

Appendix 7

**Summary of submissions and the Environmental Protection Authority and the
Western Australian Planning Commission response to the environmental
submissions**

REGIONAL OPEN SPACE						
No.	Points Raised	Submissions Raising Points	Total	WAPC Comment	WAPC Response	EPA Recommendation
Areas the subject of varying points of view						
1	Twin Rivers					
	a) Support inclusion of all of Lot 211 Barnes Ave in ROS because it provides a valuable range of vegetation types and habitats that are now limited in the area, it provides a passive recreation and education resource, it contains threatened species such as the Southern Brown Bandicoot and possibly the Quenda, and it is recognised in LIMA's Waterways Protection Precinct and EPA's System 6 Report.	24, 25, 27, 29, 35, 36, 38, 42, 44, 45, 49, 51, 52, 54, 55, 58, 59, 62 - 65, 69, 79, 88, 89, 99, 100, 110, 126, 149, ABC, 165, 177, 184, 218, SWEC, WRC	37	Lot 211 is zoned Residential under the Shire of Harvey TPS No.1 and has been recognised as suitable for residential development in regional and local planning strategies over many years. Historically, the need for a foreshore reserve along sections of the Collie and Brunswick Rivers adjoining Lot 211 has also been acknowledged. The foreshore reserve shown in Shire of Harvey's current TPS No.1 was originally approved in 1993. More recently, the significance of the foreshore reserve as a wildlife corridor, the conservation value of other remnant vegetation on Lot 211 and the strategic importance of this site for recreation have been highlighted. Accordingly, the WAPC reviewed the foreshore reserve shown in Shire of Harvey TPS No.1 and found it should be increased to protect regional conservation and recreation values associated with the site, but that these values do not justify reservation of the entire site. The Regional Open Space (ROS) reserve proposed by the advertised GBRS, which will more than double the size of the existing reserve, was delineated based on a technical assessment of conservation and recreation values and in recognition of the current Residential zoning. The WAPC commissioned an independent environmental study to review the adequacy of the proposed ROS. While the study concludes that the entire site has conservation value, it recommends that the enlarged reserve proposed by the GBRS is acceptable in the circumstances subject to minor modification of the proposed boundary alignment to better protect regionally significant natural values and a practical boundary with the Urban land.	Note. However, the proposed ROS boundary shall be modified as depicted on Map 1 Appendix 8). Should it be decided that virtually the whole of the site is to be reserved, it is recommended that the subdivision boundary (blue line) as shown Map 1 be permitted. This boundary allows a practical rounding off of development at a road separating residential use from ROS which is consistent with WAPC policy.	Refer to Section 9.3 for details of the EPA's assessment and recommendations.
	b) ROS over Lot 211 Barnes Ave should be reduced to reflect the Greater Bunbury Structure Plan, local TPS and approved local structure plan.	231, 232, 240, 269	4	The portion of Lot 211 shown on the <i>Greater Bunbury Structure Plan (1995)</i> as Parks, Recreation and Drainage is greater than the area reserved Recreation by the Shire of Harvey TPS No.1. Whilst the ROS boundary proposed by the GBRS is not consistent with the boundary indicated on the <i>Greater Bunbury Structure Plan</i> , the purpose of the latter was not to define the actual reserve boundary but to	Dismiss. Subject to the modification of the boundary alignment referred to in 1(a) above, the proposed additional area of ROS has regionally	Refer to Section 9.3 for details of the EPA's assessment and recommendations.

				indicate the general need for a reservation. The GBRS will define the reservation over Lot 211 required to adequately protect regional conservation and recreation values. The investigations undertaken on behalf of the WAPC indicate that subject to modification of the boundary alignment, the proposed additional area of ROS has regionally significant conservation values that should be protected.	significant conservation values that should be protected.	
	c) No environmental justification for ROS boundary over Lot 211 Barnes Ave.	232, 240	2	The boundary recommended by the WAPC's independent environmental study is based on environmental considerations including vegetation, wetlands and flooding.	Dismiss.	Agree with WAPC response. For further details of the EPA's assessment and recommendations also refer to Section 9.3.
2	Ocean to Preston River Regional Park.					
	(a) Through detailed vegetation survey, further consideration should be given to including additional areas of remnant bushland in the Park around the Maidens and the Tuart Forest and between Usher and Hay Park, the Bussell Highway and Manea Park (north and south of College Grove) and Manea Park and the Preston River.	110, 120, C/B, 194, 218, SWEC, 239, 248	8	Generally, the ability to include additional areas in the Park at this stage is limited because such modifications would constitute substantial variations to the advertised GBRS. However, amendments to the Scheme Map can be made once the GBRS is operational. A future Park enhancement study shall be undertaken by the WAPC to identify additional areas suitable for inclusion in the Park and to determine management priorities and processes for the Park. Notwithstanding this, some additional areas can be included in ROS because of their particular circumstances. For example, the WAPC's independent environmental study concludes that the undeveloped portion of Pt Loc 302 and 303 south of Mosedale Road, Usher, which is Crown land proposed to be zoned Urban by the GBRS, has regionally significant conservation value. As this is Crown land and because of its conservation value, the GBRS should be amended to reserve this land ROS. The WAPC's environmental study recommends a small corner of Pt Loc 632 east of Parade Road be added to the regional park. A submission on behalf of the main landowner in this area supports this modification. The EPA's Service Unit has indicated to the College Grove developer an appropriate width for the east-west open space link to the south of College Grove and the GBRS should be modified to accord with this advice. The WAPC's environmental study concludes that the portion of Pt Loc 632 west of Parade Road, two areas adjacent to the proposed north-south ROS corridor between Usher and Hay Park, and the proposed Industrial	Uphold in part. The GBRS shall be modified to reserve for ROS the undeveloped portions of Pt Loc 302 and 303 south of Mosedale Road, Usher, the small corner of Pt Loc 632 east of Parade Road. Given the previous environmental studies in this area, and Council and the community's involvement in the management of this land, it should be reserved in ROS. The proposed ROS over section of the Preston River should be reduced, as shown on Map 3 (Appendix 8). College Grove- The 200m ROS boundary line is supported but should additional ROS be included it is recommended that flexibility be allowed in determining the final alignment of the northern ROS boundary to facilitate a	Note WAPC comment and response. The EPA recommends that: a)all of the remnant vegetation on Pt Loc 632 is regionally significant, as shown in Map 11 (Appendix 9) , and should be reserved and appropriately managed; b) a corridor between 300 and 500m on Lot 1000 Bussell Hwy, as indicated in Map 9 (Appendix 9), be reserved in the GBRS and appropriately managed c) All of the remnant vegetation on Reserve 670 should be reserved and appropriately managed because of its regional significance, faunal habitat values and ecological linkage importance; d)A portion of the remnant vegetation to the north of Reserve 670 should be conserved to provide a consolidated ecological linkage between Reserve 670

			<p>zone over Reserve 670 east of North Boyanup Rd have regionally significant conservation value. With respect to the portion of Loc 632 west of Parade Road, it would be misleading to leave this land zoned Urban in the knowledge that it has regionally significant conservation values requiring protection. This land should be zoned Urban Deferred, with the lifting of Urban Deferred to be conditional upon regional conservation values being protected. The two areas between Usher and Hay Park may be able to be protected within local open space as part of structure planning. The proposed Industrial zone over Reserve 670 east of North Boyanup Road is consistent with the zoning under City of Bunbury TPS No.7. The WAPC will consider inclusion of these areas in the Park as part of its future Park enhancement study. The WAPC's environmental study identifies two cleared portions of the proposed ROS between Usher and Hay Park that could be excluded. These areas form part of a narrow north-south regional conservation/recreation corridor and removing either from ROS could compromise the functions of the corridor. It is recommended that these areas be retained as ROS and rehabilitated. The study also recommends the reserve width along sections of the Preston River be reduced. While on conservation grounds there may be justification for the reduction, the ROS corridor width should not be reduced below the 1 in 100 year flood line to ensure the recreation values of the river foreshore are not compromised.</p>	<p>modification to the structure plan which is now with the WAPC for assessment. DEP should liaise with the proponent and DPI to discuss the final alignment. See Map 2 (Appendix 8).</p> <p>It is recommended that the southern portion of Lot 670 be reserved as ROS. The northern environmental values in the portion of the land is questioned, particularly the cleared area and as such further assessment should be undertaken at the structure planning, subdivision or development stage. In relation to the land to the north and east of the Lot 670 it is recognised that the natural qualities of the sites are significant. Further assessment should be undertaken at the structure planning, subdivision or development stage, or through provisions should an amendment to the town planning scheme be submitted. See Map 3 (Appendix 8).</p> <p>Once the GBRS is operational, the WAPC will undertake a study to identify other areas for protection and/or inclusion in the Park. The WAPC will also consider whether the Park can be enhanced by local open space through the consideration of adjoining</p>	<p>and the Preston River; and</p>
--	--	--	--	--	-----------------------------------

					structure plans.	
	(b) There are opportunities for extensions to the Park from Preston River through Glen Iris to the Collie River, Kemerton and the coast and Bunbury Regional Park and the Dardanup/Boyanup area.	SWEC, 239, 248	3	Some of these links are provided for through the GBRS ROS network, in combination with planning for undeveloped areas. Further regional-level studies should be undertaken when the GBRS is operational to identify additional regionally significant vegetation links and to determine appropriate protection measures. In the interim, EMM 4 provides for protection of regionally significant vegetation as part of any future GBRS rezoning proposal.	Note. The WAPC will undertake further regional-level studies when the GBRS is operational.	Agree with the WAPC comment and response. Refer to the EPA's recommendations to 2(a) above.
	(c) ROS over Location 267 North Boyanup Rd, apart from portions reserved in local TPS, should be replaced by Industrial zone because it is not consistent with the Greater Bunbury Structure Plan, the site does not have regional conservation value and ROS would not provide road interface between the Park and industrial development.	205	1	The <i>Greater Bunbury Structure Plan (1995)</i> recognises the conservation value of remnant vegetation in this area and the need for a conservation/recreation link between the coast and the Preston River. The proposed ROS would form part of the Ocean to Preston River Regional Park. The WAPC's independent environmental study recommends the proposed ROS over Location 267 be retained despite vegetation condition to enhance the conservation link provided by the Park.	Dismiss.	Agree with the WAPC comment and determination.
	(d) The ROS link between Preston River and Manea Park should be north of the Bunbury airport.	245	1	ROS link proposed by GBRS between Preston River and Manea Park is north of Bunbury Airport.	Note.	Refer to the EPA's recommendations to 2(a) above.
3	Muddy Lakes					
	(a) Objects to ROS over area set aside to protect Muddy Lakes wetlands because it will affect the agricultural productivity of existing businesses.	23, 75, 139, 187, 219, 223, 224, 250	8	The ROS proposed for the Muddy Lakes wetlands is based on the boundaries defined in the Lakes EPP. The WAPC's independent environmental study concludes that on their own these lakes have regionally significant natural values but that they also form part of a larger conservation area that supports natural values of outstanding regional significance that should be protected. On this basis, the ROS should remain. It has been confirmed through further site surveys with the WRC and DEP that the proposed ROS boundaries are required to protect these values. There is no doubt that preventing stock access to the ROS, some of which is used for summer pasture, would have a significant impact on the agricultural productivity of some affected properties. However, stock would not be prevented over this area by the GBRS until it is in Crown ownership. Even then there may be an option to lease some of the land back for	Dismiss objection to ROS. Note the landowners concerns regarding the effect of preventing access to the ROS on the agricultural productivity of some properties. Once the GBRS is operational the WAPC will coordinate preparation of a structure plan for this general area. Any change to the ROS boundary would require an Amendment to the GBRS.	Noted and agree with the WAPC determination. The EPA recommends that: a) the alignment of the ROS reserve boundary around Muddy Lakes should remain as shown in the advertised GBRS; and b) the alignment of the ROS reserve boundary should be amendment to include other areas of environmental significance pending the outcome the management plan to be prepared for the area;

				grazing until restoration works commence. Notwithstanding these considerations, at some point in the future the GBRS will impact on the suitability of some properties for grazing. It is also likely that this area will be subject to pressure for closer subdivision in the future. For these reasons, a structure plan should be prepared to determine appropriate land use and management guidelines for the protection and enhancement of coastal and wetland resources in this general area. This could be undertaken in the context of the coastal management plan recommended in 6(c) below.		For further details of the EPA's assessment and recommendations refer to Section 9.3.
	(b) WRC should conduct a hydrological study of the Muddy Lakes area to determine the level of saline incursion, whether wetlands can be reinstated by drain modifications and establish the need for and extent of ROS.	223	1	WRC advises that Muddy Lakes are an expression of the local aquifer system and that groundwater management contributes to maintaining water quality in the lake. WRC also advises that annual flushing of the lake system with surface drainage assists in maintaining salinity levels. WRC indicates that there is currently insufficient evidence to demonstrate that drain modifications are required to maintain ecological function and that if drain modifications were determined necessary then further hydrological understanding would be required to assess the impacts of modifications on the lake. The WAPC's independent environmental study confirms that the Muddy Lakes area in its current state has regionally significant conservation values. However, there will be a need for a hydrological study in the future to gain a better understanding of the hydrological system and determine appropriate remedial actions to restore conservation values of the wetland system.	Note. There will be a need for a hydrological study in the future to gain a better understanding of the hydrological system and determine appropriate remedial actions to restore conservation values of the wetland system.	Noted. Agree with the WAPC comment.
	(c) Only areas within Loc 492 and 41 Minninup Rd Stratham proven to have high conservation value should be included in ROS.	251	1	The WAPC's independent environmental study concludes that the majority of the area proposed to be included in ROS has natural values of outstanding regional significance. It recommends that the few small portions that on their own do not have regionally significant conservation value, form part of the consolidated area and that excluding these areas from ROS may compromise its regionally significant values.	Uphold. The area proposed to be reserved ROS has natural values of outstanding regional significance and the proposed boundaries are required to protect these values.	Agree with the WAPC comment and determination.
	(d) The proposed ROS over Lot 1 and Pt Lot 394 Rich Road, Stratham should be reviewed.	208	1	Refer to WAPC Comments for 3(c) above.	Refer to WAPC response for 3(c) above.	Refer to EPA recommendation to 3(a).
4	Land north of Leschenault Estuary					
	(a) Support for Rural zoning of Loc 7 Buffalo Road.	S/H	1	Apart from along the eastern boundary, Loc 7 Buffalo Road is proposed to be zoned Rural pending further	Note.	Noted

