

# Dongara Port Denison District Structure Plan

Table 1: Summary of submissions

#	Submitter	Issue raised / modification requested	Response
<b>Government / Agency Submission</b>			
1	Department of Aboriginal Affairs	No currently known (registered) sites within the DSP area. Notwithstanding DDA Site 18907 Irwin River (SC04) appears to intersect the DSP area, this is not affected by the proposed SP.	Noted. No changes proposed.
2	Department of Water	<b>Draft DSP</b>	
		Section 2 ( <i>Planning Framework</i> ) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Reference should be made to SPP2.7 <i>Public Drinking Water Source Policy</i> and 2.9 <i>Water Resources</i>.</li> <li>- Update to current policy titles (i.e. it appears old / expired policy names are referenced)</li> </ul>	Section 2 ( <i>Planning Framework</i> ) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Noted. In line with recent advice from the WAPC, we will condense the detailed explanation of the various SPP and include 2.7 and 2.9 on the same page. Policy titles have been reviewed and updated.</li> </ul>
		Section 3 ( <i>Site &amp; Context Appreciation</i> ) Floodplain management, climate change and coastal adaptation should be more explicitly considered – liaise with DoW.	Consideration of these comments has occurred in consultation with DoW and the Shire of Irwin. A recommendation to undertake a coastal adaptation and protection study has been included in the DSP document at section 4.2.5.
		Section 3.5.2 ( <i>Rural Living</i> ) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Should be noted that potential land development in the Springfield area is constrained by lack of potable water supply.</li> <li>- Where reticulated water supply is not available, should include an assessment of 'demonstrated availability' of groundwater for 'outside' use.</li> <li>- Reference to Section 7.1 Climate Change in the Rural</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Noted. DSP has been updated to reflect.</li> <li>- Noted. This section regards future development rather than existing context. DSP has been updated at section 4.2.6.</li> <li>- Noted. This section regards future development rather than existing context. DSP has been updated at section 4.2.6.</li> </ul>

#	Submitter	Issue raised / modification requested	Response
		Planning Guidelines should be included in the DSP.	
		The above requirements should also apply to the Bonniefield Precinct.	The Bonniefield Precinct is not included in the DSP area.
		Section 4.2.6 ( <i>Rural Living</i> ) Viability of rainwater tanks for peri-urban areas within the DSP should be more closely assessed.	A note discussing this in light of rural planning frameworks has been included in the DSP at section 4.2.6.
<b>Draft DWMS</b>			
		Section 2.2 ( <i>Previous Studies</i> ) <i>Irwin River Coastal Estuary Management Plan</i> – recommend that concurrent with future roadwork’s or upgrades of stormwater infrastructure, the installation of bottomless gully pits and junction pits be considered.	Noted. Consideration of these comments has occurred in consultation with DoW and the DWMS has been updated accordingly.
		Section 4.8 ( <i>Surface Water</i> ) Update first para of this section relating to ‘Mingenew surface water’ (is incorrect).	Noted. Update has been made.
		Section 5 ( <i>Fit-for-purpose water source planning</i> ) Numerous revisions to information are recommended.	Noted. Consideration of these comments has occurred in consultation with DoW and the DWMS has been updated accordingly.
		Section ( <i>Water Sensitive Urban Design</i> ) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Recommends updates to Table 5 of ‘various structural BMP’s and lists some additional design considerations.</li> <li>- Update terminology, ie. ‘Infiltration area’ rather than ‘infiltration basins’.</li> <li>- Update stormwater management criteria for ‘Small events’ and ‘Major Events’ in line with comments provided by DoW.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Noted. Table 5 has been updated to include recommended updates.</li> <li>– Noted. Terminology has been updated throughout the DWMS.</li> <li>– Noted. Consideration of these comments has occurred in consultation with DoW and the DWMS has been updated</li> </ul>

