Whilst it is stated that the Eco tents are to be occupied by wedding guest there is no guarantee that these would be exclusively for event guests which would result in more being on site that stated in the report.</p>	<p>requiring level or ramped access, or specify internal layouts suitable for wheelchair users. At least one of the 10 proposed tents and the access path from the car bay to that tent must comply with AS 1428.1. The additional footprint required for an accessible tent will necessitate further vegetation clearing.</p> <p>32. Noted</p>
--	--	--	---	---

		<p>33. The proposed perimeter access roads to the site directly impact the amenity of neighbouring properties by routing vehicles alongside adjoining lots, bringing with them additional noise, dust and light nuisance.</p> <p>34. The vehicle access management plan has not been confirmed. While Horse Hill Road is described as the 'main entry', additional vehicle movements via Magpie Rise are inevitable, particularly for access to Short Beach.</p> <p>35. No fencing or locked gates are permitted along the boundaries due to the fire risk of the peninsula. Guests unfamiliar with the site could inadvertently stray onto adjacent properties.</p> <p>36. It is also worth noting the sheer volume of traffic this proposal would generate. The current plan presented includes 16 eco-tents and 12 caravan</p>	<p>33. Uphold – having the road along the northern boundary will impact on adjacent dwelling through additional noise and dust impacts</p> <p>34. -Uphold - in the absence of a traffic impact assessment there is insufficient information to determine the application.</p> <p>35. Uphold - under Local Planning Scheme No. 2 Cl 5.24.3 o) Boundary fences are not to be erected on lots with coverage of more than 80% natural vegetation which would mean the boundaries adjacent the 'rural residential' zoned land should not be fenced.</p> <p>36. Uphold in part – 10 eco tents are proposed, no</p>	<p>33. Upheld - having the road along the northern boundary will impact on adjacent dwelling through additional noise and dust impacts</p> <p>34. Upheld - - in the absence of a traffic impact assessment there is insufficient information to determine the application.</p> <p>35. Upheld - under Local Planning Scheme No. 2 Cl 5.24.3 o) Boundary fences are not to be erected on lots with coverage of more than 80% natural vegetation which would mean the boundaries adjacent the 'rural residential' zoned land should not be fenced.</p> <p>36. Upheld in part – 10 eco tents are proposed, no</p>
--	--	---	--	---

		<p>sites, which means a minimum of 28 vehicles and realistically more when you factor in additional friends visiting, workers etc. Conservatively, that is 30 cars. If each of those vehicles enters and leaves the property just three times in a day (which is entirely normal for holiday makers: breakfast out, a coffee run, a trip to the beach, a visit to the shops, dinner at the pub), that is 180 car movements minimum per day. Whether those movements occur on Horse Hill Road or Magpie Rise, that is not an acceptable level of traffic for a rural residential locality.</p> <p>37. Add an additional 12 caravan sites opposite the 12 caravan sites that are shown as future development on the plan (and which will, in our view, inevitably be the subject of a future application), and you are looking at 50 cars and 300 car movements per day. Then add additional future chalets in potential future development, and the numbers keep climbing. At some point this stops being rural tourism and becomes a commercial resort operation imposed on a quiet rural peninsula.</p> <p>38. The proposed site, and Point Henry as a whole, are identified as high fire</p>	<p>caravans and the wedding venue.</p> <p>Irrespective of this the absence of a traffic impact assessment there is insufficient information to determine the application.</p> <p>37. Dismiss – No caravan bays are proposed as part of the development. Any future development will be deleted from this application if approved.</p> <p>Any future development will required a new application will need to be lodged.</p> <p>38. Noted - 'rural residential' zoned land is to comply</p>	<p>caravans and the wedding venue.</p> <p>Irrespective of this the absence of a traffic impact assessment there is insufficient information to determine the application.</p> <p>37. Dismissed</p> <p>38. Noted</p>
--	--	--	--	---

		<p>risk in numerous Shire planning policies and documents. While the applicant notes that the site is zoned 'Rural' and not 'Rural Residential', it sits in very close proximity to lots subject to Local Planning Policy LPP18 (Point Henry Fire Management Plans).</p> <p>39. Intensifying the occupancy of the site with additional visitors and overnight accommodation substantially increases the risk of fire events affecting both the site and the surrounding area, particularly where guests will be unfamiliar with the land, the layout and the evacuation procedures, and potentially dealing with a high-stress emergency scenario.</p> <p>40. A very high level of scrutiny is therefore warranted, well above what LPP18 assumes for low-intensity residential development and very-low development on Rural lots. While a fire shelter has been proposed to reduce the risk to life on site, there is minimal detail about the conversion of the existing shed, which would require a very large cleared area, emergency power, communications and mechanical ventilation. Critically, fire</p>	<p>with LPP18 Point Henry Fire Management Plans</p> <p>39. Uphold - overnight accommodation by additional visitors significantly raises the risk of potential fire-events occurring that impact the site and the surrounding area.</p> <p>40. Uphold –The Shed which is being converted into a fire shelter would need to comply with the following:</p> <p>While closure and early evacuation are recommended in the first instance, the following conditions should be imposed on a</p>	<p>39. Upheld - overnight accommodation by additional visitors significantly raises the risk of potential fire-events occurring that impact the site and the surrounding area.</p> <p>40. Uphold - The Shed which is being converted into a fire shelter would need to comply with the standards outlined under Submission 13 recommendation 32 d)</p>
--	--	---	---	--

