

3 detailed submissions:

Submission 1: Environmental Loss and Aboriginal Heritage at Risk

I'm totally opposed to the amended plan for North Stoneville. Reference number DR 189/2020

The proposed North Stoneville development threatens to devastate the local environment and put Aboriginal heritage sites at risk. The development would require the removal of 50,000 trees and the destruction of 160 hectares of land, which is home to numerous species of flora and fauna. This loss of habitat would have a profound impact on local ecosystems and could even lead to the extinction of some endangered species.

Furthermore, there are registered Aboriginal heritage sites in the area that would be at risk of damage or destruction as a result of the development. It is essential that these sites be protected and preserved for future generations, and the proposed development would put them in grave danger.

In light of these concerns, I urge the government to reject the proposal and prioritize the protection of the local environment and Aboriginal heritage.

Submission 2: Bushfire Risk and Inadequate Evacuation Solutions

I'm totally opposed to the amended plan for North Stoneville. Reference number DR 189/2020

The proposed North Stoneville development is located in an extreme bushfire zone, and would place approximately 3,000 people at risk in the event of a bushfire. Given the recent devastating bushfires in Australia, it is essential that we take this risk seriously and do everything in our power to mitigate it.

However, the proposed development's evacuation solution is inadequate and unrealistic. Satterley, the company behind the proposal, has suggested that a new highway would be constructed to facilitate evacuation in the event of a bushfire. However, there is no concrete plan for the construction of this highway, and it is not clear how long it would take to complete. In the meantime, residents of the proposed development would be left stranded in a high-risk area with no adequate evacuation route.

Given the seriousness of the bushfire risk, it is imperative that the government reject the proposed development.

Submission 3: Traffic and Amenity Impact

I'm totally opposed to the amended plan for North Stoneville. Reference number DR 189/2020

The proposed North Stoneville development would result in approximately 8,000 additional local traffic movements every day, which would have a significant impact on the local road network and lead to increased traffic congestion. This would not only inconvenience local residents, but could also pose a significant safety risk.

Furthermore, the development would have a negative impact on the amenity of the Perth Hills, which are a natural treasure that should be protected and preserved. Suburbia is not a suitable addition to this area, which is known for its natural beauty and appeal as a tourist destination. The proposed development would fundamentally alter the character of the area, and would be detrimental to its long-term appeal.

For these reasons, I strongly urge the government to reject the proposed development and prioritize the preservation of the Perth Hills' natural beauty and amenity.