

That Council recommend the Western Australian Planning Commission refuse Structure Plan 34 because: NET LOSS IS NOT ACCEPTABLE.

The Noongar Land to which we refer is country that was taken from traditional owners, with no exchange of cash, goods, or services, by Queen Victoria in 1891. This was approximately 48, 109 years after the First Australians acquired the land from Gondwanan megafauna. It was then gifted to the Anglican Diocese of Perth, who are now set to make enormous financial profit from land that was never theirs. Church to make \$700M on land stolen from murdered owners? doesn't read well.

Satterley is advertising the deliverance of "a new community" to the Mundaring Shire. I will talk a little of the existing community which currently supports a conservative estimate of 445, 226 lives. I refer to this site as Waalitj Reserve, which comprises 555 hectares. Tonight, I have a word for every hectare, or 3 minutes of talking.

250 ha or 45% of the site has already been stripped of its original vegetation, for farming sheep. These open grasslands now support over 200 Western Grey Kangaroos, thousands of small reptiles, birds including the Australasian Pipit (about 20), Kestrel (2 pairs) and Barn Owl (1 pair), innumerable insects from hundreds of genera groups, and tens of thousands of individual native and exotic grasses and herbs. Roads and houses are to be placed on this 'degraded land'.

305 ha, or 150 AFL football ovals, of Waalitj Reserve comprises native eucalypt forest – gum trees – some of which have seen their senior citizens (giant Jarrah and Marri trees) felled. Yet a new generation of thousands of gum trees of ages from 0 – 500 years, remains. A single tree in this forest can support over 500 SPECIES of insect, reptile, mammal and bird. That's well over 500 lives for every tree. In one of the 5 nests belonging to the single breeding pair of Wedge-tailed Eagles that have resided here for over 20 years, a new eagle life is added each year.

Populations of three birds:

Carnaby's Cockatoo (*Calyptorhynchus latirostris*) – Endangered
Baudin's Cockatoo (*Calyptorhynchus baudinii*) – Vulnerable
Forest Red-tailed Cockatoo (*Calyptorhynchus banksii naso*) – Vulnerable

all utilise this forest. 50 Forest Red-tails are permanent residents. Over 450 of the other species are seasonal, foraging visitors. Every tree in the forest supports them. All three are listed under State and Federal legislation as Threatened, because populations are declining with continued loss of their forest.

Federal Recovery Plans outline actions required to address threatening processes most affecting the ongoing survival of Threatened species. The aim of ONE such plan, for the Carnaby's Cockatoo is:

“To stop further decline in the distribution and abundance of Carnaby’s Cockatoo by protecting the birds throughout their life stages and habitat critical for survival throughout their breeding and non-breeding range”.

ANY further NET LOSS of cockatoo habitat is in direct contrast with the new Federal Government’s \$3 million commitment to Black Cockatoo conservation.

The following statements were made in the Mundaring Shire’s Agenda for tonight’s Special meeting:

Firstly, it was emphasized on Page 29 that “... a contemporary, environmentally responsive and sustainable urban design solution be achieved. **Sustainability** in design was considered paramount.”

The definition of sustainability is: “*Avoidance of the depletion of natural resources in order to maintain an ecological **balance**.*”

Quote 2: Conservatively, the total amount of native vegetation to be removed is 186.36 ha. This represents 61% of the thousands of Jarrah, Marri, Yarri, Moitj, Condil, Balga, Modong, Pingle, Boodjak and Mooja trees... and tens of thousands of other shrubs, herbs and grasses comprising Waalitj Reserve’s current community. NINETY THREE football fields.

But, quote number 3:

“... the extent of vegetation removal anticipated by SP34 is considered acceptable.”

Is this because, under SP34, 90 ha will be retained in a “Conservation / Recreation reserve?”

Here I should define the two terms:

Conservation is preservation, protection or restoration of the natural environment; it aims to preserve the integrity of biodiversity.

“Recreation is activity done for enjoyment when one is not working”. It facilitates a multitude of ego-centric land-uses.

The two do NOT go hand in hand.

So, morally, how can we justify that providing concrete houses for 4000 humans is worth significantly eroding a the value of a existing community supporting over 400 000 lives?