		<p>shelters are to be treated as a measure of 'last resort' only. The absence of a Bushfire Emergency Plan and the absence of DFES and local brigade responses, as already noted above, leaves the management of this risk largely unaddressed.</p>	<p>development approval where on-site shelter in a building is proposed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>a. The on-site shelter must be designed and constructed in accordance with the Building Code of Australia and the ABCB Design and Construction of Community Bushfire Refuges Handbook (2014). The design must be undertaken by a suitably qualified fire engineer with fire risk assessment expertise, accredited with Engineers Australia.</li><li>b. Prior to occupation of the development, a final inspection of the on-site shelter must be undertaken by a suitably qualified fire engineer with fire risk assessment expertise, accredited with Engineers Australia. The fire engineer should</li></ul>	
--	--	---	---	--

			<p>provide certification, to the satisfaction of the local government, that the works have been completed in accordance with the requirements of the BCA and the ABCB Design and Construction of Community Bushfire Refuges Handbook (2014).</p> <p>c. Prior to occupation of the development, an on-site shelter maintenance plan must be prepared by a suitably qualified fire engineer with fire risk assessment expertise, accredited with Engineers Australia, and must include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>i. details of maintenance requirements;</li><li>ii. and details of annual testing requirements for</li></ul>	
--	--	--	--	--

		<p>41. The Bushfire Management Plan acknowledges that the eco-tents are not required to have individual APZ clearances because they are classified as indefensible assets (they are, in plain terms, allowed to burn). What it does not address is the increased risk of a fire event being started in the first place as a result of additional site occupancy by guests who may have no familiarity with fire risk in a rural setting.</p> <p>42. A recent incident known to the respondent involved a fire at Short Beach that was started through neglect by short-stay guests. That occurred at a single dwelling that had an APZ. The risk of unintended and accidental fire incidents increases substantially with additional site occupancy: generators, lithium batteries, candles, cigarettes and other ignition sources all become more prevalent.</p> <p>43. The planning report simply states that 'it is reasonably foreseeable that this application will comply with the Noise Regs and therefore an Acoustic Report has not been prepared'. Given</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">operational compliance.</p> <p>41. Uphold – This has not been stipulated in the application. It also doesn't address the fact that a fire event could occur with people being unaware in the indefensible asset. Given the risk to life it is recommended that the application be refused.</p> <p>42. Note</p> <p>43. Uphold – The development is required to comply with the <i>Environmental Protection (Noise)</i></p>	<p>41. Upheld - This has not been stipulated in the application. It also doesn't address the fact that a fire event could occur with people being unaware in the indefensible asset. Given the risk to life it is recommended that the application be refused.</p> <p>42. Noted</p> <p>43. Upheld - The development is required to comply with the <i>Environmental</i></p>
--	--	--	--	---

		<p>the scale of the proposed operations, including at minimum one main event per week of up to 140 guests, one Wellness Event per week during summer, 4-5 deliveries per week (potentially including water tankers), and 10 eco-tents with guests arriving and departing at various times, this assertion is wholly inadequate.</p> <p>44. Events are proposed to run until midnight, at least once per week throughout the summer season. To demonstrate actual compliance with the Noise Regulations, an independent acoustic assessment should be a prerequisite for any consideration of this application.</p> <p>45. The additional internal vehicle roads and pedestrian pathways proposed on the site will not be sealed. In a location known for strong winds, unsealed roads generate significant dust that will drift onto neighbouring properties.</p>	<p><i>Regulations 1997.</i> The report states that an Acoustic Report has not been prepared. It is considered that this is a deficiency in the application given the usage of the site and that an Acoustic Report should have been prepared and as such the development should not be approved.</p> <p>44. Note - see officer comment 43.</p> <p>45. Uphold – A dust management plan should have been prepared and lodged as part of the application and as such the development should not be approved.</p>	<p><i>Protection (Noise) Regulations 1997.</i> The report states that an Acoustic Report has not been prepared. It is considered that this is a deficiency in the application given the usage of the site and that an Acoustic Report should have been prepared and as such the development should not be approved.</p> <p>44. Noted</p> <p>45. Upheld - A dust management plan should have been prepared and lodged as part of the application and as such the development should not be approved.</p>
--	--	---	---	---

		<p>46. The site has already been operating as a wedding and functions venue for what appears to be up to 3 years, as evidenced by the applicant's Instagram account. This appears to be an unapproved intensive commercial use of a Rural-zoned property.</p> <p>47. The application states that an Ancillary Dwelling and Workers Accommodation (2 bedroom) were approved by the Shire in 2023/2024 but have not yet been built. These approvals already represent an intensification of use of a Rural lot. We assume they were subject to the relevant planning, environmental and safety considerations applicable to Additional Dwellings under Clause 5.25.4 of Local Planning Scheme No. 2, which provides that the Shire 'MAY permit more than one dwelling to be erected and occupied on a lot where it is satisfied that an additional dwelling(s) is necessary or desirable for continuation of bona-fide rural activity, or for any other permitted use....the local government will have regard....to retain the rural character of the area.'</p> <p>48. The same clause specifies that additional dwellings are to be occupied only by persons employed</p>	<p>46. Uphold – It is noted that this activity has been ongoing for some time and this is the subject of ongoing compliance action.</p> <p>47. Uphold - the application that an Ancillary Dwelling and Workers Accommodation (2 bedroom) have already been approved by the Shire on 24/04/2023 this application has lapsed and a building permit was never issued. The approval was for an ancillary dwelling and worker accommodation (unlisted use) therefore outside of Clause 5.25.4 of Local Planning Scheme No. 2.</p> <p>48. Note – clause 5.24.4 did not apply in the approval that has now lapsed.</p>	<p>46. Upheld - It is noted that this activity has been ongoing for some time and this is the subject of ongoing compliance action.</p> <p>47. Upheld - the application that an Ancillary Dwelling and Workers Accommodation (2 bedroom) have already been approved by the Shire on 24/04/2023 this application has lapsed and a building permit was never issued. The approval was for an ancillary dwelling and worker accommodation (unlisted use) therefore outside of Clause 5.25.4 of Local Planning Scheme No. 2.</p> <p>48. Noted</p>
--	--	--	---	---