				environmental and planning investigations.		
	(b) Most of Loc 7 Buffalo Rd should be reserved for ROS.	30	1	This land is identified for future urban development in the <i>Greater Bunbury Structure Plan (1995)</i> and <i>Coastal and Lakelands Planning Strategy (1999)</i> subject to environmental assessment. This environmental assessment will determine the existence and extent of natural areas within the property outside the proposed ROS requiring protection.	Dismiss.	Agree with the WAPC comment and determination. There will also be further regional level studies of regionally significant natural areas.
	(c) ROS boundaries over Loc 7 and 14 Buffalo Rd should be reviewed.	S/H	1	The WAPC's independent environmental study concludes that while the northern portions of Loc 7 and 14 proposed to be reserved ROS are degraded, they are part of System 6 area C66 and represent the previous extent of the Leschenault Estuary. For these reasons, the proposed ROS over the northern portions should remain. The study also identifies two areas along the eastern boundary that could be excluded from ROS. WRC have no objection to the eastern ROS boundary being modified.	Uphold. The proposed ROS boundary shall be modified in accordance with Map 8 (Appendix 8).	The EPA recommends that: a)the proposed modification to the alignment of the ROS reserve boundary alignment on Location 14 is acceptable; and b)the alignment of the ROS reserve boundary on Location 7 should be reviewed prior to any future zoning or subdivision on the subject land, whichever comes first, and amended where necessary.
	(d) ROS should be reduced over Loc 14 Buffalo Rd to cover only the area of the remaining wetland on the western central boundary.	176	1	Refer to WAPC Comment for 4(c) above.	Uphold in part. Refer to WAPC Response for 4(c) above.	The EPA recommends that: a)the proposed modification to the alignment of the ROS reserve boundary alignment on Location 14 is acceptable.
	(e) ROS over Loc 7 Buffalo Rd includes a dwelling, sheds and cattle yards and should be removed pending a proposal to rezone the land for closer development.	193	1	No evidence has been submitted to demonstrate that the proposed ROS over Loc 7 is inappropriate. The WAPC's independent environmental study does not recommend removal of or modification to the proposed ROS boundary over Loc 7.	Dismiss.	The EPA recommends that the alignment of the ROS reserve boundary on Location 7 should be reviewed prior to any future zoning or subdivision on the subject land, whichever comes first, and amended where necessary.
	(f) ROS at the northern end of Leschenault Estuary is supported and should be extended.	WRC	1	Refer to WAPC Comments for 4(c) above. The study notes that land north of Buffalo Rd is classified as a Conservation category wetland. This does not justify inclusion in ROS but does afford some protection. Further regional-level studies should be undertaken when the	Note. The WAPC will undertake further regional-level studies when the GBRS is	Noted

				GBRS is operational to identify regionally significant natural areas and determine appropriate protection mechanisms.	operational.	
	(g) Port of Bunbury should be relocated to coastal site south of Binningup.	213	1	<i>Industry 2030 (WAPC, 2000)</i> does not recommend a future Kemerton Port, but rather improved road and rail access to the existing Port of Bunbury. Land to the south of Binningup has been identified in the <i>Greater Bunbury Structure Plan (1995)</i> and <i>Coastal and Lakelands Planning Strategy (1999)</i> for future urban development subject to environmental assessment.	Dismiss.	Noted.
	(h) GBRS should allow for future development of Kemerton Port.	268	1	Refer to WAPC comments for 4(g) above.	Dismiss.	Noted.
	(i) Port for Kemerton should not be allowed on land south of Binningup.	SWEC	1	Refer to WAPC comments for 4(g) above.	Note.	Noted.
5	ROS around Bunbury Port					
	(a) Proposed ROS between Turkey Point and Preston River is excessive and restricts access for future port operations and block of ROS between the Preston River and Newton Dve was acquired by the Port Authority for expansion of the inner harbour and should be available for that purpose in the future.	BPA, 228	2	WRC agrees that the block of ROS for the Preston River Oxbow can be reduced where the proposed ROS buffer exceeds 50m width. The Bunbury Port Authority, WRC and City of Bunbury also agree that there are high conservation values at the Preston River delta that need to be protected and that public access to and along the Leschenault Estuary foreshore needs to be accommodated, but that the ROS proposed by the GBRS is excessive between the western end of the waterbird habitat area and the man-made cove. It has been indicated that there is an intention to construct a road between port industry and the estuary foreshore but the location and alignment of such a road has not been set. For these reasons, the proposed ROS between the western end of the waterbird habitat area and the south-west corner of the proposed ROS around the man-made cove should be modified to be at least 50m from the high water mark. Further revisions to proposed ROS boundaries can be considered when more detailed planning for the port area is finalised.	Uphold in part. The ROS boundaries proposed for the Preston River Oxbow and the Leschenault Estuary foreshore between Turkey Point and Preston River shall be modified in accordance with Map 9 (Appendix 8).	The EPA agrees with the proposed modifications. Refer to Section 6 for further details of the EPA's assessment.
	(b) ROS between Turkey Point and Preston River should extend to the existing road.	WRC	1	Refer to WAPC comments for 5(a) above.	Dismiss.	Agree with WAPC response.
Objection to, or request for review of specific ROS proposals						
6	Capel Coastal					
	(a) Land proposed to be included in ROS is being effectively managed by existing landowners and the proposed ROS will result in a loss of grazing land	101, S/C, 119, 138, 146, 204, 208, 220,	13	Generally, the coastal foreshore over rural properties in the Shire of Capel is being effectively managed by existing landowners. In the absence of a change in use or management of the affected properties, it is likely that the	Uphold in part. The proposed ROS boundary shall be modified in	Agree with the WAPC comment and response. No further evaluation

	and uncontrolled public access to a fragile coastal environment.	223, 228, 242, 244, 250		coastal strip will remain on the existing titles under existing management arrangements for some time. However, reserving this foreshore as ROS under the GBRS provides the Government with a mechanism to conserve the coastal environment if threatened, control future coastal development and provide for future public access and coordinated management in accordance with coastal planning principles and policies being implemented across Western Australia. The proposed ROS has been technically reviewed against provisions of the draft State Coastal Planning SPP to determine whether the proposed reserve width is acceptable. The review concludes that modifications should only be made where the proposed ROS width is greater than the development setback recommended by the policy. There are sections where modifications should be made.	accordance with Modification Plan 10 & 11 (Appendix 8).	required.
	(b) Recommended alternative coastal ROS boundary over rural property.	101, 242	2	Some sections where boundary modifications are recommended coincide with alternative boundaries recommended by landowners.	Refer to WAPC Response for 6(a) above.	Agree with the WAPC comment and response. No further evaluation required.
	(c) Coastal management plans required to determine appropriate coastal use, development, protection and management.	244, 250	2	A coastal management plan will be prepared for this section of coastline to provide land use and management guidelines specific to particular sections. This plan may result in some refinements to the coastal foreshore ROS reserve.	Note. The WAPC will prepare a management plan for this section of coastline.	Agree with the WAPC comment and response.
	(d) ROS should be replaced by zoning and management agreements should be put in place.	223	1	Investigations into alternatives to ROS reservation have concluded that while many, including Conservation zones, would protect the foreshore from inappropriate development, none would provide for future public access. The proposed ROS reserve will not affect the current responsible use and management of this foreshore by existing landowners and will protect against inappropriate development, but would also provide for public access in the future. For these reasons the proposed ROS should be retained.	Dismiss.	Noted.
7	Capel River					
	(a) Objects to ROS over properties along the Capel River within the townsite because it affects existing agricultural uses, is not required for floodplain management, is excessive for public access requirements, that can be accommodated when future subdivision	S/C, 119, 125, 154, 170, 180, 182, 223, 246	9	A revised ROS boundary for the section of the Capel River through the Capel townsite has been prepared in consultation with the WRC, DEP, Shire of Capel and affected landowners and through further site surveys. The boundaries have been revised based on more detailed consideration of floodplain management, vegetation protection and public access requirements, as well as the	Uphold in part. The proposed ROS boundary shall be modified in accordance with Map 12 (Appendix 8).	Agree with the WAPC comment and response. The proposed modifications to the ROS reserve alignment are within the area of the Capel River

	occurs, and encourages uncontrolled public access that will affect privacy.			need to recognise existing development. The proposed ROS boundary should be modified in accordance with the revised boundary.		Ecological Linkage and the McLarty/Kemerton/Twin Rivers/Gwindinup Ecological Linkage. These areas should be managed to protect the values of these linkages and the vegetation (in particular the northern part of Lot 21 which supports <i>Eucalyptus calophylla</i>) should be conserved. Consideration should be given to restoration with local native species as part of any future development to protect the value of the adjacent riverine vegetation in the ROS. No further evaluation required.
	(b) Recommended alternative ROS boundary for Capel River through the townsite.	154, 182	2	The alternative ROS boundary alignments suggested by affected landowners were considered as part of the review of the proposed ROS reserve for the Capel River and were found to be acceptable modifications.	Uphold. Refer to WAPC Response for 7(a) above.	Agree with the WAPC comment and response. Refer to EPA response to 7(a) above. No further evaluation required.
	(c) ROS should be replaced by zoning and management agreements should be put in place.	223	1	Refer to WAPC Comments for 6(d) above.	Dismiss.	Noted
8	Other					
	(a) Proposed ROS for Ferguson River in Picton includes an existing residence and substantial property, including part of a nursery, and it should be reduced.	73, 91	2	The proposed ROS for Ferguson River in Picton does not include an existing residence but it has been reviewed in consultation with the WRC and some modifications have been recommended as acceptable.	Uphold in part. The proposed ROS boundary shall be modified in accordance with Map 13 (Appendix 8).	Land shall be reserved for conservation purposes to provide an appropriate buffer to the Ferguson River on Lot 42080, Picton to the requirements of the WAPC on advice of the DEP and shall only be used for conservation and complementary

						purposes. Refer to Assessment Sheet 15 (Appendix 5).
	(b) ROS over western portion of Lot 6 Old Coast Rd, Australind and adjoining Lot 46 should be reduced.	150, S/H	2	The proposed ROS provides for a contiguous foreshore reserve along this section of the Leschenault Estuary eastern bank. While there is an existing retaining wall and fill within the proposed ROS over Lot 6, the WAPC considers the existing and potential conservation and recreation values of this foreshore would be compromised by a reduced reserve width for these lots. The proposed ROS over Lots 6 and 46 should not be reduced.	Dismiss.	Agree with the WAPC comment and determination. No further evaluation required.
	(c) Objects to ROS over southern foreshore of Brunswick River east of Australind Bypass.	152, 153	2	This area has been identified as under consideration for conservation, protection and reservation in the <i>Greater Bunbury Structure Plan (WAPC, 1995)</i> . However, the WAPC's independent environmental study concludes that apart from Lot 61, only the riparian corridor should be retained in ROS. A revised ROS boundary has been surveyed in consultation with the WRC, DEP and the landowner. Vegetation along the southern boundary of the proposed ROS has been identified in the WAPC's environmental study as having conservation value, and Eucalyptus woodlands further south as providing a conservation linkage. EMM4 provides for preparation of an EMP as part of any future GBRS rezoning proposal for these lots. Otherwise, these values can be considered as part of future planning for this area.	Uphold in part. The WAPC supports the amended ROS boundary as shown on EPA's Map 6 (Appendix 8).	Agree in part with the WAPC comment and determination Further EPA evaluation required (Section 9.1).
	(d) Objects to ROS over Lots 5 & 6 Estuary Drive, Pelican Point and recommends alternative ROS boundary.	197, 198	2	The WAPC's independent environmental study concludes that the portion of the lots proposed to be reserved ROS as part of the Leschenault Estuary foreshore is of regionally significant conservation value. Accordingly, the proposed ROS should remain.	Dismiss.	Agree with the WAPC comment and determination. No further evaluation required.
	(e1) Objects to proposed ROS landscape buffer over industrial land adjacent to proposed Port Access Road reserve in Picton.	MRWA, 267	2	<i>Industry 2030 (WAPC, 2000)</i> recommends a buffer on both sides of the Glen Iris Service Corridor. The GBRS proposes to include all but the southern portion of the recommended buffer on the western side of the Service Corridor in ROS. The buffer on the eastern side is proposed to be zoned Industrial. While there are existing industrial uses on the western side of the Service Corridor that do not require separation, the long-term planning objective for this area is to make the land available for uses compatible with an Urban zone. Some uses permitted in the Urban zone such as residential development would require separation from the Service Corridor but others	Uphold. The GBRS should be modified in accordance with Map 10 (Appendix 8).	Agree with the WAPC comment and determination. Further EPA evaluation required (Section 9.1).

