

By email:

Mark Luzi
Town Planner
Shire of Mundaring

24th August 2006

Hi Mark,

I sent the email below to a number of interested parties as the result of attending a meeting of the Gidgegannup Progress Association on Monday evening.

We welcome your comments on these proposals and would like to know what the involvement of the Mundaring Shire has been to date.

These developments would have a major impact on the Shire's infrastructure, medical services, policing etc. Mundaring being the nearest large townsite. They would undoubtedly hasten the need for various roads to be widened given the high level of traffic that already exists for example on Stoneville Road and the proposed developments in Stoneville and Parkerville. Many residents would be adversely affected by the construction of a water pipeline from Sawyers valley to supply such development. Approval for such development would I'm sure require a submission from the Shire as to the impact on Shire residents of such a proposal.

A public meeting is planned for October 16th and we would like to know what your input to this meeting would be.

Finally, I requested some information of you (plans showing scope and location etc.) re the proposed 569 unit retirement development on Toodyay Road, Bailup some time ago. Given the scope of the Gidgegannup proposals that information would be greatly appreciated.

Regards,

Mike Davies

Hi,

Our Secretary, Kristi Turner, and I attended a very interesting meeting of the Gidgegannup Progress Association last night.

It seems that residents will shortly be asked to comment on plans for a number of developments around the Gidgegannup townsite that include smaller blocks. The lead developer, Mr. Coleman, has offered to provide funds to get scheme water to the townsite to enable such development to take place.

This rings several alarm bells. Firstly the Gidgegannup Place Plan was only completed on July 10th and these proposals step outside that plan. (The North Eastern Hills Settlement Pattern Plan did not envisage any major development until Gidgegannup had grown to a population of 5000). Secondly a report commissioned by the City of Swan in 2004 regarding the practicalities of getting water to and sewage from Gidgegannup townsite [http://www.saveperthhills.org/pdfs/Gidge%20townsite%20\(sewerage%20&%20water\).pdf](http://www.saveperthhills.org/pdfs/Gidge%20townsite%20(sewerage%20&%20water).pdf) clearly identified that this was only practical in terms of the increased cost imposed per block if high density development was pursued. Therefore if Mr. Coleman is prepared to supply the necessary millions to get water to the townsite, one can assume that the long term plan would not be so that large 1 acre, 5 acre blocks and larger can have scheme water, quite the opposite. A 569 unit retirement village is also planned on Shire of Mundaring land further along Toodyay Road at Bailup. This has been put on hold pending the changes to the Shire's

town planning scheme, but where would that development need to get its water from? The Toodyay Residents and Ratepayers Association (currently in the process of incorporation) is protesting a large development of in the centre of Toodyay. Is there a pattern emerging here?

The President of the GPA stated last night that if water were to be supplied to the townsite they would insist that the pipeline was large enough to cope with any future development expansion. This water would be taken from the Kalgoorlie pipeline in the vicinity of Sawyers Valley/Mt. Helena. The proposed Mundaring Water Treatment Plant will double the current supply capacity (at present it supplies 115,000 people) and enable such developments to take place. The Water Corporation will certainly need a lot of extra customers to justify the development costs of the largest plant of its kind in the State.

It is intended to hold a public meeting re these plans on October 16th. However it was pointed out last night that the only plans provided to date (which were not available at the meeting) lack detail. Therefore how can the public make informed comments on a nebulous development? Is this the way in which the developers and the Swan Council tick the box marked 'Community Consultation' when in truth few people know the full details? A similar process occurred with the Parkerville and Stoneville developments and the Shire subsequently reported to the Minister that 'the community welcomed these developments' - we have found no evidence of such a sweeping statement, quite the opposite. The object of such an exercise would be to grasp the holy grail of rezoning the subject land as quickly and as easily as possible. The development plans are capable of drastic change, but the value of the land lies in the category of zoning which is hard to rescind or modify once in place. The Armadale City Council is hoping to steam roller through the rezoning of the land identified for the Araluen Resort next month in the absence of any environmental or geophysical surveys and with no idea as to how sewage will be dealt with. Why?

It has been our long held belief that the Hills are the target for major subdivisions. Many have disagreed or said that this is all 'years away' - I'm sure you can draw your own conclusions.

Regards,

Mike Davies

Chairman
Stoneville Progress Association