		<p>locally in rural uses. The proposed use of the dwellings (both existing and proposed), the lack of a suitable alternative water supply, and the sheer intensity of use being applied for in the current application are entirely at odds with this limitation.</p> <p>49. The proposed Ancillary Dwelling and Workers Accommodation building locations also appear to have been moved to different positions on the site when compared to those shown in the submitted soil condition report. The Shire should consider whether a change of location of an approved building would require a new or amended planning application.</p> <p>50. The existing 170m<sup>2</sup> dwelling and 216m<sup>2</sup> shed are listed as 'existing' structures, with no further detail provided. The report notes they are identified as not approved and that they are 'exempt structures of a minor nature formally being claimed'. It also states: 'The property has recently been purchased by the Client, and it is suspected that some development is not reflected in documents from the City'. RP Data confirms the property was purchased in 2021. It appears no effort has been made to verify with the Shire whether these structures were ever</p>	<p>49. Note – the approval for the proposed ancillary dwelling and workers accommodation expired in April 2025 and as they were not substantially commenced a new application will be required.</p> <p>50. Uphold – the officer the existing 170m<sup>2</sup> dwelling is unapproved and was renovated without any approvals being issued. The 216m<sup>2</sup> shed is a Class 10 structure which is exempt under Schedule 4 of the <i>Building Regulations 2012</i>.</p> <p>It is noted that the 216m<sup>2</sup> shed is proposed to be converted to a fire shelter.</p>	<p>49. Noted</p> <p>50. Upheld - the officer the existing 170m<sup>2</sup> dwelling is unapproved and was renovated without any approvals being issued. The 216m<sup>2</sup> shed is a Class 10 structure which is exempt under Schedule 4 of the <i>Building Regulations 2012</i>.</p>
--	--	--	---	---

		<p>approved, either by planning or building permit.</p> <p>51. Additional information about the existing structures should be required before they are formally designated as exempt. Bushfire compliance should not be taken as granted given their lack of APZ protection and the additional risk they pose to surrounding properties.</p> <p>52. Even if the Shire accepts the existing shed as an exempt structure, it is now proposed to serve as the bushfire shelter for the entire site. That change of use will require planning approval (including APZ and bushfire compliance) and a Building Permit. The application should not be assessed without the fire shelter being formally included in the scope of the proposal, given the scale of vegetation clearing its APZ requires.</p> <p>53. What is being proposed now, and what is planned for the future of this site, is not low-impact development. It is not retaining and protecting the existing natural environment. The</p>	<p>The requirement for a fire shelter are addressed under the officer comment on submission 13 point 32 d).</p> <p>51. Noted</p> <p>52. Noted - The requirement for a fire shelter are addressed under the officer comment on submission 13 point 32 d).</p> <p>As the fire shelter is for a large crowd it would be classed as a 9b building and will need a building permit.</p> <p>53. Uphold - any expansion of the uses on the site would be subject to another Development Application</p>	<p>51. Noted</p> <p>52. Noted</p> <p>53. Upheld - any expansion of the uses on the site would be subject to another</p>
--	--	--	--	---

		<p>'future use' elements included on the current application plans make this abundantly clear, as does the following exchange from a published interview with the Owner (source: <a href="https://togetherjournal.com/salt-cove-bremer-bay/">https://togetherjournal.com/salt-cove-bremer-bay/</a>):</p> <p>54. Asked how Salt Cove might evolve in the years ahead, the Owner responded: "With 100 acres on offer, I just see the site opportunities as endless. Every year, we are adding more on-site photo locations, meandering paths, and adding to the event lawn with tiers, stairs and planning platforms. There is an old house on site that we would love to rescue eventually and have as an option for bridal parties."</p> <p>55. The proposed toilet block includes sufficient fixtures, as noted by the applicant, to service up to 250 patrons. This exceeds the stated maximum site capacity of 120 guests (or even 140 for weddings). Why are facilities for 250 patrons being installed now if the guest numbers are being capped at 120 or 140?</p>	<p>If the development was to be approved all references to future plans will be marked as 'Deleted from this Application'.</p> <p>54. Uphold - all development on the site will need to be in accordance with and building approvals.</p> <p>55. Dismiss - the proposal has proposed a toilet block that could cater for 250 people. The required facilities for a number of people is a minimum standard and there are no restriction providing over and above the minimum level of ablutions.</p>	<p>Development Application</p> <p>If the development was to be approved all references to future plans will be marked as 'Deleted from this Application'</p> <p>54. Upheld - all development on the site will need to be in accordance with and building approvals.</p> <p>55. Dismissed</p>
--	--	--	---	--