				may not. Reserving the buffer as ROS would effectively sterilise that land. A SCA, as an alternative, would provide the necessary control to protect the Service Corridor and the flexibility to allow for appropriate uses to be permitted within the buffer. The buffer on both sides of the Glen Iris Service Corridor should be included in a SCA.		
	(e2) ROS reservation over wetland on Lot 6 Wimbridge St, Picton is not justified.	267	1	The ROS over Lot 6 between the Wimbridge Road reserve and the Glen Iris Service Corridor buffer covers an area in excess of 4ha that does not have regionally significant environmental value. Given its proximity to a future regional park, this area would be suitable for future urban development. This land should be zoned Urban.	Refer to WAPC Response for 8(e1) above.	Further EPA evaluation required. (Section 10.5)
	(e3) ROS boundaries at Picton Waters should be modified.	270	1	Agreed. In July 2002 the EPA's Service Unit advised the landowner of a revised wetland buffer alignment that it supports. The proposed ROS boundary should be modified to accord with the revised wetland buffer alignment. Substantial rehabilitation of this wetland is required to restore its regional conservation value. While the WAPC is prepared to contribute to the rehabilitation project, other stakeholders that will benefit from the allocation of ROS in this area and/or the improvements that will result from the rehabilitation project should also contribute. ROS should not be used for local drainage purposes.	Refer to WAPC Response for 8(e1) above. Note that all stakeholders that will benefit from the allocation of ROS in this area and/or the improvements that will result from rehabilitation should contribute to rehabilitation and that ROS should not be used for local drainage purposes.	Further EPA evaluation required. (Section 9.4)
	(f) Objects to ROS over south east corner of Lot 10 Paris Road because it has no environmental value.	43	1	The proposed ROS provides a buffer between an EPP wetland and land zoned for medium density residential development in Shire of Harvey TPS No.1. Accordingly, the ROS should remain to protect the wetland from the pressures of future development.	Dismiss.	Agree with the WAPC comment and determination. No further evaluation required.
	(g) Proposed ROS within Kemerton be removed and land be included in rural buffer subject to SCA No.2.	DRD	1	The areas within Kemerton proposed as ROS contain EPP wetlands. Whilst it may be acceptable to manage these wetlands in a rural environment under normal circumstances, the fact that they are within the defined boundaries of the Kemerton Industrial estate justifies their inclusion in ROS. Landcorp, in consultation with DMPR, supports the request for the proposed ROS reserves to be included in SCA No.2. However, there will be sufficient controls on the use of these areas under the GBRS if they are reserved as ROS.	Dismiss.	Agree with the WAPC comment and determination.
	(h) ROS over southern portions of Lot 5 and Pt Lot 1 North Boyanup Rd, Davenport will have a detrimental	151	1	The WAPC's independent environmental study concludes that the proposed ROS over the southern portion of Lot 5 should be retained because it contains a Priority flora	Uphold in part. Further assessment should	The EPA recommends that the remnant vegetation on Lot 1, shown in Map 12

	impact on an area used for irrigated pasture as part of the existing abattoir operation and should be deleted.			species and forms an integral part of the Ocean to Preston River Regional Park. The study does, however, recommend that the proposed Preston River foreshore ROS over Pt Lot 1 can be reduced. While there is justification for the reduction, the ROS corridor width should not be reduced below the 1 in 100 year flood line to ensure the recreation values of the river foreshore are not compromised.	be undertaken at the structure planning, subdivision or development stage, or through provisions should an amendment to the town planning scheme be submitted. The land is not located in the Preston River Floodway and therefore, it is recommended that that it should be retained as Industrial pending further assessment. The proposed ROS over Pt Lot 1 along the Preston River foreshore shall be modified in accordance with Map 3 (Appendix 8)	(Appendix 9) , be reserved and appropriately managed as part of any future zoning, subdivision and/or development on the site.to consolidate the size and shape of the foreshore reserve. Refer to Section 10.8 for further details of the EPA's assessment and recommendations. Refer to Assessment Sheet No. (Appendix 8)
	(i) Recommends alternatives to ROS boundary along southern side of Harvey River Diversion.	161	1	The WAPC's independent environmental study concludes that the area proposed to be reserved ROS is a priority for protection and that the proposed ROS better protects regionally significant environmental value than the alternative suggested.	Dismiss.	Agree with the WAPC comment and determination. No further evaluation required.
	(j) Objects to ROS over Forrest Homestead property on Preston River, particularly near the heritage homestead itself.	201	1	The proposed ROS boundary is consistent with the reserve boundary shown on the City of Bunbury TPS No.7 and recommendations of the <i>Greater Bunbury Structure Plan (WAPC, 1995)</i> and <i>Industry 2030 (WAPC, 2000)</i> . It forms part of the ROS corridor along the Preston River.	Dismiss.	Agree with the WAPC comment and determination. No further evaluation required.
	(k) ROS over Pt Lot 1 and Pt Lot 22 Cathedral Ave, Australind should be reviewed.	S/H	1	The proposed ROS boundary over these lots generally follows the boundary between the riparian zone of the Leschenault Estuary and the Yoongarillup landform, which is a desirable foreshore reserve boundary alignment.	Note.	Noted.
	(m) Sections of Lake Preston Rd should not be included in ROS but zoned Rural.	S/H	1	The Lake Preston Road reserve is Crown land immediately adjacent to Lake Preston. Only this Crown land is proposed as ROS by the GBRs. Whilst the adequacy of this reserve as a foreshore reserve for Lake Preston will be reviewed as part of any future rezoning, subdivision or development proposal for adjacent properties, it would be unlikely that a reduced ROS width for the lake foreshore would be considered environmentally acceptable.	Dismiss. This reserve is required as a minimum foreshore reserve for the lake.	Agree with the WAPC comment and determination. No further evaluation required.
	(n) Harvey Tourism Precinct should be	S/H	1	The Harvey Tourism Precinct to the west of South	Dismiss.	Agree with the WAPC

				maximise the opportunities to create the corridor, it is recommended that this area be retained as ROS and rehabilitated.		
	(s) Proposed western and northern ROS boundaries for Dalyellup Beach Estate should reflect approved structure plan.	264	1	Agree in part.	Uphold. The zoning for the Tourist Precinct should remain as advertised (Map 6 – Appendix 8).	Further EPA assessment required. Refer to Section 10.9 for further details of the EPA’s assessment and recommendations
	(t) Centenary Rd, Dalyellup should not be included in ROS.	S/C	1	Centenary Road is proposed to be included in ROS to increase the width of the open space link between the Tuart Forest and Bussell Highway, as part of the proposed Ocean to Preston River Regional Park. Main Roads’ draft regional road access plans for this area do not indicate the need for Centenary Road to remain open. The City of Bunbury’s draft Tuart Brook Structure Plan also indicates that Centenary Road should be closed. The DPI has given in-principle support for the closure of Centenary Road.	Dismiss.	Agree with the WAPC comment and determination. No further evaluation required.
	(u) ROS over southern portion of Garden of Eaton estate adjacent to Millars Creek should be adjusted to reflect approved Structure Plan.	159, S/D	1	Agree.	Uphold. The proposed ROS boundary shall be modified in accordance with Map 8 (Appendix 8).	Agree with the WAPC comment and determination. No further evaluation required.
	(v) Delete 17m2 of ROS from north east corner of Lot 100 Eades St, Glen Iris.	196	1	The subject portion of land forms part of a residential property and has no environmental or recreational value so it should be zoned Urban.	Uphold. The proposed ROS boundary shall be modified in accordance with Modification Plan 19 (Appendix 8).	Agree with the WAPC comment and determination. No further evaluation required.
	(w) ROS proposed over Ridley Place, Australind should be removed.	S/H	1	Ridley Place provides access to a Leschenault Estuary foreshore car park, picnic area and boat ramp. Including such an access road in ROS is appropriate.	Dismiss.	Agree with the WAPC comment and determination. No further evaluation required.
Recommended additional ROS						
9	Point Douro					
	Lot 5 Old Coast Rd, Australind should be protected for recreation and waterbird habitat conservation.	110, 121, 165, BNG, 168, SWEC, WRC, 257	8	The proposed amendment to Shire of Harvey TPS No.1 for this site is subject to a separate environmental assessment. The amendment proposes to modify the Urban/ROS boundary shown on the GBRS. If a modification to the proposed GBRS boundary is required as a result of a determination on the related local TPS	Dismiss.	Amendment 13 to the Shire of Harvey TPS No 1 (Pt Douro) is being formally assessed by the EPA pursuant to Division 3 of Part IV of the <i>Environmental</i>

				amendment, then the GBRS can be amended at that time.		<i>Protection Act 1986.</i> The scheme amendment proposes to change the alignment of the ROS reserve boundary. The boundary changes proposed in the Amendment 13 are not included in the GBRS. The ROS reserve boundary alignment in the GBRS is consistent with the alignment currently shown in the Shire of Harvey TPS. If the amendment is approved, the GBRS will need to be amended.
10	Major Rivers					
	(a) Concerned that ROS along major rivers does not extend into rural areas.	87, ABC, WRC, 258	4	ROS is not generally proposed for river foreshores in rural areas because these section of foreshore are not subject to the same pressures and demands associated with adjacent urban development. EMM 4 provides for protection of riparian vegetation as part of any future GBRS rezoning proposal and the need for a foreshore reserve would be considered as part of any local rezoning or subdivision. Further regional-level studies should be undertaken when the GBRS is operational to identify other sections of river foreshore in the Rural zone that should be protected and to determine the appropriate protection mechanism.	Note. There are adequate measures in place to ensure protection of river foreshores is considered as part of planning proposals. However, the WAPC will undertake further regional-level studies when the GBRS is operational.	Noted.
	(b) ROS along the Brunswick River foreshore north of the Millenium Industrial site should be increased to maximise protection of the conservation values of this corridor.	ABC	1	The ROS proposed by the GBRS generally reflects approved foreshore reserves shown on local Town Planning Schemes and structure plans. In many cases, adjacent areas have already been developed. Additional ROS is proposed adjacent to the Twin Rivers subdivision in recognition of the particular recreation and conservation significance of this area. All foreshore reserve boundaries proposed by the GBRS have been determined based on technical assessments and provide for a continuous foreshore reserve along the Brunswick River from the Millenium Industrial site through to the Australind Bypass.	Note. The ROS along the Brunswick River from the Millenium Industrial site through to the Australind Bypass is continuous and substantially increases the area to be protected over Lot 211 Barnes Avenue (Twin Rivers).	Noted. Refer to Section 9.3 (Twin Rivers) for further details of the EPA's assessment and recommendations
11	Waste Water Treatment Plant on Paris Road, Australind.					
	a) Northern portion of WWTP on Paris Rd, Australind be included in ROS	ABC, 256	2	The WAPC's independent environmental study concludes that the northern and western portions of this Crown	It is recommended that the Urban Deferred zoning is	Agree with the WAPC comment and determination.

	rather than Urban Deferred.			reserve contain vegetation of regional conservation value, particularly in terms of providing for an extension to the adjacent Wardandi Reserve, but that the balance either supports wastewater treatment infrastructure or is degraded. Based on this information, the northern and western portions of this site should be included in an ROS reserve.	retained except for the area of ROS delineated on Reserve 35061.	Refer to Section 4.1 for further details of the EPA's assessment and recommendations.
	b) Water Corp land abutting the Wardandi Reserve should be included in ROS.	SWEC	1	Refer to WAPC comment for 11(a) above.	Refer to WAPC response for 11(a) above.	Agree with the WAPC comment and determination. Refer to Section 4.1 for further details of the EPA's assessment and recommendations
12	Land north of Myalup					
	(a) Lack of conservation connection between Lake Preston and the ocean and delineation of northern development boundary for Myalup is likely to isolate Lake Preston and reduce conservation significance.	30	1	The <i>Coastal and Lakelands Planning Strategy (WAPC, 1999)</i> only permits a dwelling density of one dwelling per 5ha north of Myalup subject to environmental criteria. Development at this density would not prevent conservation connections between Lake Preston and the ocean. There is an opportunity to create a reserve connection between the lake and the ocean through a future amendment to the GBRS if that is considered necessary.	Dismiss.	Noted. The EPA supports the completion of the System 6 and System 1 update on the Swan Coastal Plain and adjacent Scarps as a 'whole of government' program through a similar co-ordinated approach, as used for Bush Forever. Areas such as this maybe identified as part of this process.
	(b) Land on northern boundary of Myalup is in pristine condition and represents an important conservation and recreation corridor. It is owned by Council and managed by the local community.	MCA	1	The GBRS does not propose any additional development pressure on this area. The conservation value of this land would be considered as part of any future rezoning, subdivision or development proposal.	Note.	Noted. Refer to 12(a) above.
	(c) Western portion of Lot 200 to the north of Myalup should be ROS.	S/H	1	The proposed Urban zoning for the western portion of Lot 200 in the GBRS is consistent with the Tourist zone in Shire of Harvey TPS No.1. Including the additional land in ROS would represent a substantial variation to the advertised GBRS. EMM 1 provides for the responsible authority to require an EMP for any rezoning, subdivision or development proposal over this land. The need for additional coastal foreshore reserve should be considered	Dismiss. To be considered as part of any future rezoning, subdivision or development proposal.	Agree with the WAPC comment and determination. No further evaluation required.

				as part of such proposals.		
13	Other					
	(a) Cokelup Swamp should be reserved in ROS.	30, 209	2	This wetland is protected by the Lakes EPP. The GBRS proposes to include it in the Rural zone, so does not increase the potential for degradation. EMM 1 and 2 provide for protection of EPP wetlands as part of any future rezoning, subdivision or development proposal.	Dismiss.	Noted Refer to 12(a) above.
	(b) Queries why ROS for Collie River adjacent to Treendale subdivision is not continuous.	30, 258	2	The proposed ROS for the Collie River adjacent to the Urban zone east of Australind Bypass is consistent with the foreshore reserve alignment shown on the approved Treendale Farm Structure Plan and the plans of subdivision granted preliminary approval by the WAPC. The WRC has been involved in determining this foreshore reserve boundary alignment. The ROS does not extend to the southern foreshore of the Collie River because it is proposed to be zoned Rural and will therefore not be exposed to the same pressures and demands as the northern foreshore.	Dismiss	Agree with the WAPC comment and determination. No further evaluation required.
	(c) Proposed new Urban zone at Harvey should be included in ROS.	165, WSWA	2	The proposed new Urban zone in Harvey contains existing pockets of CALM housing in a bushland setting. Only the pockets of housing are zoned residential in Shire of Harvey TPS No.1. Any future rezoning, subdivision or development proposal would be subject to separate assessment.	It is recognised that the qualities of the site are significant and that further assessment should be undertaken at the subdivision or development stage, or should an amendment to the town planning scheme be submitted. The implementation of the Peel-Bunbury Bushplan will provide a further mechanism for the protection of areas of regional environmental significance.	Further EPA assessment required. Refer to Section 4.6 for further details of the EPA's assessment and recommendations
	(d) More land on eastern side of Leschenault Estuary should be ROS.	WRC, 256	2	Constructed roads are in place along most of the eastern foreshore of the Leschenault Estuary. Generally, residential and rural residential lots front these roads to the east and the natural conditions have been substantially modified. These roads represent a physical boundary between the Estuary foreshore and development and are the basis for the proposed ROS boundary alignment. At the very north, where a road reserve is not in place, the proposed boundary generally follows the boundary between the riparian zone of the Leschenault Estuary and the Yoongarillup landform, which is a desirable foreshore	Dismiss.	Noted. Refer to 12(a) above.