#	Submitter	Issue raised / modification requested	Response
			accordingly.
		Section 8 ( <i>Flood Management</i> ) Floodplain management, climate change and coastal adaptation should be more explicitly considered – liaise with DoW.	Noted. Consideration of these comments has occurred in consultation with DoW and the DWMS has been updated accordingly.
		Section 9 ( <i>Stormwater Management</i> ) and Appendix F Stormwater Management elements to be considered in liaison with DoW.	Noted. Consideration of these comments has occurred in consultation with DoW and the DWMS has been updated accordingly.
		Additional comments regarding climate change adaptation.	A recommendation to undertake a coastal adaptation and protection study has been included in the DSP document.
3	Department of Agriculture and Food	Does not support southerly direction of urban expansion proposed by the DSP in the area described as the Port Denison Precinct as it encroaches into ‘one of the best sources of lime sand in the state’.	Noted. It is agreed that the long term development of this area is subject to agreement between multiple parties and the DSP includes a recommendation for an MOU specifically in regard to this. No changes proposed as the significance of this is already raised.
		Dongara has a future ultimate population of 23,000 people, however South Port Denison provides space for just 452 additional lots (or 1000 additional people) – appears to be a low yield in comparison with other precincts in the DSP.	Noted. The yield is a product of available land area, density proposed and existing developed land within the precinct.
		Due to significance of lime sand resources and the low yield of potential dwellings in the south of the DSP, it is recommended that the South Port Denison Precinct be removed from the DSP and reassessed ‘at the next phase of the structure planning phase’.	It is noted in the DSP that this area is unlikely to be developed within the next 15 years. By this stage a review of the currently developed DSP should have occurred. It is not recommended that this area be removed from the DSP as it will return the Shire to the current status quo with no impetus to move forward on coordinating future planning.
		Supports the DSP goal of restricting agricultural land being used for residential development.	Noted. No changes proposed.

#	Submitter	Issue raised / modification requested	Response
4	Department of Mines and Petroleum	Update Figure 5 (Opportunities and Constraints) as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Change Legend from '<i>Current Extractive Industry (lime sand)</i>' to read '<i>Lime sand extraction site</i>'.</li> <li>- Increase 1.25km buffer to WAPC endorsed 1.5km buffer footprint</li> <li>- Include <i>Westdeen Holdings</i> lime sand dune and label as '<i>Agreed Mining Area</i>' and 500m buffer.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Legend has been updated</li> <li>- Buffer has been updated</li> <li>- Labels has been updated on Figure 5, a note will indicate that this buffer is indicative only.</li> </ul>
		Provides updated text for Section 3.1.7 Geology and soils to ensure regional geology is more accurately described.	The changes requested by this submission have been made.
		Update Figure 6 (Geology and Acid Sulphate Soils) as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Remove 'Ocean' from legend.</li> <li>- Change '?Qa/Czla' to 'Qa'.</li> <li>- Change '?Qt' to 'Qt'.</li> </ul>	Noted. Changes have been made as per this submission.
		General update required to Figure 11 ( <i>Mining tenements, petroleum titles and geothermal titles</i> ) to accurately reflect mining tenements and geothermal titles prior to finalising DSP.	Noted. Updated mapping has been sought and included in final submission as latest reflective.
		Section 3.5.5 'Extractive Industry' should be renamed 'Extraction under Mining Act'. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Use of term 'Industry-extractive' potentially confusing in this context.</li> <li>- If the DSP is to list mining tenements (not recommended), include additional detail as outlined in the submission.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Noted. Changes to section title have been made in line with submission.</li> <li>- Individual mining tenement details have been removed from the document.</li> </ul>
		Section 3.6.3 'Natural Resources' should be renamed 'Mineral Resources'.	This section would include discussion of other industries such as forestry under natural resource, if forestry was a significant local economic driver. Natural Resource is still more accurate and reflects other planning documents. No changes proposed.
		Strong concerns raised with <i>Section 4</i> which proposes residential expansion of the South Port Denison Precinct (conflicts with lime sand resources).	Noted. It is agreed that the long term development of this area is subject to agreement between multiple parties and the DSP includes a recommendation for an MOU specifically in regard to this. Minor changes to language are proposed to more adequately

#	Submitter	Issue raised / modification requested	Response
		Strong concerns raised with <i>Section 4.2.9</i> (Basic Raw Materials) that the 'Basic Raw Materials' zone does not include the existing lime sand operation within M70/309 in the South Port Denison Precinct.	reflect the legal rights of the mining leases, however, the South Port Denison area is proposed to remain as the significance of this issue is already raised.
		Concern at <i>Section 5.2.3</i> (Memorandum of Understanding) with the proposed establishment of a new 'Land use planning and mineral resource exploration and mining' MOU.	We do not support removing this from the DSP as it will return the Shire to the current status quo with no impetus to move forward on establishing an open framework of communication.
5	Department of Planning	DSP notes tourism has not reached its full potential, but does not identify new areas set aside for tourism purposes (this detail should be included).	<p>Noted. Councils <i>Draft Tourism Development Plan 2013-2018</i> has recently been produced and provides a series of recommendations for tourism in Dongara-Port Denison.</p> <p>The plan does not suggest that the town planning framework limits tourism opportunity, and the DSP proposes increased commercial areas in the townsites, suggesting these as logical places for tourism activities.</p> <p>The discussion relating to tourism has been reviewed to state more explicitly this intent. In smaller regional towns it is considered more appropriate to allow for flexibility rather than constrain development with too-specific zones. As such, no recommendation to include a tourism zone is proposed.</p>
6	Office of the Environmental Protection Authority	As the DSP retains and protects sensitive areas with suitable buffers, the OEPA supports the draft DSP	Noted. No changes proposed.
7	State Heritage Office	Generally supportive. DSP documentation ( <i>Section 2</i> ) should mention all relevant State Planning Policies	Noted. Additional policies have been included as appropriate, including reference to SPP 3.5 as requested, in <i>Section 2.2.8</i> .
		With respect to Aboriginal and Historic cultural heritage, as these are managed under different acts it is recommended that they be separated (i.e. <i>Section 3.4</i> split into 'Aboriginal Heritage' and 'Historic Heritage').	Noted. This section has been separated.