		<p>56. We call on the Shire to require the Applicant to remove all references to future plans for the site, including caravan sites, a central facilities/stage area and accommodation chalets, and to resubmit so that there is absolute clarity about what is actually being applied for. More importantly, we again formally call on the Shire to reject this application in its entirety.</p>	<p>56. Noted – request to reject the application in its entirety.</p>	<p>56. Noted</p>
18.	Paul Audin & Christine Soulier	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Our dwelling is one of those identified in Appendix D2 as being directly impacted, to the same degree as other nearby properties already contacted by the Council. We therefore request that our objection be formally registered.</li> <li>2. The Shire of Jerramungup Local Planning Scheme No. 2 designates the Point Henry area for “low-impact rural-residential retreats that minimise effects on the landscape and vegetation, while balancing fire management to ensure a safe environment”.</li> <li>3. This proposal for intensive commercial-scale weddings and short-stay accommodation directly conflicts with that intent. It introduces higher-intensity land use, elevating</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Note – objection</li> <li>2. Dismiss - the site subject of the application is zoned ‘Rural’ and not ‘Rural Residential’</li> <li>3. Uphold – the intensification of the use of the site both by this application and any future application will be</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Noted</li> <li>2. Dismissed</li> <li>3. Upheld - the intensification of the use of the site both by this application and any future</li> </ol>

		<p>risks in an already high bushfire-prone area, generating significant noise (as previously experienced over the last 3 years from events on the site and detailed in three unanswered letters to the Council), necessitating vegetation clearing, straining septic absorption systems, and disrupting the peaceful rural-residential amenity—while setting an undesirable precedent for future intensification.</p> <p>4. We are particularly concerned that the master plan in Appendix D3 indicates potential evolution into higher-density accommodation (e.g., caravan park-style), which would be entirely inconsistent with the Scheme's low-impact vision, the Point Henry Limited Rural Strategy, bushfire planning requirements, and other related policies. We therefore recommend that the Shire prevent this proposal and any future higher-density residential or commercial uses on the site.</p> <p>5. Additionally, the application provides insufficient or questionable information to adequately address critical matters, including: (i) protection and retention of remnant</p>	<p>referred to adjoining landowners for comment.</p> <p>4. Uphold - the development application only consists of the reception centre, 10 Glamping Tents, Fire Shelter and Toilet Block.</p> <p>If the development was to be approved all references to future plans will be marked as 'Deleted from this Application'.</p> <p>5. Uphold – it is noted that Appendix A (Soil and Site Evaluation) has no relevance to this application. It relates to a previous application for</p>	<p>application will be referred to adjoining landowners for comment.</p> <p>4. Upheld - the development application only consists of the reception centre, 10 Glamping Tents, Fire Shelter and Toilet Block.</p> <p>If the development was to be approved all references to future plans will be marked as 'Deleted from this Application'.</p> <p>5. Upheld - it is noted that Appendix A (Soil and Site Evaluation) has no relevance to this application. It relates to a previous</p>
--	--	--	--	--

		<p>vegetation; (ii) limiting environmental conflicts arising from effluent disposal, water supply, and servicing capabilities; (iii) effective noise management; and (iv) minimising fire risks to guests and neighbours through a robust, high-standard Bushfire Management Plan (BMP).</p> <p>6. We further note that 43 Horse Hill Road remains zoned Rural (low-intensity use), despite representations at the time of its last sale that rezoning to Rural-Residential would occur—this has not eventuated. Moreover, the site has apparently operated wedding functions and camping for up to three years without approval, suggesting the current commercial activities are already non-compliant and indicative of an approach outside the planning rules.</p>	<p>an Ancillary Dwelling and Workers Accommodation on the site and Appendix B (Wastewater Report) is not a report or study at all. It is simply a quotation and product specifications, with no reference to specific locations, drain lengths or site conditions is inadequate to provide a basis for approval.</p> <p>6. Noted - the current application contains a number of retrospective elements and there is ongoing compliance with the historic use of the site.</p>	<p>application for an Ancillary Dwelling and Workers Accommodation on the site and Appendix B (Wastewater Report) is not a report or study at all. It is simply a quotation and product specifications, with no reference to specific locations, drain lengths or site conditions is inadequate to provide a basis for approval.</p> <p>6. Noted</p>
--	--	--	---	--

		<p>7. A development of this scale would likely require multiple access points/egresses, which we consider unfeasible without substantial disruption to the rural-residential character and amenity of neighbouring properties. We therefore oppose any vehicle access via Magpie Rise or the creation of roads along the northern strategic firebreak. All traffic must remain strictly restricted to 43 Horse Hill Road.</p> <p>8. Reject the proposal, as it fails to align with the Scheme's rural-residential intent and related policies (including the Point Henry Limited Rural Strategy and bushfire planning requirements).</p> <p>9. Extend the submission period and broaden consultation to encompass the wider Bremer Bay community.</p> <p>10. Restrict all traffic and access to 43 Horse Hill Road only (excluding Magpie Rise and the northern firebreak) to protect the character and amenity of neighbouring rural-residential areas.</p>	<p>7. Dismiss – two accesses to the site are required for ease of access to leave the site in case of emergency.</p> <p>8. Note – request to reject proposal.</p> <p>9. Dismiss - The application was advertised for 3 weeks which is in excess of the Scheme requirement of 2 weeks.</p> <p>10. Dismiss – two accesses to the site are required for ease of access to leave the site in case of emergency.</p>	<p>7. Dismissed</p> <p>8. Noted</p> <p>9. Dismissed</p> <p>10. Dismissed</p>
--	--	--	---	--

