

3 Examples of regular submissions

Submission 1: Environmental Impact

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed North Stoneville development. The project poses a significant threat to the environment and wildlife in the Perth Hills region. The development will result in the destruction of 50,000 trees and 160 hectares of land, including the habitat of the endangered black cockatoos. This loss of habitat will have a significant impact on the local ecosystem and wildlife.

Moreover, the proposed development does not appear to have taken into account the ecological significance of the area. The Perth Hills are an important region for biodiversity and conservation, and any development should be undertaken with the utmost care to protect these natural resources.

I strongly urge you to reconsider the proposed development and instead explore alternative options that prioritize the protection of the environment and wildlife.

Submission 2: Bushfire Risk

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

I am writing to express my concerns about the proposed North Stoneville development and the significant risk it poses to the safety of the local community. The development is located in an extreme bushfire zone, and the proposed density of 3,000 people in the area is a cause for great concern.

In the event of a bushfire, the proposed development would place an enormous strain on emergency services and could potentially result in loss of life. The safety of residents should be the highest priority for any development, and the risks associated with this proposal are simply too great.

I strongly urge you to reconsider the proposed development and explore alternative options that do not place the safety of the community at risk.

Submission 3: Traffic and Infrastructure

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed North Stoneville development. (Reference number DR 189/2020) and the impact it will have on local infrastructure and traffic. The proposed development would result in an additional 8,000 local traffic movements every day, which would have a significant impact on local roads and infrastructure.

Moreover, the proposed development does not appear to have a viable evacuation plan in the event of an emergency. The so-called 'evacuation solution' put forward by Satterley is a non-existent highway, which is simply not feasible or safe.

Furthermore, the proposed development would place an enormous financial burden on the Mundaring Shire ratepayers, who would be left to deal with the consequences of a stranded townsite. This is simply unacceptable.

I strongly urge you to reconsider the proposed development and explore alternative options that do not place such a significant strain on local infrastructure and services. The Perth Hills need protection from urbanisation, and any development should prioritize the long-term sustainability and wellbeing of the local community.