#	Submitter	Issue raised / modification requested	Response
8	Water Corporation	Has no objection.	Noted.
		'Wastewater conveyance planning' and 'Water scheme planning' information provided should be fed into the DSP Precincts (St. Dominics, Race Course Estate, Fransisco Road North and South Port Denison) to ensure current information on water and wastewater servicing is applied.	Noted. Detailed local structure planning which occurs in line with DSP recommendations should always consider latest information and liaise directly with Water Corporation for ongoing accuracy of data. No changes proposed.
		Various technical detail is provided for consideration (as relevant) when updating the DSP.	Documents provided (predominantly relating to planning in buffer areas) have been reviewed to confirm that DSP assumptions are current. No changes proposed.
9	Western Power	Planning advice (DSP) has been noted in the WP database in advance of the next review of network capacity requirements.	Noted. No Changes proposed.
10	Department of Health	R12.5 / R30 developments are required to connect to scheme water and reticulated sewerage as required by the draft <i>Country Sewerage Policy</i> .	Noted. The DSP provides an overarching framework and is not to be considered a detailed subdivision plan. This is too great a level of detail for the DSP. No changes proposed.
		Reference made to the <i>Government Sewage Policy – Consultation Draft 2011</i> is incorrect as appearing in the DSP.	Noted. This has been updated.
11	Main Roads Western Australia	Supportive of the general approach of the DSP.	Noted. No Changes proposed.
		Notes the two northernmost precincts in particular (does not name these) are the ones which would have the greatest impacts on the main roads network	Noted. No Changes proposed.
		Seeks to be involved in early discussions relating to Structure Planning affecting Brand Highway or access to it.	Noted. No Changes proposed. Council to monitor and advise proponents.
		<i>Section 5.2.3</i> (Structure Planning) should ensure the requirements for contents of Structure Plans could be reiterated. Recommend that the draft WAPC Transport Assessment guidelines are referred to.	This section has been updated to include recommendations.

#	Submitter	Issue raised / modification requested	Response
12	Department of Parks and Wildlife	<p>Parks and Wildlife managed estates:</p> <p>A number of maps appear to have excluded reference to Parks and Wildlife managed estates (these include Beekeepers Nature Reserve and Dongara Nature Reserve).</p>	Maps have been amended to reflect these reserves.
		<p>Inconsistencies exist in Figure 5 (<i>Opportunities and Constraints Map</i>) and the District Water Management Strategy (DWMS) which includes:</p> <p>‘Identified urban expansion areas’ overlap with Beekeepers Nature Reserve (The nature reserve is not identified as a P&amp;W managed reserve at Figure 5).</p> <p>Section 4.6 ‘Flora and Fauna’ incorrectly states that there are no reserves, conservations area within or adjacent to the study area – requires updating.</p>	The DWMS and DSP have been amended to respond to this submission.
		<p>Bushfire protection:</p> <p>It is recommended that measures be included in the plan to address bushfire mitigation, threat and protection requirements.</p>	Noted. The DSP comprises a section discussing the broad assessment for risk and includes advice re the need to undertake detailed assessment at local structure planning. No changes proposed.
		<p>Flora and Fauna:</p> <p>It is recommended that the DSP where possible set targets for the retention of vegetation consistent with <i>National Objectives and Targets for Biodiversity Conservation 2001-2005</i>.</p> <p>The presence of threatened fauna and communities should be acknowledged and that the need to protect individuals of these species and communities as well as their critical habitat be stated.</p> <p>Section 3.1.8 of the DSP be amended to acknowledge observation of EPBC communities in the area around the mouth and lower reaches of the Irwin River.</p>	Noted. Amendments to the Flora and Fauna sections have been made in line with suggestions.