19.	Peter & Michele Brown	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. As retired farmers, we enjoy the quiet and private property we have invested in, as our home. In the past the Baums have been running their business 'Salt Cove Bremer Bay - Destination wedding location in Bremer Bay, Western Australia', approved by the Shire of Jerramungup. We have no objection to this current business they are conducting.</li> <li>2. I did speak briefly with Brodie about their idea and the need to expand and provide luxury and alternative accommodation choices to complement their already established business. I identify with this aspiration as well as the opportunity of promoting a Yoga retreat/event facility, when weddings were not in the schedule, as outlined in the proposal 'Proposed Weddings &amp; Short-Stay Accommodation Development Application Town Planning Report 2 February 2026' Planning Outcomes WA town planning, urban design, landscaping + appeals Tourism Council Western Australia, comprising of 34 pages.</li> <li>3. Considering the map that was provided, 'DA for Weddings &amp; Accommodation – Appx.D3: Master Plan', while I see no reason to object</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Note – support on the basis that the wedding operation has been approved by the Shire which is not the case as this application includes this use for the first time.</li> <li>2. Note – support of yoga/events when weddings not running.</li> <li>3. Note – no objection to tourist accommodation.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Noted</li> <li>2. Noted</li> <li>3. Noted</li> </ol>
-----	-----------------------	--	---	--

		<p>to the construction of 10 Echo Tents, where they are situated on the property,</p> <p>4. Peter, however, has a strong objection to the 10 Echo Tents mainly on the grounds of extra people on the property and the increased fire risk associated with this kind of structure.</p> <p>5. Along with this we understand the need to supply a reception venue however, no information has been supplied so we cannot comment on this. In saying that, for basic sanitation needs when large groups gather, we identify the need for the demountable ablution facility and hence do not object to this upgrade as noted on 'Page 4. DA for Weddings &amp; Accommodation – Appx.D5: Toilet Block Plan Set'.</p> <p>6. We do however have great concern for the future development of the business as outlined on the map. '</p> <p>7. Twelve caravan bays and 3 possible future stages. We would not support the implementation of a caravan park-up facility or stages- presumably catering for events and the like (no clarification outlined; therefore, we cannot disregard music concerts).</p>	<p>4. Note - objection to tourist accommodation mainly due to extra people on the property and the increase fire risk associated with this kind of structure.</p> <p>5. Note - supports the ablution block.</p> <p>6. Note - concern over the extend of development on the map.</p> <p>7. Dismiss – this application does not propose any caravan bays. If the development was to be approved all references to future plans will be marked as</p>	<p>4. Noted</p> <p>5. Noted</p> <p>6. Noted</p> <p>7. Dismissed</p>
--	--	---	--	---

		<p>The logistics of running this type of business at Point Henry would need a far more extensive proposal with all the approved licences, management plans, and local and federal government policies that safeguard human life, dictate infrastructure requirements and standards e.g. building structures, waste, power, water, occupational safety and health and seek environmental approval etc. These proposals are usually advertised to the broad community for public comment.</p> <p>8. Extend road Magpie rise to Short Beach and emergency destinations. We have noted that on the map, 'there is a gate and extension to the road from 43 Horse Hill Road that leads onto Magpie Rise (a cul-de-sac or dead-end street with a rounded, circular end designed for vehicles to turn around) to allow for access with a notation arrow on the map, 'to Short Beach and emergency destinations'. We strongly object to any access from the property, 43 Horse Hill Road to Magpie Rise by any means; foot, bicycle, horse, motorcycle, vehicle or the like, unless, in an emergency evacuation procedure. The main gate and only gate should be the access point to the location as designated by Landgate, Western Australia.</p>	<p>'Deleted from this Application'</p> <p>8. Note - objects to the opening of Magpie Drive unless it is on emergency.</p>	<p>8. Noted</p>
--	--	---	---	-----------------

		<p>9. The fire risk and open flame activities such as bush fire's, campfires, fire pits, cooking on coals and open gas BBQ's, even during cooler weather after a dry summer. There is only one road that connects Point Henry and the surrounding locality to the townsite of Bremer Bay. An extensive evacuation and fire management plan would have to be professionally presented with all the appropriate government and volunteer emergency services approvals, conditions and guidelines. Many of the tourists that visit Bremer Bay are not familiar with the local fire risk or management procedures, nor do they have local knowledge of the terrain, should a dangerous/hazardous event of this nature occur.</p> <p>Furthermore, signage at the one and only main entrance leading off Horse Hill Road, should have clear bold information stating NO open flame. In our opinion cooking on the property should be within a closed facility e.g. a kitchen within a dwelling or within a closed stainless steel gas BBQ, as found in many parks around Australia.</p> <p>10. Privacy. I have spoken to Brodie about our concern with people using the firebreak joining both of our properties, for their own recreational</p>	<p>9. Note - the fire risk and open flame activities such as bush fire's, campfires, fire pits, cooking on coals and open gas BBQ's, even during cooler weather after a dry summer. There is only one road that connects Point Henry and the surrounding locality to the townsite of Bremer Bay. An extensive evacuation and fire management plan would have to be professionally presented with all the appropriate government and volunteer emergency services approvals.</p> <p>10. Note - not supportive of the pedestrian pathways shown on the map (Appendix D3).</p>	<p>9. Noted</p> <p>10. Noted</p>
--	--	--	---	----------------------------------