				reserve boundary alignment.		
(e) McCarley's Swamp, south west of Capel townsite, should be included in a Conservation reserve.	209	1	Refer to WAPC's comment for 13(a) above.	Refer to WAPC's response to 13(a) above.	Noted Refer to 12(a) above.	
(f) Eastern portion of Lot 37 Harris Rd Picton be reserved as ROS.	130	1	An EPP wetland is located over this portion of Lot 37 and the adjoining lot to the east. <i>Industry 2030 (WAPC, 2000)</i> recommends further structure planning for this area, including vegetation and wetland surveys, prior to subdivision and development. Protection of the wetland should be addressed as part of the future structure planning.	Dismiss.	Noted Refer to 12(a) above.	
(g) Boyanup Locations AA 396 and AA 107 should be included in ROS to be managed with adjoining reserves.	138	1	The GBRS proposes to include each lot in the Rural zone and EMM 4 provides for protection of regionally significant vegetation as part of any future GBRS rezoning proposals. The impact of any local rezoning or subdivision proposal Notwithstanding this, regional-level studies should be undertaken when the GBRS is operational to identify additional regionally significant remnant vegetation that should be protected and to determine the appropriate protection mechanism.	Dismiss. There are adequate measures in place to ensure protection of natural values is considered as part of planning proposals. However, the WAPC will undertake further regional-level studies when the GBRS is operational.	Noted Refer to 12(a) above.	
(h) Area in south-east of Basalt buffer contains a wetland and Priority listed plant species and should be included in ROS.	138	1	This wetland is protected by the Lakes EPP. The GBRS proposes to include the area referred to in the Rural zone, so does not increase the potential for degradation. EMM 1 and 2 provide for protection of regionally significant wetlands and EMM 4 provides for protection of regionally significant vegetation as part of any future GBRS rezoning proposal. Refer to WAPC Comments for 12(g) above regarding recommendations for future studies.	Refer to WAPC Response for 12(g) above.	Noted Refer to 12(a) above.	
(i) Stand of trees along eastern boundary of Pt Lot 41 Minnip Rd, Stratham should be included in ROS.	139	1	Refer to WAPC Comments for 12(g) above.	Refer to WAPC Response for 12(g) above.	The stands of trees can be conserved and managed as part of future zoning or development proposals.	
(j) Original buffer for Kemerton be included in ROS.	ABC	1	The area covered by SCA No.2 represents the buffer requirements for the proposed Kemerton Industrial zone, as recommended in the <i>Kemerton Expansion Study Final Concept Plan (WAPC, 2000b)</i> . Landcorp intends to acquire some additional properties affected by SCA No.2 and has already acquired others. The primary purpose of SCA No.2 is to provide a buffer for industry at Kemerton, not for conservation or recreation. Including the buffer in	Dismiss.	It is the EPA's opinion that: 1) areas of regionally significant bushland within SCA No. 2 should be reserved as ROS as a future amendment to the GBRS; and	

				ROS would therefore not reflect the primary purpose of the area.		2) Special Control Area No. 2 provides adequate separation between proposed industrial development and surrounding landuses to accommodate the impacts of noise, air quality and risk in accordance with the EPA's environmental objectives and criteria for these environmental factors.
	(k) East-west vegetation link should be provided between Kemerton and Leschenault Peninsula.	SWEC	1	Refer to WAPC Comments for 12(g) above.	Note. Refer to WAPC Response for 12(g) above.	The EPA identified a series of regionally important ecological linkages (Appendix 4) which could be achieved through the update of the remainder of the System 6 and part System 1 area in a similar co-ordinated program to <i>Bush Forever</i>
	(l) Portion of Urban zone south of Dalyellup Beach Rd/Mininup Rd intersection should be ROS.	CALM	1	Agreed. Subject land is shown on approved Dalyellup Beach Estate Structure Plan as Regional Conservation.	Uphold. GBRS should be modified in accordance with Modification Plan 13.	The EPA recommends that the ROS boundary be realigned as shown in Appendix 16 . For further details of the EPA's assessment and recommendations also refer to Section 10.9.
	(m) Some existing reserves are not included in ROS.	WRC	1	No further information has been provided to identify reserves not included in ROS and none have been found.	Dismiss.	Noted
	(n) Portions of Lot 21 Cathedral Ave, reserved for recreation by the Shire of Harvey TPS No.1 Amendment 17 should be included in ROS.	WRC	1	The area referred to is local public open space and is sufficiently protected under the Shire of Harvey TPS No.1.	Dismiss.	Agree with the WAPC comment and determination.
	(o) North west corner of Pt Lot 632 east of Parade Rd, Brook Village should be included in ROS.	262	1	The WAPC's independent environmental study recommends that this corner should form part of the regional corridor (Map 5 – Appendix 8). The main landowner in this area supports the modification. The north-west corner of Pt Lot 632 should be reserved as	Uphold.	The EPA recommends that the ROS boundary be realigned as shown in Map 11 (Appendix 9). For further details of the EPA's

				ROS.		assessment and recommendations also refer to Section 10.1.
	(p) Land fronting Australind Bypass between Johnson Rd realignment and proposed Port Access Road should be reserved as ROS.	218	1	This land has been identified as a possible alignment for the Preston River Diversion Channel. Whilst ROS is likely to be an appropriate reservation for the diversion channel, matters such as the timing and detailed design of the channel are subject to further investigation. In the absence of this information or any information regarding the recreation or conservation significance of this land currently, the proposed Rural zoning is appropriate.	Dismiss.	Agree with the WAPC comment and determination.
Support for specific proposals						
14	Proposed ROS for the Collie River flood plain within Glen Huon, Eaton.	30	1	Proposed ROS reflects the floodway for the Collie River.	Note.	Noted
15	Proposed ROS on northern side of the Capel River mouth.	119	1	The proposed ROS over this area supports plans of the local Land Conservation District Council to control access to and rehabilitate land around the river mouth.	Note.	Noted
16	ROS around Millennium Industrial site in Australind.	S/H	1	This area serves the dual purpose of providing an industrial buffer and a conservation and recreation resource.	Note.	Noted
General						
17	Lack of justification for ROS areas and boundary alignments.	228	1	Many of the proposed ROS reserves reflect existing regional conservation and recreation reserves. Both the WAPC and the EPA are reviewing the new ROS reserves to ensure they reflect regional recreation and conservation values and modifications to the GBRs will be carried out accordingly.	Dismiss.	Noted. In addition to the Environmental Review the EPA has undertaken additional biological surveys and mapping (Appendix 5) and has also prepared a strategy to identify regionally significant natural areas in its consideration of the GBRs.
18	Additional ROS should be provided to protect more poorly represented vegetation complexes.	WSWA	1	The EPA has developed criteria that it will use to assess proposed new zones and reserves under the GBRs in terms of their impact on remnant vegetation. These criteria include giving priority to protection of poorly represented vegetation complexes. The WAPC's independent environmental study has technically reviewed new zones and reserves against the EPA's criteria for assessing their impact on remnant vegetation and where necessary, has recommended modifications. EMM 4 provides for protection of regionally significant vegetation as part of any future GBRs rezoning proposals. Notwithstanding this, regional-level studies should be	Dismiss. The WAPC has technically reviewed new zones and reserves against the EPA's criteria and where necessary, has recommended modifications. There are adequate measures in place to ensure protection of natural values are considered as part of planning proposals.	Agree with the WAPC comment and determination. Refer to 12(a) above.

				undertaken when the GBRS is operational to identify additional regionally significant remnant vegetation that should be protected and to determine the appropriate protection mechanism.	However, the WAPC will undertake further regional-level studies when the GBRS is operational.	
19	All threatened flora communities should be included in ROS.	WSWA	1	Of the known areas supporting threatened floristic communities in the GBR, over half are within existing reserves and the remaining areas are proposed to be zoned Rural. Threatened flora is protected by provisions of the <i>Wildlife Conservation Act 1950</i> . Also refer to WAPC comments for 18 above.	Refer to WAPC response to 18 above.	Agree with the WAPC comment and determination. Refer to 12(a) above.

ZONES						
No.	Points Raised	Submissions Raising Points	Total	WAPC Comment	WAPC Response	EPA Recommendation
Kemerton Industrial Zone						
20	Objection to the expansion of Kemerton due to impacts on air quality, waste disposal, water quality, wetlands, bushland, Declared Rare Flora and visual amenity.	37, 56, 85, 124, ABC, 165, BNG, 168, 210, WSWA, SWEC	11	The <i>State Planning Strategy (WAPC, 1997)</i> identifies Kemerton as a strategic industrial site. The proposed expanded industrial area is generally consistent with recommendations of <i>Industry 2030 (WAPC, 2000)</i> . The recommended buffer for Kemerton indicated in the <i>Kemerton Expansion Study Final Concept Plan (WAPC, 2000b)</i> has been supported by the EPA in terms of providing an adequate separation distance for surrounding sensitive uses. SCA No.2 generally includes all properties affected by the recommended buffer and these properties are being acquired by Landcorp. EMM 5 requires preparation of an EMP prior to any subdivision or development in the Kemerton Industrial zone to ensure the protection of wetlands, remnant vegetation and DRF is taken into account. The <i>Kemerton Expansion Study Final Concept Plan</i> designates the ridgeline as a Ridge Development Control Area where development will be subject to special planning controls to ensure visual impacts are minimised. These special planning controls should be included in EMM 5.	Note. Refer to WAPC Response for 23 below.	Agree with the WAPC comment and determination. The EPA is recommending that a condition is imposed on the GBRS requiring that prior to subdivision or development, whichever is first, being approved within the Kemerton Industrial Area or the Special Control Area No. 2 an Environmental Management Plan is to be prepared and implemented to manage the potential impacts of the subdivision or development on remnant vegetation, wetlands, watercourses and visual amenity.. Refer to Section 5 for further details of the EPA's assessment and recommendations. Subsequent proposals within the Industrial zone may also require referral to the EPA for detailed assessment in relation to air quality, noise

						and risk..
21	Lot 6 Wellesley Rd should not form part of the Kemerton expansion area because it contains diverse plant species, Declared Rare Flora and Priority species, fauna habitats and lacks management commitments.	53, 110, ABC, 165, BNG	5	The <i>Kemerton Expansion Study Final Concept Plan (WAPC, 2000b)</i> includes the southern portion of Lot 6 in a Vegetation Management Area. Only the portion of the property outside the area subject to a conservation covenant will be available for industrial development.	Dismiss	Agree with the WAPC comment and determination. No further evaluation required.
22	Proposed northern boundary of Kemerton expansion area doesn't reflect the boundary recommended in <i>Industry 2030</i> Report.	DRD	1	The northern boundary of the proposed Industrial zone at Kemerton should be modified to be consistent with the boundary recommended by <i>Industry 2030 (WAPC, 2000)</i> .	Uphold The northern boundary of the Kemerton Industrial zone shall be modified in accordance with Modification Plan 11.	Agree with the WAPC comment and determination. No further evaluation required.
23	Ridgeline and vegetation management guidelines for the western and northern expansion areas of Kemerton need to be provided in the GBRS to address issues raised in <i>Industry 2030</i> .	189	1	Refer to WAPC comment for 21 above. Also the <i>Kemerton Expansion Study Final Concept Plan (WAPC, 2000b)</i> includes the western and northern portions of the Kemerton Industrial zone in a Vegetation Management Area. EMM 5 should refer to visual amenity to ensure recommendations regarding development control along the ridgeline are implemented through future subdivision and development proposals.	Uphold in part. EMM 5 will refer to visual amenity.	Agree with the WAPC comment and determination. The EPA is recommending that a condition is imposed on the GBRS requiring that prior to subdivision or development, whichever is first, being approved within the Kemerton Industrial Area or the Special Control Area No. 2 an Environmental Management Plan is to be prepared and implemented to manage the potential impacts of the subdivision or development on remnant vegetation, wetlands, watercourses and visual amenity.. Refer to Section 5 for further details of the EPA's assessment and recommendations
24	Kemerton Industrial zone should be replaced by single-industry sites dispersed across the Bunbury-	203	1	There are significant advantages in planning for large-scale strategic industrial estates both in terms of efficiently providing for the special servicing	Dismiss.	Noted