#	Submitter	Issue raised / modification requested	Response
13	Shire of Irwin Heritage Advisor (Tanya Henkel)	Figure 2 Any reason why Walkaway and Yuna are not included as local centres on map?	This map is an extract. We do not have the authority to amend it. No changes.
		Section 3.4 (Heritage Value) Queries inclusion of Former Seventh Day Adventist Church photo as this is outside of DSP study area.	Noted. This image has been replaced with another image of an historical building in the area.
		Terminology relating to Municipal Inventory changed from 'classifies' to 'documents'.	Noted. Changes have been made to reflect this submission.
		List of Built Heritage (P.21) odd – what was justification for including these places? Recommend in terms of built heritage within DSP area that a similar table be compiled including all places entered in the 'State Register of Heritage Places' (example table provided in submission).	Noted. We have reviewed and combined lists. The intent for this listing is to more clearly reflect those buildings which have some significance.
<b>Private / Landowner Submission</b>			
14	Peter and Margaret Dawson	Proposes a dual zone change to 30377 Brand Highway to both <i>Commercial</i> and <i>Special Use</i> (to allow caravan parks etc).	It is noted that specific lot zoning is more detail than usually provided in a DSP. No changes proposed for the DSP. Notwithstanding this, 30377 Brand Highway is located within the area identified for Regional Centre which will have numerous permissible land uses. Further consideration of land use zones and land use permissibility should occur during a review of the Local Planning Strategy and Local Planning Scheme to ensure specific land uses can be achieved.
15	Robert Scadden	Suggests subdivision into smaller residential blocks be allowable at the <i>Racecourse Estate</i> .	Noted. It may be possible to achieve a denser residential product in this area, however, it is subject to servicing and site constraints as well as challenges related to land fragmentation.

#	Submitter	Issue raised / modification requested	Response
			As per the recommendations of the DSP Section 4.2.3, detailed local structure planning is suggested for future redevelopment of the area which may determine a range of lot sizes. No changes proposed.
16	Craig Nelson	Proposes zone change at 133 Brennand Road, Dongara to R5 or R10 to allow subdivision of land.	This area is located within the Racecourse estate and has been identified for greater density. As per the recommendations of the DSP Section 4.2.3, detailed local structure planning is suggested for future redevelopment of the area which may determine a range of lot sizes. No changes proposed.
17	Landowners of Lots 501 and 9500 (previously lot 502) Brand Highway	Generally supports DSP as it applies to subject land	Noted.
		Given proximity of the site to the Dongara Town Centre, a portion of the land may be better suited to conventional, sewerer urban development (which is being currently investigated by the landowner)	Noted. As per the recommendations of the DSP, detailed local structure planning is required for all proposed future urban development. Achieving a sewerer product would be highly desirable and the landowner is encouraged to continue investigations. No changes proposed.
		DSP does not specify nature of land uses intended to occupy General Industry land located east of Moore Road	Noted. General Industry is defined under Local Planning Scheme No. 5. Detailed land use permissibility is more detail than usually provided in a DSP. No changes proposed.
18	Glenn Marsden	Concerned with the location of the proposed <i>Conservation and Public Purposes Land</i> on their site known as Victoria Location 653. Location of a Civic / School site better moved to an area that can use buffer zone areas for ovals and parks.	Noted. The DSP is a high level document and as per the recommendations of the DSP, detailed local structure planning should be completed to determine the appropriate location of land uses, including Conservation/Civic/School sites. Shared contribution schemes will provide equity across land parcels and should be undertaken as a part of the local structure planning process. Some minor changes have been made identifying less specific conservation areas on the DSP maps to reflect the high level nature of the document, however, it should be noted that during local structure planning landowners will need to fully assess servicing