		<p>use. The Baums share our concern and would like this to be addressed along with all the property owners in the area. We continue to work with the Shire of Jerramungup on this issue with positive results.</p> <p>The fire breaks are on private land and are there for emergency access only. In stating this, we are not supportive of the pedestrian pathways on the map, 'DA for Weddings &amp; Accommodation – Appx.D3: Master Plan', that lead onto the fire breaks. It is the nature of humans to become curious and explore. Visitors to the area may not realise these pathways lead onto the neighbouring properties. I would much rather the pathways loop internally around the property or alternatively lead onto Crown land that borders between the property and the coastline at Point Gordon.</p> <p>11. Increased traffic and visitors staying for extended periods of time. Horse Hill Road is a gravel road. The dust and noise would be of great concern regarding the increased flow of traffic coming and going from the property over a 24-hour period. Horse Hill Road would have to be bituminised and curfew opening and closing hours of the business, would have to be applied to respect the ... 'ambience of the neighbouring property owners' as</p>	<p>11. Uphold – A dust management plan should have been prepared and lodged as part of the application and as such the development should not be approved.</p>	<p>11. Upheld - A dust management plan should have been prepared and lodged as part of the application and as such the development should not be approved.</p>
--	--	---	--	--

		<p>stated in the Shire of Jerramungup Town Planning Scheme 2 -That an objective of the Rural-Residential zone at Point Henry is to ...'Facilitate the creation of quality rural-residential retreats in a scenic area.'</p> <p><i>'A retreat is a quiet, isolated place that you go to in order to rest or to do things in private'</i>. Collins Online Dictionary. This is the common definition of the word 'retreat', and I presume the intention of the Shire of Jerramungup's Town Planning Scheme 2, regarding Point Henry Rural-Residential zoning.</p> <p>12. Precedent. Considering there are other rural-residential properties within the Point Henry locality, we are concerned that they too could apply for commercial ventures of a similar nature, which would then be detrimental to the philosophy intended for those residing at Point Henry, and place more stress on an already fragile environment and rural town, with limited capacity to maintain basic service demands.</p> <p>13. Local amenities and services. The increased demands on volunteer emergency services, health and welfare needs, domestic infrastructure e.g. water, electricity, waste and roads etc. in a rural town with a limited</p>	<p>12. Dismiss - the subject lot is zoned 'rural' not 'rural residential' so no precedent is created for 'rural residential' zoned land.</p> <p>13. Note - The increased demands on volunteer emergency services, health and welfare needs, domestic infrastructure e.g. water,</p>	<p>12. Dismissed</p> <p>13. Noted</p>
--	--	--	---	---------------------------------------

		<p>capacity to manage the increased visitor population, over many months of the year, is of paramount importance. It is how our local government establishes local laws and policy and manages progress that needs to be well researched, professionally considered, well outlined and scrutinised by local government staff, the local community and the broader public.</p> <p>14. Environmental impact. With the weather patterns changing, the pristine coastal and inland areas are becoming increasingly vulnerable. It is a known fact that species of fauna and flora are steadily becoming threaten within our region. And after the recent fires in the Fitzgerald and broader surrounds in the Southeast/west and Great Southern, habitats have been destroyed and this is becoming more frequent and evident. Again, with an increase in the demographic to accommodate large 'tourism based' proposals, the environmental aspects must meet state and federal legislation and undergo an extensive consultation and education period, before any commercial operation is approved by the appropriate agencies, all those possibly impacted and the community.</p>	<p>electricity, waste and roads etc. in a rural town with a limited capacity to manage the increased visitor population, over many months of the year, is of paramount importance.</p> <p>14. Note - environmental impact with changing weather patterns and flora and fauna are become threatened in this region.</p> <p>A fauna and vegetation study was not provided and the comment in Part 2.3 stating that no wildlife has been observed on site other than transitory birds demonstrates that the fauna on the site has not been adequately surveyed. The lack of details does not make the development supportable.</p>	<p>14. Noted</p>
--	--	--	---	------------------

		<p>15. Insurance liability. We are concerned with the potential increase in the premiums of personal house and contents and public liability insurance cover to the owners who boundary commercial venues and whose property is utilised as an emergency access only along a shared fire break. Point Henry and Point Gordon Peninsular is now a known fire hazard. Therefore, any commercial venture allowing multiple people to stay overnight on Point Henry and Point Gordon Peninsular will no doubt drive up insurance underwriting. This concerns us and it will no doubt be on the mind of every property owner and business owner just how much cost will be involved in taking out insurance for the obvious reasons stated in our comments in this proposal.</p> <p>16. In conclusion. We support the current Shire of Jerramungup approved business 'Salt Cove Bremer Bay - Destination wedding location in Bremer Bay, Western Australia', at 43 Horse Hill Road, Bremer Bay WA.</p> <p>17. We identify the need for the demountable ablution facility and hence do not object to this upgrade as noted on 'Page 4. DA for</p>	<p>15. Note - concern over insurance costs with increasing development.</p> <p>16. Note – supporting of the reception centre on the basis it was already approved (which it was not).</p> <p>17. Note – identified the need for the demountable ablution facility and does not object.</p>	<p>15. Noted</p> <p>16. Noted</p> <p>17. Noted</p>
--	--	---	--	--