	Wellington region.			requirements of those industries and in controlling the impacts of pollution and risk associated with those industries.		
Other Industrial Zones						
25	Lot 15 Bunbury Industrial Park					
	(a) Lot 15 should be included in Ocean to Preston River Regional Park.	239	1	The Industrial zoning proposed for Lot 15 by the GBRB is consistent with the City of Bunbury TPS No.7 and there is an approved structure plan for the area.	Dismiss. This area has been significantly grazed and there is no evidence of any regional natural significance on the site. The site is the subject of an approved structure plan which identifies some vegetation in the south west corner. Further assessment should be undertaken at the subdivision or development stage, or should an amendment to the town planning scheme be submitted. The implementation of the Peel-Bunbury Bushplan will provide a further mechanism for the protection of areas of regional environmental significance.	It is the EPA's opinion that the remnant vegetation on Lot 15 is a significant fauna habitat and effort should be made to conserve a consolidated area of remnant vegetation and appropriately manage the remnant vegetation as part of any future zoning, subdivision and/or development on the site. For further details of the EPA's assessment and recommendations also refer to Section 10.3.
	(b) Lot 15 should not require detailed vegetation survey as it is subject to an approved structure plan.	245	1	Given that the land is already zoned for industrial development in the local TPS, any vegetation survey of this area should be undertaken at the subdivision stage.	Dismiss. A vegetation survey of this land may be required at the subdivision stage.	Dismiss.
26	North Capel					
	(a) Area of Industrial zone should be reduced through the operator adopting better practices.	141	1	The effect of noise is likely to extend beyond property boundaries regardless of operating practices. Proposed SCA No.3 will provide an adequate separation between the industry and incompatible land uses to ensure noise does not exceed acceptable levels.	Dismiss.	The boundary of SCA No. 3 has been calculated based on noise emissions modelling for current and future industrial activities. Reducing the width of the buffer may expose sensitive

						land uses to unacceptable noise levels.
	(b) Object to impact of proposed new Industrial zone on remnant vegetation.	WSWA	1	The Industrial zone at North Capel, including the proposed new Industrial zone in the north east of the precinct, has been cleared and supports existing development.	Dismiss.	Agree with the WAPC comment and determination. No further evaluation required.
27	Object to proposed new Industrial zone in Davenport due to impact on remnant vegetation.	WSWA	1	This site extends to the north of the proposed Ocean to Preston River Regional Park east of North Boyanup Road. The WAPC's independent environmental study concludes that this site is part of a regionally significant vegetation corridor extending to the north to the Preston River and recommends that it should be protected. The proposed Industrial zoning, however, is consistent with zoning in City of Bunbury TPS No.7. The WAPC will consider inclusion of this area in the Park as part of its future Park enhancement study.	Note. Once the GBRS is operational, the WAPC will undertake a study to identify additional areas for protection and/or inclusion in the Ocean to Preston River Regional Park.	All of the remnant vegetation on Reserve 670 should be reserved and appropriately managed because of its regional significance, faunal habitat values and ecological linkage importance. For further details of the EPA's assessment and recommendations also refer to Section 10.2.
28	SCA should be provided for Preston Industrial Park buffer.	186	1	<i>Industry 2030 (WAPC, 2000)</i> recommends preparation of a number of studies, including noise, air quality and risk modelling, as part of a structure plan for the area. This modelling will identify whether a buffer is required. The structure plan will recommend how the buffer should be implemented.	Dismiss.	Noted
29	Integrated drainage system should be developed for existing and proposed industrial areas in Picton and Preston.	WRC	1	<i>Industry 2030 (WAPC, 2000)</i> recommends preparation of a number of studies, including a comprehensive water and drainage management strategy, as part of a structure plan for the area.	Uphold. To be undertaken as part of structure planning for the area.	Noted
Urban and Urban Deferred Zones						
30	Object to South Dalyellup Urban Deferred because it will result in clearing of Tuart woodland, destruction of habitat and an EPP wetland, impact on adjacent conservation reserves and remove an important conservation link between System 6 area C71 and the coastal ROS south of Dalyellup.	120, 138, 141, 165, WSWA, CALM	6	The WAPC's independent environmental study concludes that the southern three lots proposed to be zoned Urban Deferred (Lots 315, 316 and 317) have regionally significant conservation value due to the east-west link they provide between two conservation areas and the vegetation condition. The study notes that current activity on the property is degrading conservation values. Given the conservation values of the southern three lots, it would be inappropriate to indicate their suitability for future urban development. However, these values may be retained with an appropriate rural use over the land. Accordingly, the southern three lots should be zoned Rural and the EPA should note observations from the WAPC's independent environmental study.	Uphold in part. GBRS shall be modified in accordance with Modification Plan 17. <i>In the interim it is recommended that the land be included in a Regional Interim Development Order to conserve natural values.</i>	Remnant vegetation on Lots 315, 316 and 317 should be conserved and appropriately managed either as a ROS reserve in the GBRS or as part of future zoning, subdivision and/or development on the lots Refer to Section 4.2 for further details of the EPA's assessment and recommendations

31	Urban zoning over Pt Lot 302 & 303 Ocean Pde and Pt Lot 1 Parade Rd, Shearwater should not be reduced further because it has already been significantly reduced from the area zoned by City of Bunbury TPS No.6, it is ideal for residential development, such a decision would bring about the need for further structure planning and the additional ROS will place a burden on management authorities.	263	1	Refer to WAPC comments for 2(a) above.	Dismiss. Refer to WAPC response for 2(a) above.	Agree with the WAPC comment and determination.
32	Object to proposed Urban zone over existing industrial uses at Picton because some of these uses have off-site impacts and zoning the land Urban will encourage residential development, which will result in land use conflict.	32	1	The proposed Urban zoning over existing industries will permit existing industrial uses to continue to operate, with buffers being provided where required as part of planning for adjoining land, in accordance with <i>SPP No.4 – State Industrial Buffer Policy (WAPC, 1997)</i> . This land forms part of a consolidated area that has been identified for future urban development in the <i>Greater Bunbury Region Structure Plan (WAPC, 1995)</i> . Zoning the land Urban in the GBRS allows for a broad range of uses and would prevent the introduction or expansion of uses that could compromise long-term planning objectives. City of Bunbury TPS No.7 will define uses permitted in regional Urban zones.	Dismiss.	Noted.
33	Land south of Dalyellup Beach Road at Western end.					
	(a) The proposed Urban zoning for this land should be ROS.	CALM	1	The inclusion of this land in the Urban zone under the GBRS reflects the approved Dalyellup Beach Estate Structure Plan, which identifies this area for a Tourist precinct. However, the area of the Tourist precinct on the approved structure plan is larger.	Dismiss. <i>It is recommended that the portion of the site, as originally advertised, be retained for future development for Urban (Tourism). Further assessment should be undertaken at the structure planning, subdivision or development stage, or through provisions should an amendment to the town planning scheme be submitted. The area of land between the 'Red' line and the Urban</i>	The remnant vegetation within the tourist precinct site on Pt Loc 497, south of Dalyellup Road Road, is part of regionally significant bushland and ecological linkage and should be reserved and appropriately managed.

					<i>zone has significant natural values and should be reserved. Therefore the WAPC recommends that only the land shown as Urban be retained and not expanded to the 'Red' line. See Map 8 (Appendix 8).</i>	
	(b) The proposed Urban zoning on the coastal boundary of the Tourist Precinct (as defined on the approved Dalyellup Beach Structure Plan) should remain.	264	1	Agreed.	Uphold.	Refer to 33(a) above
34	Object to Boyanup Urban Deferred due to impact on a poorly represented vegetation complex and the adjacent State Forest.	WSWA	1	The WAPC's independent environmental study concludes that remnant vegetation on Lots 1a, 4a, 66, 97, 138 and 139 and along the southern boundary of Loc 4402 is of regionally significant conservation value and that this vegetation should be protected. The approved structure plan for this area includes the vegetation on Loc 4402 in a foreshore reserve but identifies the remainder for residential development. As this area is currently zoned Special Rural in Shire of Capel TPS No.7, protection of the remnant vegetation can be considered as part of future rezoning and/or subdivision proposals or as part of a structure plan review.	Dismiss. The land has been identified in a study commissioned by the WAPC as having regionally significant natural values. The remnant vegetation either is protected by the approved structure plan or can be protected as part of future planning proposals, or through planning provisions should an amendment to the town planning scheme be submitted.	There is regionally significant remnant vegetation on the land proposed to be zoned Urban Deferred which should be conserved and appropriately managed as part of any future zoning, subdivision and/or development on the site.
35	The Capel Urban Deferred zone will impact on remnant vegetation of the Southern River Complex, an EPP wetland and possibly DRF and Priority Flora. The remaining remnant vegetation should be protected.	WSWA	1	The portion of the proposed Urban Deferred zone referred to covered by remnant vegetation represents 16.8% of the total site area. More detailed site investigations could be required at the local rezoning stage to determine the amount of this remnant vegetation that should be retained in a local recreation reserve.	Note. The WAPC advises that there is no evidence of the regional significance of this vegetation. If the site did possess significant natural qualities it is isolated and of such small size that it is doubtful that it would be environmentally sustainable. Further assessment should be undertaken at the subdivision or development	The remnant vegetation on Lot 35 is a significant fauna habitat and effort should be made to conserve a consolidated area of remnant vegetation and appropriately manage the remnant vegetation as part of any future zoning, subdivision and/or development on the site Refer to Section 10.6 for further details on the EPA's assessment.

					stage, or should an amendment to the town planning scheme be submitted. The implementation of the Peel-Bunbury Bushplan will provide a further mechanism for the protection of areas of regional environmental significance.	
Land suggested for inclusion in an Urban or Urban Deferred Zone						
36	Land between Binningup and Myalup should be zoned Urban or Urban Deferred.	160, 161	2	The inclusion of this land in an Urban or Urban Deferred zone would be a substantial variation to the advertised version of the GBRS and would require a separate environmental assessment and advertising exercise. There has been no evidence submitted to demonstrate that there is a need to rezone this land to Urban or Urban Deferred.	Dismiss.	Noted. No further evaluation required.
37	Land south of proposed Binningup Urban zone should be zoned Urban Deferred even in the absence of environmental assessment because this zoning would be consistent with recommendations of the <i>Greater Bunbury Structure Plan</i> and <i>Coastal and Lakelands Planning Strategy</i> and lifting the Urban Deferred could be conditional upon environmental assessment.	193	1	This land is part of the System 6 C66 area and the <i>Coastal and Lakelands Planning Strategy (1999)</i> identifies it as having particular environmental sensitivity or high conservation value. Given that this area has recognised regional conservation value, an environmental assessment should form the basis for determining the acceptability of areas being zoned for future urban development. Also refer to WAPC comments for 36 above.	Dismiss.	Agree with the WAPC comment and determination. No further evaluation required.
38	Land proposed to be zoned Residential by Shire of Capel TPS No.7 Amendment No.3 should be zoned Urban Deferred rather than Urban due to concerns regarding drainage.	S/C	1	The EPA has determined that Amendment No.3 is environmentally acceptable. Both the Shire of Capel and the WAPC have adopted Amendment No.3 for final approval and the amendment has been forwarded to the Minister for Planning and Infrastructure for consideration. The amendment, as adopted by the WAPC, will insert into the Scheme a requirement for the subdivider to prepare a drainage management strategy as a condition of subdivision.	Dismiss. Drainage issues will be addressed at the subdivision stage.	Noted
39	Lot 300 Goodwood Rd, Capel should be zoned Urban Deferred.	109	1	Refer to WAPC's comments for 36 above. A structure plan for the Capel Townsite was included in previous Shire of Capel TPS No.5 and this plan identified Lot 300 for future urban development. Current TPS No.7 refers to the need to review this structure plan. Lot 300 should not be zoned Urban Deferred until the structure plan review is complete.	Dismiss.	Noted.
40	Boyanup Lot 155 Gelorup west of	77	1	Refer to WAPC comments for 36 above.	Dismiss.	Noted.

	Bunbury Outer Ring Road and at the south-east corner of the proposed Urban zone at Gelorup should be zoned Urban.					
41	The majority of Lot 1 and Pt Lot 394 Rich Road, Stratham should be zoned Urban Deferred in order to realise the development potential indicated in the Shire of Capel Rural Strategy.	208	1	The Shire of Capel Local Rural Strategy identifies this area as having potential for low-key tourism, which does not require Urban Deferred zoning in the GBRs. Also refer to comments for 36 above.	Dismiss.	Noted.
42	Pt Lot 2 Old Coast Road adjacent to Bunbury Golf Club should be zoned Urban Deferred.	S/H	1	Proposed Rural zoning reflects zoning in Shire of Harvey TPS No.1. Also refer to comments for 36 above.	Dismiss.	Noted.
43	Land immediately surrounding Dardanup townsite identified in the Dardanup Expansion Strategy should be zoned Urban Deferred.	S/D	1	Refer to comments for 36 above. The Commission still has concerns regarding the Dardanup Expansion Strategy and until these concerns are addressed the Strategy should not be used as a guide to future development.	Dismiss.	Noted.

