

Letters to the Editor

The real cost of cheap housing

FREDDIE Hendriksen (letter, *Hills Gazette*, August 26) seems to believe a "lifestyle... housing option" is what the Parkerville and Stoneville developments are offering. Suburban developments such as these do not constitute a "lifestyle"; they are simply dollars for developers.

Yes, there may be lots of people in the hills wanting retirement housing, but far flung developments full of cheap housing will only create and entrench a group of people that has no access to public transport, high petrol prices,

limited health care and few employment opportunities. Is this the lifestyle Mr Hendriksen talks of?

Our community has passed the point where it can afford the environmental, social and economic costs associated with poorly conceived developments. It's time for the Shire of Mundaring to provide a triple bottom line (ie environmental, social and economic) cost-benefit analysis before the community accepts these plans as appropriate developments.

Kristi Turner,
Parkerville.

No high density

RE: Letter, August 12. We are appalled by the skewed view of the Bennetts of Greenmount and are pleased to say we are a vocal majority in the Hills who are opposed to the planned demolition of the environment and peaceful lifestyle. Retirees and young homeowners are welcome, but high density housing is not.

S. Kelly,
Parkerville.

Bulge will pass

THE recent letter from a concerned and angry resident needs to be answered (*Hills Gazette*, August 12). As a counsellor and a former lecturer in ageing I am well aware of the difficulties older people face with regard to housing. However, high density housing in the Hills as proposed is not the answer.

These developments lack infrastructure and have been proposed in semi-rural areas. This means the elderly will need to drive to shops and other services.

Special retirement villages need to be well planned and close to appropriate health services etc, such as the Mundaring shopping centre. Also ageing baby boomers are wanting different facilities to the "old retirement model".

Using it as a justification for a vast increase in population in the Hills is not sensible either.

We seem to be saying we can destroy large areas of the environment to accommodate the ageing baby boomers. When that "bulge" has passed we will realise there will be far less demand.

J. Parkhurst,
Parkerville.