		<p>Weddings &amp; Accommodation – Appx.D5: Toilet Block Plan Set’.</p> <p>18. We do not support any further noted proposals on map.</p> <p>19. I, Michele, support the construction and management of 10 Echo Tents to compliment the already existing business if, there is an absolute majority vote cast, in favour, by the current council of the Shire of Jerramungup regarding the Town Planers report and recommendation on the, ‘Proposed Reception Centre &amp; 10 Tourist Accommodation (Eco Tents) At 43 Horse Hill Road Bremer Bay WA 6338’, at the scheduled council meeting of the Shire of Jerramungup.</p>	<p>18. Note – does not support the future development.</p> <p>19. Note – supports the tourist accommodation if there is an absolute majority decision in favour.</p>	<p>18. Noted</p> <p>19. Noted</p>
20.	Ian Weir	<p>1. As I understand it, only the immediate neighbours of this proposal have been contacted by the Shire of Jerramungup for comment. The problem here is obvious: complaining neighbours are often perceived by council and administrative tribunals as NIMBYs - not in my backyard types – “those types don’t want any form of development next door”.</p>	<p>1. Note - the proposal was advertised in accordance with the Scheme.</p>	<p>1. Noted</p>

		<p>2. A development such as this, that will have commercial impact on other <u>businesses</u> in the locality should be broadcast more widely.</p> <p>3. A development such as this that will have an impact on community bushfire safety should be broadcast more widely.</p> <p>4. Name of the Application 'Wedding Venue' is misleading. After correspondence with the shire planner I have learnt that this development application is actually for 10 so-called 'eco tents', a prefab toilet block, a bushfire shelter, pergola and workers accommodation. This does not constitute a typical wedding venue - to name it as such is a misrepresentation and will lead people to believe this proposal is for something that is well mannered and that is fulfilling a need in Bremer Bay.</p> <p>5. Regarding those items on the site plan that are labelled 'future building or use' - the Council needs to advise the applicant that either:</p>	<p>2. Note - the proposal was advertised in accordance with the Scheme.</p> <p>3. Note - the proposal was advertised in accordance with the Scheme.</p> <p>4. Dismiss - the application was refed to as Reception Centre and 10 Tourist Accommodation (Eco Tents) all the other development is incidental to those 2 land uses.</p> <p>5. Uphold – if the development was to be approved all references to future plans will be</p>	<p>2. Noted</p> <p>3. Noted</p> <p>4. Dismissed</p> <p>5. Upheld - if the development was to be approved all references to future</p>
--	--	---	---	---

		<p>None of those 'future' elements can be assessed - and therefore they need to lodge a new site plan and application to be presented to neighbours and the community for a better informed comment. Or;</p> <p>That the proponent prepare a different application seeking 'Approval in Principle' for the future elements of development.</p> <p>6. Due to the lack of clarity here, If council approves this application based on the presented information then the proponent could misunderstand this as being a formal 'in-principle approval' for all those 'future' items depicted on the site plan.</p> <p>7. Not only does the application include 'future' elements, the legibility of the graphics on the site plan is very poor and therefore misleading</p>	<p>marked as 'Deleted from this Application'.</p> <p>Any expansion of the uses on the site would be subject to another Development Application.</p> <p>6. Note - if the development was to be approved all references to future plans will be marked as 'Deleted from this Application'.</p> <p>7. Uphold – confusion over which stages are 'future development' It is very unclear which roads and parking areas are to be included in the current application to be able to assess the proposal, and the number of parking spaces listed in the</p>	<p>plans will be marked as 'Deleted from this Application'.</p> <p>Any expansion of the uses on the site would be subject to another Development Application.</p> <p>6. Noted</p> <p>7. Upheld – confusion over which stages are 'future development' It is very unclear which roads and parking areas are to be included in the current application to be able to assess the</p>
--	--	--	---	---

		<p>8. All this uncertainty increases the ambiguity on the illegibility of the entire application - to the point that this administrative process is quite dysfunctional.</p> <p>9. The application must be sent back to the proponents for revision. If council instead approves the application with written conditions, then that will be a miscarriage of the planning process because those conditions will need to be of such magnitude that they could not reasonably be envisaged by those currently making comment upon the Council-supplied information and within the advertising period.</p> <p>10. There are no plans or elevations included for the on-site bushfire shelter (this application - not a future use) – the Bushfire Management Plan makes reference to an existing shed but this respondent does not believe that this is anywhere near</p>	<p>Planning Report do not correspond to the Masterplan provided.</p> <p>8. Note – there was sufficient information within the application to make a determination.</p> <p>9. Note - the application will not be approved for a range of reason outlined within this Schedule of Submissions.</p> <p>10. Note – refer to submission 13 officer comments 32. d).</p> <p>This will be a Class 10c building</p>	<p>proposal, and the number of parking spaces listed in the Planning Report do not correspond to the Masterplan provided.</p> <p>8. Noted</p> <p>9. Noted</p> <p>10. Noted</p>
--	--	--	---	--

		<p>large enough to accommodate all the guests and staff in a bushfire emergency.</p> <p>11. The site plan is misleading as it depicts the bushfire shelter as a small structure. Visualise here instead - what one would expect for a fit-for-purpose bushfire shelter for 100-200 people - a medium sized agricultural machinery shed - or say 3-4 times the area of the proposed toilet block.</p> <p>12. Under state planning policy 3.7, on-site bushfire refuges must be engineered by a specialist fire engineer – so this casts doubt on whether an existing shed (regardless of size) could be made fit-for-purpose as a bushfire shelter.</p> <p>13. The on-site bushfire shelter is mandatory (under SPP3.7) for such developments where the accommodation might be destroyed in a bushfire - which is the case here with the proposed eco tents. The vulnerable use here is the accommodation of the tents - not the two houses (which must have BAL-29 APZ's) and yet the bushfire shelter is located many 100's of</p>	<p>11. Note - the Shed in question has an area of 216m<sup>2</sup> which is sufficient for the numbers proposed on the site.</p> <p>12. Note – refer to submission 13 officer comments 32. d).</p> <p>13. Uphold - the bushfire shelter is placed to service the reception centre but not the Tourist Accommodation. Due to the remoteness of the eco-tents from the bushfire shelter it is recommended that the tourist accommodation is refused.</p>	<p>11. Noted</p> <p>12. Noted</p> <p>13. Upheld - the bushfire shelter is placed to service the reception centre but not the Tourist Accommodation. Due to the remoteness of the eco-tents from the bushfire shelter it is recommended that the tourist</p>
--	--	---	--	---