NON-ROS RESERVES						
No.	Points Raised	Submissions Raising Points	Total	WAPC Comment	WAPC Response	EPA Recommendation
Port Installations						
44	Proposed reserve boundaries need to be reviewed.	BPA, 169	2	Refer to WAPC Comments for 5(a) above.	Refer to WAPC Response for 5(a) above.	Agree with the WAPC comment and determination.
45	Object to impact of proposed reserve on remnant vegetation.	WSWA	1	The portion of proposed Port Installations reserve to the south-east of the Preston River delta contains remnant vegetation associated with the Leschenault Estuary foreshore. The Port Installations reserve boundary in this area should be modified to exclude the foreshore vegetation. Otherwise there is little remnant vegetation in the proposed port expansion area and its retention should be considered as part of future port expansion proposals.	Uphold in part. The Port Installations reserve boundary shall be modified in accordance with Map 5 (Appendix 8)	Further EPA assessment required. Refer to Section 6.
46	Object to extent of proposed reserve due to potential impacts on amenity, drainage and groundwater supply.	259	1	The extent of the proposed reserve will not itself impact on amenity, drainage and/or groundwater supply. Future port expansion proposals may have a potential impact on these environmental values and these impacts will be considered through the assessment of individual proposals.	Dismiss.	Further EPA assessment required.
47	Swampy area on Lot 8 Newton Rd, Glen Iris is used by swans and other waterbirds.	260	1	This wetland is classified as a Multiple Use wetland and has therefore been substantially modified and retains little of its original conservation value.	Note.	Refer to 12(a) above.
Glen Iris Service Corridor and Port Access Road						
48	Object to the impact of proposed reserve corridor on remnant vegetation.	WSWA	1	There is little remnant vegetation within the proposed Glen Iris Service Corridor/Port Access Road reserve. Main Roads has prepared an Environmental Assessment and Management Plan for the remaining section of the Port Access Road to the south and is in the process of confirming the environmental acceptability of particular sections with the DEP. Any minor modifications to the reserve alignment required as a result of these investigations can be incorporated into the GBRS prior to finalisation.	Dismiss. This portion of the port Access Road between the Outer Ring Road and the Boyanup Picton Road is currently under review and subject to further assessment. The review of the road can be included in the Preston Industrial Area Structure Plan. The Scheme can be amended to reflect any new findings that may arise. It is recommended that the current alignment be	a) The PAR Primary Regional Road Reserve should be realigned to avoid impacting on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Area 9: Barbetti's/CSBP Lot 5; • Area 10: Bushland between Boyanup/Picton road and railway; and • Area 11: Ferguson River. Refer to Section 7.3 for further details of the EPA's assessment and recommendations.

					retained until all other alternative alignments have been investigated.	
49	Corridor should have a maximum width of 135m along eastern portion of Pt Lot 52.	266	1	The WAPC has approved subdivision to create road reserves over portion of the land proposed to be reserved ROS. The DEP has advised that the approved subdivision provides an adequate separation between residential lots and the Port Access Rail/Road Corridor. The proposed ROS boundary should be modified to reflect the approved subdivision.	Uphold. The proposed ROS boundary shall be modified in accordance with Modification Plan 10.	Agree with the WAPC comment and determination. Refer to Section 10.5 for further details of the EPA's assessment and recommendations
Widening of South Western Highway						
50	Objection to proposed widening based on impacts on remnant vegetation.	33, 95, 134, WSWA	4	Many sections of the proposed South Western Highway widening are over cleared farming land. For those sections containing remnant vegetation, Main Roads seeks to retain as much remnant vegetation as possible as part of its road designs. In this regard, the proposed reserve width for South Western Highway is 90m. Only 30m of this is required for the actual road pavement, 15m of which is already existing. The remaining 60m can be used to protect significant remnant vegetation as part of the road design. Main Roads also actively revegetates road verges and medians to extend or link sections of bushland adjacent to roads.	Dismiss. There are few sections of the proposed South Western Highway widening that affect remnant vegetation and for those that do there is flexibility to avoid significant stands as part of the road design.	The alignments of the South Western Highway meets the EPA's environmental objectives provided Environmental and Noise/Vibration Management Plans and Vegetation and Waterway Mitigation Strategies are prepared and implemented, when appropriate, to the satisfaction of the EPA. Refer to Section 7.2 for further details of the EPA's assessment and recommendations.
51	Objection to proposed widening based on the noise and vibration impacts on nearby residents.	33, 134	2	Main Roads must ensure road projects meet base noise level objectives either through separation or incorporating noise control measures. Potential noise and vibration impacts will be assessed at the design and construction stages.	Dismiss. To be addressed by Main Roads during design and construction stages.	Refer to 50 above.
52	Proposed widening has not been subject to environmental assessment.	60	1	The proposed South Western Highway widening alignment has largely been determined by the alignment of the existing Highway. As part of defining the road widening corridor, Main Roads prepared an Environmental Status Report, which considers the extent and condition of remnant vegetation on either side of the existing road reserve. There will be sufficient flexibility within the proposed reservation width to allow the new carriageway to be designed to avoid significant remnant	Dismiss. Protection of remnant vegetation can be addressed as part of the road design.	Refer to 50 above.

				vegetation. The design stage of the project may be subject to a separate environmental assessment.		
53	Objection to proposed widening based on impacts on Weeks Brook and an historic Gum Tree.	164	1	Main Roads will consider drainage as part of the road design stage, including minimising the impact on natural drainage systems. Potential erosion can be managed by either engineering or vegetation solutions. If the Gum tree is demonstrated to have cultural or ecological significance, Main Roads may include its protection in the design.	Dismiss. To be addressed by Main Roads during design and construction stages.	Refer to 50 above.
Widening of Bussell Highway						
54	Object to proposed widening due to impact on remnant vegetation.	WSWA	1	Most of the proposed widening for Bussell Highway already contains the existing constructed dual carriageway. There will be sufficient flexibility within the proposed reserve width to allow the remaining sections of new carriageway to be designed to avoid significant remnant vegetation. The design stage for these sections may be subject to a separate environmental assessment. The proposed widening adjacent to the future Bunbury Outer Ring Road intersection is required to provide for a grade-separated interchange. Removing this proposed widening would necessitate a redesign of the interchange and a further widening of the reservation over freehold land to the east of the intersection. As the proposed widening would not substantially reduce the conservation values of the adjoining conservation reserve or the amenity of adjoining residents, it should be retained.	Dismiss. The proposed widening will not reduce the conservation values of adjoining reserves and in many cases, the protection of remnant vegetation can be considered further at the design stage.	The Primary Regional Road reserve for Bussell Highway, has been widened to facilitate the upgrading of the highway. The dual carriageway has been constructed for the full length of the highway within the GBRS area.
55	Object to the noise impact of the proposed widening on residents of existing dwelling on Lot 50 Bussell Highway, Stratham.	18	1	Bussell Highway is already constructed to dual carriageway along this section. The proposed widening will increase the verge width and will not result in traffic passing closer to the existing dwelling.	Dismiss.	Refer to 54 above.
56	Object to proposed widening because it will include 100 trees planted on Lot 37 Bussell Highway by the owners as a buffer in the road reserve.	191	1	As the proposed road widening is only required to increase the width of the road verge in this locality, the landscape buffer planted by the landowners will not be physically affected.	Dismiss.	Refer to 54 above
Bunbury Outer Ring Road						
57	More investigations required to determine alignment.	213, WSWA	2	Main Roads has prepared an Environmental Assessment and Management Plan for the Bunbury Outer Ring Road and is in the process of confirming the environmental acceptability of particular sections with the DEP. Any minor modifications to the reserve alignment required as a result of these investigations can be incorporated into the GBRS prior to finalisation.	Dismiss. <i>It is recommended that the current alignment be retained until all other alternative alignments have been investigated. Where necessary, wetland</i>	Further was undertaken by the EPA and Main Roads. The EPA recommends that the BORR Primary Regional Road Reserve should be realigned to avoid impacting on: -Area 1:Dalyellup Reserve (System 6 -Area C71);

					<p><i>relocation options should also be considered.</i></p> <p><i>Changes to the alignment of the road will be included as a future amendment to the Region Scheme.</i></p>	<p>-Area 3B: Wetland north of Lilydale Road;</p> <p>-Area 4: Lot 2 Miles Property;</p> <p>-Area 7: Hines Road/Australind Bypass.</p> <p>Refer to Section 10.4 for further details of the EPA's assessment and recommendations</p>
Boyanup Bypass						
58	Proposed alignment cuts through north-western corner of Boyanup Billabong wetlands area.	107	1	The WAPC's independent environmental study concludes that Boyanup Billabong is not regionally significant. Accordingly, the proposed alignment does not need to be modified at this point. However, the study recommends the southern extremity of the proposed alignment be modified to avoid regionally significant remnant vegetation. The DPI and Main Roads should investigate the possibility of modifying this section of the proposed reserve prior to finalisation of the GBRS.	<p>Note.</p> <p>The DPI and Main Roads will investigate the possibility of modifying the southern extremity of the proposed Boyanup Bypass reserve prior to finalisation of the GBRS.</p>	<p>The EPA recommends that the road be designed and constructed to minimise impact on bushland and avoid any direct or indirect impacts on the Boyanup Billabong.</p> <p>Refer to Section 7 for further details of the EPA's assessment and recommendations.</p>
59	Proposed alignment will eliminate the drainage and biological filter designed to trap and store nutrient runoff from the orchard on Loc 22 Junction Street, Boyanup.	255	1	Main Roads considers existing infrastructure in road designs. If the nutrient trap is demonstrated to be significant and the proposed road alignment is likely to affect it, Main Roads may include its relocation/replace as a design consideration. Environmental impacts and management plans can be assessed by the EPA at the design or construction stages.	<p>Note.</p> <p>To be considered by Main Roads at the road design stage.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Agree with the WAPC comment.</p>
General Comments regarding Proposed Regional Roads Reserves						
60	Objection to proposed new arterial road corridors.	SWEC	1	The Primary Regional Roads proposals of the GBRS are identified in <i>Roads 2020: Regional Roads Development Strategy - South West and Peel (Main Roads, 1997)</i> . These roads are required to provide for the effective operation of the regional road network into the future. The environmental impacts of each proposed Primary Regional Roads reserve have been considered and each will require environmental approval.	Dismiss.	Noted.
61	Care should be taken in determining road alignments and road design to protect remnant bushland.	ABC	1	All proposed new regional roads and regional road widenings have been reviewed based on their impact on remnant vegetation. Generally it has been determined that sufficient protection of remnant bushland within the	Note.	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The EPA will require the preparation of Environmental Management</p>

				proposed road reserves can be achieved by sensitively designing the road to avoid remnant vegetation where possible.		Plans and Vegetation Mitigation Strategies prior to the construction of the regional roads in the GBR.
62	River foreshores disturbed through the construction of bridges for Primary Regional Roads reserves should be restored through revegetation.	WRC	1	These concerns can be addressed by Main Roads as part of the management planning for Primary Regional Roads river crossings.	Note.	Noted. Refer to 61 above.

SPECIAL CONTROL AREAS						
No.	Points Raised	Submissions Raising Points	Total	WAPC Comment	WAPC Response	EPA Recommendation
SCA No.1.						
63	Unsustainable logging needs to be addressed.	PEG, 165, 183, 206, SWEC	5	Decisions regarding the use and management of State Forest are not made under planning legislation. Any logging proposal for areas within public water supply catchments needs to be accompanied by a management plan, the principal purpose of which is to demonstrate water quality will not be adversely affected. Both the EPA and WRC assess management plans to ensure biodiversity and water quality are maintained.	Dismiss.	Agree with WAPC comment and determination. No further evaluation required.
64	Objection to restrictions being imposed upon existing and future land use and development in SCA No.1.	147, 148, 157	3	These properties are located in declared Priority 2 water source protection areas. Existing approved uses and development in these areas would not be affected by SCA No.1. Restrictions would only apply to new land use and development proposals whether an SCA is created or not. The restrictions do not necessarily prevent use and development of the land. In many cases, land use and development typical of rural areas would be permitted subject to suitable controls and conditions to prevent pollution of public drinking water source areas. WRC will provide advice on these matters in considering future rezoning, subdivision and development proposals.	Dismiss. There is a need to ensure land use and development in public drinking water supply catchments do not pollute the water resource.	Agree with WAPC comment and determination. No further evaluation required.
65	Lot 1 Honeymoon Rd, Harvey should not be included in SCA No.1 as it is not thought to be in the Harvey Dam catchment.	172	1	The WRC agrees that Lot 1 should not be included in SCA No.1.	Uphold. The boundary of SCA No.1 will be modified to exclude this land.	Agree with WAPC comment and determination. No further evaluation required.
SCA No.2						
66	Proposed boundary should be modified to reflect modelled buffer requirements rather than convenient physical or administrative boundaries.	112, DRD, ABC, S/H, 236, 249, 251	7	The <i>Kemerton Expansion Study -Final Draft Report (BSD Consultants 1997)</i> determined buffer requirements of the GBRS based on risk, noise and air quality impact models. SCA No.2 includes all properties potentially affected by risk, noise or air quality impacts associated with any additional industries in the expanded Kemerton Industrial zone. It also includes land south of the modelled buffer requirements around the regional landfill facility. Landcorp is acquiring all properties in SCA No.2 containing incompatible land uses (ie. residential	Dismiss. As the buffer requirements recommended by the <i>Kemerton Expansion Study - Final Draft Report</i> are based on modelling, a cautious approach to defining the buffer is required.	Refer to Sections 5 & 11.2 for further details of the EPA's assessment and recommendations. The EPA is satisfied the buffer has been appropriately modelled and reflects the buffer requirements of current and future industrial

				<p>dwellings) and affected or likely to be affected in the short term by unacceptable industry impacts.</p>	<p>It is recognised that the qualities of the site are significant and that further assessment should be undertaken at the subdivision or development stage. The requirement for the preparation of an Environmental Management Plan, as part of any application for subdivision or development in this area, could be included in the GBRs (Refer to section 5.3.2.2 of the Scheme text).</p>	<p>activities.</p>
67	<p>Recreation should be permitted.</p>	<p>ABC, S/H, S/D</p>	3	<p>There should be a presumption against recreational activities that inevitably lead to people being exposed to unacceptable levels of risk. However, there may be recreational uses that, because of their operations, would be compatible and have an acceptable level of risk at certain locations within SCA No.2. Further consultation with DMPR, Shire of Harvey and Landcorp should be undertaken to introduce a provision into the GBRs that would provide for such uses without permitting inappropriate recreation activities.</p>	<p>Note.</p> <p>Further consultation with DMPR, the Shire of Harvey and Landcorp required.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Agree with the WAPC comment.</p>
68	<p>Land proposed as ROS in Kemerton be included in Rural buffer subject to SCA No.2.</p>	<p>DRD</p>	1	<p>Refer to WAPC Comments for 8(g) above.</p>	<p>Refer to WAPC response for 8(g) above.</p>	<p>Agree with the WAPC comment and determination.</p>
<p>SCA No.3</p>						
69	<p>Area should be reduced based on operator adopting better practices.</p>	<p>141</p>	1	<p>The boundary of SCA No.3 reflects the projected 35 dB(A) noise level contour identified in modelling conducted on behalf of the operator for existing and ultimate industrial activity. SCA No.3 will ensure no residents are exposed to unacceptable noise levels and the operator is negotiating with affected landowners regarding compensation for loss of development rights. These initiatives represent best operating practices.</p>	<p>Dismiss.</p>	<p>The boundary of SCA No. 3 has been calculated based on noise emissions modelling for current and future industrial activities. Reducing the width of the buffer may expose sensitive land uses to unacceptable noise levels.</p>
70	<p>Recreation should be permitted.</p>	<p>S/D</p>	1	<p>The proponent of the North Capel Industrial Complex has advised that some recreation uses may be acceptable in SCA No.3. On this basis, a suitable provision will be prepared for the GBRs in consultation with DMPR, the Shire of Capel and the proponent to ensure the</p>	<p>Note.</p> <p>Further consultation with DMPR, the Shire of Capel and the proponent required.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Agree with the WAPC comment.</p>

				proponent's interests are adequately represented in the consideration of recreation proposals within SCA No.3.		
71	Support for SCA.	268	1	SCA No.3 will prevent the siting of incompatible land uses in areas where they could potentially conflict with industrial operations in the North Capel Industrial zone.	Note.	Noted.

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS						
No.	Points Raised	Submissions Raising Points	Total	WAPC Comment	WAPC Response	EPA Recommendation
Environmental Review						
72	The Environmental Review should not pre-empt provisions of the Coastal Zone Management Policy with respect to coastal management recommendations.	213	1	The only new proposals of the GBRS along the coast are additional areas identified for future foreshore reserve. These proposals are consistent with the intent of the Coastal Zone Management Policy's stated coastal zone management, environmental and community principles and objectives to protect the conservation values and provide for public access to the coast. EMM 1 allows the decision-making authority to require an environmental management plan for any future coastal rezoning, subdivision or development proposal adjacent to coastal ROS. Such proposals will be assessed against relevant coastal policy such as the Coastal Zone Management Policy.	Note. The GBRS will implement recommendations of the Coastal Zone Management Policy.	Noted.
73	The absence of any Site Specific Factors under the Coastal Areas and Urban Bushland categories in the Summary Table is astonishing. More detailed analysis is required.	213	1	For Coastal Areas, the GBRS does not propose any additional impacts on particular coastal sites. In accordance with requirements of EMM 1, more detailed analysis will be undertaken as part of any future coastal rezoning, subdivision or development proposals. For Urban Bushland, the WAPC's independent environmental study has contributed to ensuring GBRS proposals do not impact on regionally significant remnant vegetation, where possible. EMM 4 provides for a vegetation survey as part of any future GBRS rezoning proposal potentially affecting remnant vegetation.	Note. More detailed analysis has been undertaken for sites affected by GBRS proposals. Detailed analysis of the impacts of future proposals on remnant vegetation will be undertaken as part of their assessment.	Noted. In addition to the Environmental Review the EPA has undertaken additional biological surveys and mapping (Appendix 5) and has also prepared a strategy to identify regionally significant natural areas in its consideration of the GBRS.
74	Objection to Section 3.7.3 because it states that industries with limited potential for groundwater contamination will be permitted in the Preston Industrial Park. This decision should be made by the EPA.	DRD	1	This section of the Environmental Review will have no bearing on the permissibility of uses in the Preston Industrial Park. A comprehensive drainage and water management strategy is required as part of structure planning for the area and provisions of local Town Planning Schemes and conditions of subdivision and development approval will determine permissibility of uses and drainage management conditions.	Dismiss.	Agree with the WAPC comment. No further evaluation required.

75	Section 5.2 should only require vegetation management plans for areas within Kemerton identified in <i>Industry 2030 (WAPC, 2000)</i> and not the industry core generally. The existing heavy industry core and proposed expansion area exclude wetlands of high conservation value, which are protected by the Lakes EPP.	DRD	1	The WAPC recognises the importance of maximising the opportunities for industrial development in the Kemerton Industrial zone but considers that environmental values of the area should also be protected where possible. For this reason, EMM 5 requires preparation of EMPs prior to subdivision or development.	Dismiss. Environmental values of the Kemerton Industrial zone should be protected where possible.	Agree with WAPC comment and determination.
76	Commitment to Preston River Diversion under Section 5.11.2 should be subject to environmental approval.	SWEC	1	The Preston River Diversion is not proposed by the GBRS. In the Environmental Review, the second paragraph under the heading "Regionally Significant Wetlands" states that the EPA has requested formal environmental assessment of the Preston River Diversion proposal.	Note.	Agree with the WAPC comment.
77	Water Management Strategy for Kemerton					
	(a) Comprehensive strategy should be developed prior to water management conditions being considered for specific developments.	DRD	1	According to WRC, a comprehensive groundwater management plan is currently being prepared for Kemerton to address groundwater allocation and protection (including wetland water levels) issues. Drainage and nutrient management plans are required as part of each subdivision or development proposal in Kemerton.	Note.	Agree with the WAPC comment.
	(b) Strategy should have been released with GBRS for public comment.	165	1	WRC advises that public consultation will be incorporated into the approval process for the comprehensive groundwater management plan referred to in WAPC comments for 77(a) above.	Dismiss.	Noted.
78	Conservation value of Conservation and Resource Enhancement category wetlands should be considered.	WRC	1	EMM 1 provides for an EMP for rezoning, subdivision or development proposals impacting on wetlands identified in an approved Government policy for conservation. Conservation and Resource Enhancement category wetlands are not identified in an approved Government policy. It is understood that WRC and EPA are working towards addressing this issue. Notwithstanding the status of these wetlands, the absence of reference to Conservation and Resource Enhancement category wetlands in EMM 1 does not prevent the protection of environmental values associated with those wetlands from being considered as part of future rezoning, subdivision and development proposals.	Note. The GBRS does not prevent the conservation value of these wetlands from being considered as part of future rezoning, subdivision and development proposals.	The EPA will have the opportunity to assess the potential impact of schemes and proposals on wetlands within Rural zones and other areas where it listed as a deferred factor in Section 15.
79	Conservation category wetland classification over portion of the Kingston Estate should be deleted from	190	1	The Environmental Review reflects the management category assigned to the wetland following a comprehensive assessment of wetlands on the Swan	Dismiss. The Conservation	Agree with WAPC comment and determination.

	Figure 8.			Coastal Plain. As there is no technical evidence to suggest that this classification is incorrect, there is no reason to delete the classification from the Environmental Review. Appropriate environmental management measures have been incorporated into plans for this area to protect conservation values of the wetland.	classification of the wetland is appropriate. The DEP has had input into plans for the area to ensure conservation values of the wetland are protected.	
80	Unclear whether Conservation category wetland on southern boundary of Dalyellup Beach Estate is regionally significant.	264	1	The subject wetland is proposed to be included in ROS.	Dismiss.	Noted.
81	Reference to "water sensitive design in new developments" on Page x of Executive Summary should specify urban, industrial, commercial, roads, railways, agriculture, horticulture and other rural pursuits.	WRC	1	The general reference to "new developments" in the Proposed Management Strategy on Page x allows water sensitive design to be required of all new development proposals, whether urban or rural. As the Proposed Management Strategy relates to all new development there is no need to specify particular types of development to which it applies.	Dismiss.	Noted.
82	EMM 1 should be required for proposals adjoining watercourses or significant (including Conservation category) wetlands.	WRC	1	EMM 2 provides for preparation of a DNMP as part of any subdivision or development proposal where drainage may lead to degradation of a wetland or watercourse. EMM 4 provides for a vegetation survey as part of any GBRS rezoning that potentially affects riparian vegetation. EMM 1 provides for an EMP for rezoning, subdivision and development proposals affecting wetlands identified in an approved Government policy for conservation. While Conservation category wetlands are currently not included, it is understood that WRC and EPA are working towards addressing this issue. Also, the protection of environmental values associated with these wetlands can be considered as part of future rezoning, subdivision and development proposals. These mechanisms will ensure impacts of future proposals on watercourses and wetlands are addressed as part of the assessment of future proposals.	Dismiss. The expansion of EMM 1 to include watercourses and Conservation category wetlands is not required to protect their environmental values. There will be adequate mechanisms available to ensure these environmental values are protected as part of future proposals.	Agree
83	EMM 4 should be made compulsory for all rezonings.	165	1	Vegetation surveys should not be required for rezoning proposals that do not impact on remnant vegetation. The need for a vegetation survey should be determined by the responsible authority, which includes the EPA, when rezoning proposals are submitted for consideration.	Dismiss. The need for a vegetation survey can be considered as part of rezoning proposals.	Noted
84	EMM 5 should ensure wastewater re-use for irrigation within Leschenault Estuary catchment does not impact on waterways.	WRC	1	Wastewater disposal from industrial developments in Kemerton will be one of the most important issues to be addressed by the Environmental Management Plan required under EMM 5. If wastewater is proposed to be used for irrigation, the Environmental Management Plan	Note. EMM 5 will require wastewater disposal, including disposal for off-site	Noted

				would need to provide details of the environmental acceptability of this method of disposal.	irrigation, to be addressed.	
85	Concerns about risk associated with Kemerton-Bunbury rail link shown on Figure 4.	SWEC	1	Figure 4 shows recommendations of <i>Industry 2030 (WAPC, 2000)</i> . The Kemerton-Bunbury rail link is not a proposal of the GBRS and any amendment to reserve the rail link in the GBRS would require separate public consultation and environmental approval.	Dismiss.	Noted
Strategic Minerals and Basic Raw Materials Resource Policy						
86	Basalt Extraction Referral Area					
	(a) Policy should not be finalised until the report on the Gelorup basalt quarries buffer requirements is finalised.	S/C, 178	2	"A Technical Assessment of the Effects of Blasting at the Gelorup Basalt Quarries" is currently available for public comment. This study will be used to determine appropriate planning controls around the quarry. Any changes to the referral area required as a result of the study can be made to the policy once the study is finalised.	Dismiss.	Noted.
	(b) Buffer should be removed and memorials placed on new titles.	178	1	The importance of the basalt resource in this location and the relatively significant impacts that could be experienced by a sensitive land use located within the area of blasting effect warrants the establishment of an appropriate buffer. The implementation mechanism is yet to be determined.	Dismiss.	Noted.
	(c) Area should be 500m radius excluding existing residential areas.	213	1	While the Basalt Extraction Referral Area will be reviewed following finalisation of the related study. It is premature to adopt a reduced buffer.	Dismiss.	Noted.
	(d) Basalt Quarry operation should be subject to controls.	213	1	The basalt quarry operation is subject to controls but still requires the Basalt Extraction Referral Area to ensure access to the basalt resource is not compromised by an increase in incompatible land uses in the area of blasting effect.	Dismiss.	Agree with WAPC comment.
87	Environmental value of area south of Capel shown as a SM&BRMR Policy area should be protected.	31, 165, 209	3	The policy only defines general areas identified as containing mineral or basic raw material deposits. Any proposal to mine these deposits would be subject to a separate approval, which may include environmental assessment. Such an approval would specify the areas from which, and the conditions under which minerals and basic raw materials can be extracted.	Note. More detailed environmental assessment will be undertaken for any future extraction proposals.	The EPA recommends that the text of the policy be modified as outlined in Section 12.4.
88	More detailed environmental assessment required to define areas from which minerals and basic raw materials can be extracted.	WSWA	1	Refer to comments for 87 above.		The EPA recommends that the text of the policy be modified as outlined in Section 12.4.
89	Section 3.1 (ii) relating to buffers should be deleted.	S/D	1	Section 3.1(ii) states that the Policy applies to planning applications within 500m of SM&BRMR Policy areas. This referral allows DMPR to consider the effect of	Dismiss.	Noted.

				planning proposals on the ability to access mineral and basic raw material resources and to ensure access to those resources is maintained.		
Public Water Supply Catchment Policy						
90	Insufficient logging controls.	PEG, 165, 183, 206, SWEC	5	Refer to WAPC comments for 63 above.	Dismiss.	Agree with WAPC comment and response. No further evaluation required.
91	The land use permissibility table should be deleted.	S/D	1	Land use permissibility in Public Water Supply Catchments is determined based on WRC guidelines. These guidelines should be referred to in the GBRS policy to ensure consistency and avoid the need for future amendments to the GBRS policy.	Uphold. The land use permissibility table in the PWSC Policy should be deleted.	Agree with WAPC comment and response.
92	Wellington Dam catchment area should be Priority Area 1.	SWEC	1	PWSC Policy areas have been defined based on management requirements for each catchment. Stakeholders are currently considering the most appropriate uses for the Wellington Dam water supply. The results of this process will determine whether the proposed PWSC Policy areas for the Wellington Dam catchment need to be revised.	Dismiss.	Noted
93	Water catchment areas extending beyond the GBRS boundary need to be protected.	SWEC	1	All Public Water Supply Catchments extending outside the GBR are protected by provisions of the <i>Country Areas Water Supply Act 1947</i> and these provisions apply whether the catchment is covered by a regional town planning scheme or not.	Note.	Noted
Strategic Agricultural Resources Policy						
94	Areas covered by remnant vegetation should not be included.	WSWA	1	The inclusion of areas containing remnant vegetation within SAR Policy areas does not commit them to agriculture. It only requires the responsible authority to have regard to potential for agriculture in determining land use and development proposals. Regional-level studies should be undertaken when the GBRS is operational to identify regionally significant remnant vegetation that should be protected.	Dismiss. The WAPC will undertake further regional-level studies when the GBRS is operational to identify regionally significant vegetation.	The EPA recommends that the text of the policy be modified as outlined in Section 12.3.
95	State Forest north of Myalup east of the Perth-Bunbury Highway should be included.	93	1	CALM will determine the future use of this portion of the State Forest following harvesting of the existing pine plantation. Any proposal to include additional land within SAR Policy areas can be considered as an amendment to the policy.	Dismiss.	Agree with WAPC comment and response. No further evaluation required.
96	Land north of Leschenault Estuary should not be included.	WRC	1	The portion of Loc.14 north of Leschenault Estuary to be included in ROS should not be included in a SAR Policy area. Whilst western portions of other lots north of the Estuary included in SAR Policy areas have been mapped	Uphold in part. The portion of Loc.14 north of Leschenault Estuary to be	Agree with WAPC comment and response. No further evaluation required.

				as containing Vasse soils, which do not justify the same level of protection for agriculture as the Spearwood soils to the east, the SAR Policy area boundary is consistent with lot boundaries rather than soil type boundaries. The fact that a large proportion of these lots are highly suitable for intensive agriculture justifies their inclusion in the SAR Policy areas. More detailed analysis of land capability will be considered as part of any intensive agriculture proposal.	included in ROS will be excluded from the SAR Policy area.	
97	Planning proposals within 500m of a SAR Policy area should not require referral to DEP and Department of Agriculture.	S/D	1	Planning applications within 500m of SAR Policy areas need to be referred to DEP and Department of Agriculture to ensure existing agricultural operations or the potential to use these areas for agriculture are not compromised by incompatible land uses.	Dismiss.	Agree with WAPC comment and response. No further evaluation required.
Floodplain Management Policy						
98	Policy should recognise that global warming will cause sea levels to rise and must ensure no housing development or filling occurs on floodplains.	143	1	The policy has been formulated in consultation with WRC and prohibits development or inappropriate land uses in floodways and requires suitable site preparation in flood fringes. The policy will be subject to review and any changes in floodplain management requirements can be introduced as part of future review.	Dismiss.	Noted.