		<p>metres from the tents. Some tents being almost half a kilometre from the fire shelter</p> <p>14. This plan also confirms that all eco tents are to be in unmanaged BAL-FZ sites – that is, the most dangerous sites in which to live and camp.</p> <p>15. When we consider this so-called Bushfire Management Plan in the following context:</p> <p>a) Many guests – at a venue of this nature - would be toddlers, or elderly or inebriated.</p> <p>b) They have the traverse steep rocky and thickly vegetated terrain going uphill to get to the shelter;</p> <p>c) Significant wildfires on Point Henry have been caused by lightning strikes, then winds driving the fires east (not west) - regardless fire can come from any direction including the eco tents themselves;</p>	<p>14. Uphold - due to the remoteness of the eco-tents from the bushfire shelter it is recommended that the tourist accommodation is refused.</p> <p>15. Upheld - the Bushfire Management Plan has several deficiencies as outlined in the comment. Based on this it is considered an unacceptable risk to approved the development.</p>	<p>accommodation is refused.</p> <p>14. Upheld - due to the remoteness of the eco-tents from the bushfire shelter it is recommended that the tourist accommodation is refused.</p> <p>15. Upheld - the Bushfire Management Plan has several deficiencies as outlined in the comment. Based on this it is considered an unacceptable risk to approved the development.</p>
--	--	--	--	---

		<p>d) Camping (which is what this is) in bushland areas presents its own risks regarding unauthorised and poorly managed campfires.</p> <p>In this context, the utility of the Bushfire Management Plan is highly questionable – it does not even pass the ‘pub test’.</p> <p>16. People of all ages and physical capabilities will be attracted to this accommodation - especially if this caters for weddings. The type of use here is quite unlike that where similar vulnerable use ecotourism facilities have been developed in bushland areas, that is: guests here are not fit, adult bushwalkers trekking overland, but rather, are more likely to include the inebriated, the elderly, and young toddlers.</p> <p>17. Therefore, as a first principle, there needs to be much closer co-location between the tents and the shelter and possibly a number of shelters.</p>	<p>16. Noted - given that the eco-tents will be run in association with the reception centre there is a risk that those in the accommodation may unfamiliar with the environment.</p> <p>17. Upheld - the eco-tents if approved need to be located in close proximity to the bushfire shelter.</p>	<p>16. Noted</p> <p>17. Upheld - the eco-tents if approved need to be located in close proximity to the bushfire shelter.</p>
--	--	--	--	---

		<p>18. The State-mandated asset protection zones around the shelter, the tents and other habitable structures are not shown on the site plan. One has to be familiar with reading Bushfire Management Plans to make a judgement on how much environmental impact such a development will have. Council therefore needs to delay decisions on the proposal until comprehensive and <i>consistent</i> information is presented to the community for comment.</p> <p>19. It is acknowledged that under the TPS it might be possible for the landowner to subdivide this property to produce say 10 lots at 4 ha each (10 acres) as per the pattern of rural residential development across Point Henry. Ultimately that could realise 10 homes with another 10 ancillary accommodations. Thereby the 100-acre property might accommodate similar numbers of people and car movements to the current proposal (if we include the 'future uses'). However, such a development would have to satisfy mandatory</p>	<p>18. Note – the mandated protection zone will be the maximum as the outbuilding being used was not built in accordance with AS 3959.</p> <p>19. Dismiss – the subject lot is zoned 'Rural' and there is no potential for subdivision for this under the Scheme or WAPC Policy.</p>	<p>18. Noted</p> <p>19. Dismissed</p>
--	--	--	--	---------------------------------------

		<p>requirements of SPP3.7 Planning for Bushfire Protection and each home would have to have 10,000 litres of standing water, formed roads with fire breaks and so on. So, with a rural residential pattern of development there would be 100,000 litres of water dedicated to fire fighting.</p> <p>20. Each ecotent – as shown on the plans - has a toilet, shower and wash area. So each will generate waste water of a volume comparable to a typical small house. This effluent needs to be treated on site, and as the application documents show (“Wastewater ATU .pdf”), they will require significant earthworks, but these disposal areas are not shown on the plans</p> <p>21. This application should be rejected in its entirety – without conditions. This whole process reads like the applicant could not be bothered consulting the shire and fire authorities in advance and so they just cobbled together some docs and lodged the application to draw out objections. After all such land uses are not even permitted in the Shire’s own Town Planning Scheme.</p>	<p>20. Noted - the disposal areas for each of the ATU have not been shown on the plan and will cause a large degree if clearing.</p> <p>21. Noted – recommend that the application is refused</p>	<p>20. Noted</p> <p>21. Noted</p>
--	--	---	---	-----------------------------------

		22. Do what everyone else does – commission a credible designer, consult with all the relevant parties and put a considered application together from the get-go.	22. Noted	22. Noted
--	--	---	-----------	-----------