GENERAL						
No.	Points Raised	Submissions Raising Points	Total	WAPC Comment	WAPC Response	EPA Recommendation
Preserving remnant vegetation						
99	Need for planning to preserve more remnant vegetation.	34, 82, 86, 110, 141, ABC, 165, 209, 218, WSWA, 234, SWEC, CALM, 248	14	The GBRS proposes to include over 10 000ha of additional land in ROS reserves. The WAPC's independent environmental study has reviewed all new zones and reserves proposed by the GBRS that have been identified through submissions as impacting on remnant vegetation. Modifications have been recommended where required to protect regionally significant vegetation. In addition, EMM 1 and 4 provide for protection of regionally significant vegetation as part of any future GBRS rezoning proposal. The GBRS also provides a mechanism to include in ROS additional regionally significant natural areas if determined appropriate. Any proposal to clear over 1ha of remnant vegetation requires a separate approval. Notwithstanding these measures, further regional-level studies should be undertaken when the GBRS is operational to identify regionally significant remnant vegetation that should be protected and to determine an appropriate protection mechanism.	Note. The GBRS will provide a valuable contribution to preserving remnant vegetation in the region. However, the WAPC will undertake further regional-level studies when the GBRS is operational.	The <i>Environmental Protection Amendment Bill 2002</i> is currently before Parliament. This Bill contains new legislation to control clearing of native vegetation in Western Australia, through a coordinated assessment process run by the Department of Environmental Protection. Under the proposed laws most instances of clearing will require a permit.
100	Process for protecting all significant remnant vegetation from inappropriate development needs to be incorporated.	120, 141, 218, WSWA, SWEC, CALM, 248	7	Refer to WAPC's Comments for 99 above.	Refer to WAPC's Response for 99 above.	Refer to 99 above
101	Lack of detailed vegetation mapping as part of GBRS preparation.	165, 213, WSWA, 239	4	Refer to WAPC Comments for 99 above.	Dismiss. Refer to WAPC Response for 99 above.	Noted. The EPA has undertaken additional biological surveys and mapping (Appendix 5) and has also prepared a strategy to identify regionally significant natural areas in its consideration of the GBRS.
102	Regional review of remnant vegetation is required.	DRD, 218, CALM, 248	4	Refer to WAPC's Comments for 99 above.	Refer to WAPC's Response for 99 above.	Noted. The EPA has undertaken additional biological surveys and mapping (Appendix 5) and has also prepared a strategy to identify regionally significant natural

						areas in its consideration of the GBRS.
103	Should be a moratorium on land clearing until System 6 Update is completed.	141, 165, 234, SWEC	4	Refer to WAPC Comments for 99 above.	Refer to WAPC's Response for 99 above.	Refer to 99 above
104	Objection to any further new development in areas containing remnant vegetation.	17, 20	2	Refer to WAPC Comments for 99 above.	Dismiss. Refer to WAPC's Response for 99 above.	Refer to 99 above
105	Areas of remnant vegetation extending beyond GBRS boundary need to be protected.	SWEC	1	This is obviously outside the jurisdiction of the GBRS. However, there are various other mechanisms available, both within and outside the planning system, for the protection of significant vegetation. To provide consistency, certainty and efficiency in decision-making further studies should be undertaken when the GBRS is operational to identify regionally significant remnant vegetation that should be protected and to determine appropriate protection mechanisms.	Refer to WAPC's Response for 99 above.	Refer to 99 above
Preserving wetlands						
106	All EPP wetlands should be protected through inclusion in ROS or other planning mechanisms.	S/H, 234	2	While some EPP wetlands have been included in ROS based on surrounding pressures or recommendations of environmental studies, most are proposed to be retained in Rural or other zones because they are already protected by provisions of the Lakes EPP and because the GBRS does not increase the potential for their environmental values to be degraded. EMM 1 provides for EMPs as part of future rezoning, subdivision and development proposals including or adjacent to EPP wetlands.	Dismiss.	Noted.
107	Should be a policy requiring 50 m buffers around Conservation category wetlands and site specific buffers around Resource Enhancement category wetlands.	WRC	1	Refer to WAPC Comments for 78 above.	Refer to WAPC Response for 78 above.	Noted.
108	Wetlands in Preston Industrial Park should be protected.	SWEC	1	<i>Industry 2030 (WAPC, 2000)</i> recommends a detailed survey of wetlands as part of the structure planning for the Preston Industrial Park. Any significant wetlands will be protected through this process. Future amendment of the GBRS will be required, but the proposed zonings are appropriate pending structure planning.	Note. Structure planning for this area will identify and protect significant wetlands.	Noted.
Management of Natural Areas						
109	Need for management programs for regionally significant natural areas.	113, S/H, 234	3	The management of regionally significant natural areas on private land is the responsibility of the landowner. However, development in or adjacent to ROS reserves	Note. The GBRS will place	Noted.

				will be determined by the WAPC. The WAPC will prepare or encourage and assist with the preparation of management plans for ROS reserves in Crown ownership as a guide to future development of those areas. Management programs for all ROS reserves over Crown land will be coordinated between the WAPC and other land management agencies. The GBRs, through implementation of its EMMs, also provides a mechanism to protect regionally significant natural areas from the impacts of future rezoning, subdivision and development proposals.	controls on development within or adjacent to ROS reserves and the WAPC will prepare management plans for ROS once acquired. The GBRs will also protect regionally significant natural areas affected by future planning proposals.	
110	Study required to measure nutrient inputs into the Leschenault Estuary and set management guidelines for the catchment.	213, SWEC	2	The EPA has water quality guidelines for the protection of aquatic ecosystems and WRC has guidelines for best drainage and nutrient management practice, which are applied to rezoning, subdivision and development proposals. EMM 2 provides for DNMPs as part of future rezoning, subdivision and development proposals with the potential to degrade waterways and these would ensure water quality guidelines are met. It is noted that a "No Nett Nutrient Increase" policy is applied to the Leschenault Estuary catchment.	Note.	Noted. Agree with the WAPC comment.
111	Concern regarding illegal felling of Jarrah and dumping of rubbish in Dardanup Forest Block	66	1	These issues are dealt with by CALM as part of its management responsibilities under the <i>Conservation and Land Management Act 1984</i> .	Note.	Noted. Agree with the WAPC comment.
112	Provision be made to develop guidelines for management of private land adjoining ROS.	ABC	1	EMM 1 provides for EMPs to be prepared for subdivision or development proposals adjoining ROS. In the absence of more intensive land use or development, management for areas of ROS in Crown ownership would incorporate measures to minimise impacts from surrounding land uses.	Note.	Noted.
113	Management plan required for Ludlow Tuart Forest.	SWEC	1	Management plans are prepared by CALM on a priority basis and as resources permit and the Ludlow Tuart Forest is on their management plan priority list.	Note.	Noted. Agree with the WAPC comment.
114	Need for better management of rivers and wetlands.	234	1	The GBRs generally includes in ROS those river foreshores and wetlands considered to be exposed to high levels of activity or disturbance due to adjacent development. These areas are either already in public ownership or can be acquired by the WAPC and managed appropriately. Through the application of EMMs, the GBRs will ensure other significant wetlands and river foreshores are protected where there is potential for future rezoning, subdivision or development proposals to affect	Note. The GBRs introduces planning mechanisms that will ensure protection and appropriate management of river foreshores and wetlands.	Noted.

				their environmental value.		
115	Environmental management plan should be prepared for land surrounding Lake Preston.	SWEC	1	The WAPC's <i>Coastal and Lakelands Planning Strategy (1999)</i> provides environmentally sensitive planning and land management guidelines for land use and development adjacent to Lake Preston that can be implemented through the assessment of rezoning, subdivision and development proposals.	Note.	Noted.
General Suggestions on Environmental Improvements						
116	GBRS should focus more on protecting the environment and encouraging sustainable development than simply planning for economic growth.	183, WSWA, 234	3	The GBRS will contribute substantially to environmental protection. It will include many recognised regionally significant natural areas in ROS to secure protection of their environmental values and introduce EMMs that will protect regionally significant natural areas from potential impacts of future rezoning, subdivision and development proposals. However, the concept of sustainable development has broader application than environmental sustainability. Through the implementation of principles in the <i>State Planning Strategy (1997)</i> and the close involvement of the EPA and other environmental representatives in the planning process, the WAPC will ensure high regard is given to planning for environmentally sustainable development in the context of the broader concept when assessing future planning proposals.	Dismiss. The GBRS contributes substantially to environmental protection and the WAPC will give due regard to planning for environmentally sustainable development when assessing future planning proposals.	Noted.
117	Planning for GBRS should be based on characteristics of, and objectives for each bioregion.	181	1	The <i>Greater Bunbury Structure Plan (1995)</i> , which provides the strategic foundation for many of the proposals of the GBRS, defined precincts for the GBR based on major surface water catchments and functional geographic boundaries, as well as existing and potential land use patterns. The structure plan includes recommendations to address issues relating to the protection of environmental values specific to each planning unit.	Note. The GBRS is founded on planning for bio-physical planning units as described in the <i>Greater Bunbury Structure Plan</i> .	Noted.
118	Support for a larger Wellington National Park	194	1	The declaration of National Parks is not a function of the planning process.	Note. The WAPC will undertake further regional studies when the GBRS is operational.	Noted
119	The State Forest portion of the Ludlow Tuart Forest should be included in National Park in the GBRS.	218	1	Portion of the Ludlow Tuart Forest is already included in National Park. Consideration of additions to the National Park should be addressed through the <i>Conservation and Land Management Act 1984</i> planning process, particularly through revision of the Forest Management Plan.	Dismiss.	Noted.

120	ROS with highest conservation value should be purchased as a priority.	ABC	1	The WAPC will consider conservation values when determining acquisition priorities.	Note.	Noted.
121	ROS areas around Leschenault Estuary should be acquired as a priority.	WRC	1	Refer to WAPC Comments for 120 above. The majority of ROS around the Estuary is already in Crown ownership.	Note.	Noted.
General comments regarding future planning						
122	Diversion of the Preston River should not result in the loss of ROS along the river foreshore.	WRC	1	The GBRS does not propose diversion of the Preston River. The need for ROS will be considered as part of any future proposal to amend the GBRS to provide a reservation for the Preston River Diversion Channel.	Note.	Noted.
123	Strategic drainage plans should be required prior to rezonings under GBRS and urban water management plans should be required for structure plans.	WRC	1	Drainage will be considered for any GBRS rezoning proposal. Stormwater management is addressed at the structure planning stage of the planning process. EMM 2 provides for preparation of a DNMP for any subdivision or development where drainage has the potential to impact on a watercourse or wetland.	Note.	Noted.
Land use conflict						
124	Planning must control polluting development so residents are not affected.	142	1	The WAPC's <i>SPP No.4 – State Industrial Buffers Policy</i> requires industrial buffer requirements to be considered in the assessment of planning proposals. The <i>Environmental Protection Act 1986</i> empowers the EPA to assess the potential impact of any proposal for polluting development on surrounding or nearby residential development.	Note.	Noted.
125	GBRS should provide a buffer for DBC abattoir on Lot 6 Wimbridge St, Picton.	267	1	The proposed ROS over the adjoining EPP wetland provides a buffer to the north and north west. For other surrounding areas, the WAPC's <i>SPP No.4 – State Industrial Buffer Policy</i> requires industrial buffer requirements to be considered in the assessment of planning proposals. The buffer requirements for the abattoir would therefore be considered as part of any surrounding rezoning, subdivision or development proposal.	Dismiss. The buffer requirements for the abattoir will be considered as part of any surrounding rezoning, subdivision or development proposal.	Agree with WAPC comment and determination.
Environmental Assessment Process						
126	Environmental conditions to be included in Schedule 6 of the GBRS should be provided to all decision making authorities prior to being finalised.	DRD	1	There will be an opportunity for any persons and bodies to comment on recommended environmental conditions during the appeal period for the EPA's bulletin on the GBRS.	Dismiss. There is an opportunity for comment on the EPA's recommended environmental conditions within the environmental assessment process.	Agree.
Coastal Planning						
127	Object to further coastal residential	234	1	The GBRS does not propose any new coastal Urban	Dismiss.	Noted.

	development			zones. Any future proposal to zone additional coastal land Urban or Urban Deferred in the GBRs would be considered against relevant WAPC strategic and statutory coastal planning policies and would be subject to separate public consultation and environmental assessment.		
Groundwater protection						
128	Protection areas should be declared around possible public water supply bores, such as the bores proposed for public water supply in Preston.	SWEC	1	Wellhead protection zones are declared around proclaimed public drinking water source bores. Protection zones are not enforceable for wellheads in proposed public water source areas and would be more likely implemented through a structure plan or local TPS than by the GBRs. In this regard, further structure planning is required for the Preston Industrial Park. The need for protection of bores in this area may be considered as part of the structure plan preparation.	Dismiss.	Noted.