#	Submitter	Issue raised / modification requested	Response
			and site constraints including their environmental obligations, which may include land falling within floodplain management or flood prone areas.
		This property has gifted land to the Shire of Irwin with no compensation	Noted. It is not within the process of the DSP to resolve land ownership and/or compensatory matters. Compensatory matters should be taken up with the appropriate authority. No changes proposed.
		If grey water can be used at the golf course then no reason why this land cannot be used for Public Space.	Noted. The DSP is a high level document and as per the recommendations of the DSP, detailed local structure planning should be completed to determine the appropriate provision of Public Space. During local structure planning the golf course <i>may</i> be considered in the overall provision. No changes proposed.
		Could WC sewerage plant be relocated to remove the buffer zone	The treatment plant has recently undergone an upgrade and the Water Corporation did not indicate any changes to the treatment plant were currently being considered. The relocation of this plant is subject to Water Corporation planning. No changes proposed.
19	Landowners of Survey Strata Lots 12-31 at 129 Point Leander Drive, Port Denison	Seeks amendment to DSP to allow flexibility for development of strata lots 12-31 by rezoning / earmarking future rezoning of the eastern (undeveloped) portion of the property from Special Use to Residential with a Density Code of R20.	Noted. The DSP is a high level document and this is a site specific request. It is understood that Shire of Irwin officers are currently in discussions regarding this proposal. The DSP cannot provide for the level of detail being requested. No changes proposed.
		Consideration should be given within the DSP to planning for strategic locations for holiday accommodation, short stay accommodation and holiday homes.	Noted. The DSP proposes increased commercial areas in the townsites, specifically suggesting these as logical places for tourism activities, whilst holiday accommodation may occur throughout the district subject to meeting certain requirements related to the Local Planning Scheme.  Additionally, Councils Draft Tourism Development Plan 2013-2018 has recently been produced and provides a series of recommendations for tourism in Dongara-Port Denison.  The discussion relating to tourism has been reviewed to state more explicitly this intent in Section 4.2.1 and 4.2.2, and flexibility has

#	Submitter	Issue raised / modification requested	Response
			been maintained by the broad zones identified.
20	John L. Rossiter (with petition and attachments)	Lot 947 (southern end of Big 4 Caravan Park) should be retained as Foreshore Reserve and be developed as parking and beach amenities to allow the public to enjoy.	Noted. The DSP is a high level document and this proposal is a greater level of detail than would be considered during the preparation of the DSP. It is recommended that the proposal be formally addressed to the Shire of Irwin for consideration. No changes proposed.
		Block of POS land to the west of Dongara Marine in Carrol Street – suggest removing bollards.	Noted. The DSP is a high level document and this proposal is a greater level of detail than would be considered during the preparation of the DSP. It is recommended that the proposal be formally addressed to the Shire of Irwin for consideration. No changes proposed.
21	Darren Evans	Supports the DSP in current form.	Noted. No changes proposed.
22	Greg Symons & Tammy Dickson	Requests proposed reserve affecting Location 1793 (between St Dominics Road and Blenheim Road) be moved to the south side of the property within this buffer zone.	Noted. The DSP is a high level document and as per the recommendations of the DSP, detailed local structure planning should be completed to determine the specific locations of reserves. Some minor changes have been made throughout the DSP to reflect the high level nature of the document, however, it should be noted that the DSP provides only indicative spatial responses to the broad district needs.
		Treatment plant emits odour – can discussions be held with WC	Noted. This is an immediate concern and is not a matter for the DSP. Recommend that the Shire liaise with Water Corporation regarding odour concerns. No changes proposed.
23	Ray Masini	Land known as Victoria Location 1953 is marked as 'existing reserve' when it is in fact 'freehold land'. Gives the impression of a gradually widening reserve system which increases the distance of properties from the coast.	The location of the coastal and other existing reserves have been reviewed against relevant databases. The reserve boundaries reflect the best available data from the relevant authorities. Discussion with the relevant authority is recommended if there is a concern with the identified boundaries. No changes proposed.

#	Submitter	Issue raised / modification requested	Response
		DSP needs to be revised to zone the land 'rural living' consistent with adjoining properties.	The DSP is a high level document and specific requests to rezone land is at a greater level of detail than would be considered during the preparation of the DSP. It is recommended that the proposal be formally addressed to the Shire of Irwin and the relevant management authority (e.g. the Shire or the Department of Parks and Wildlife) for consideration. No changes proposed.
		Contends that land owners under the proposed rural living zone are unfairly penalized.	Noted. The location of the coastal and other existing reserves have been reviewed against relevant databases. The reserve boundaries reflect the best available data from the relevant authorities. Coastal reserves have been maintained and rural living zones are adjacent to these.  It should be noted that the rural living areas proposed under the DSP are currently zoned general farming. Rural living is an increase in development opportunity than is currently allowed. No changes proposed.
		Raises specific issues and considerations relating to Road Infrastructure (i.e. private road on northern boundary of DSP should be a future public road) and development potential (innovative / aquaculture etc in the northern area of the DSP).	Noted. Elements such as detailed demarcation of roads as public vs private are appropriately dealt with during detailed local structure planning. Adequate land has been allowed for in the various zones for numerous economic opportunities including aquaculture and the like. These areas have been set aside in locations well serviced and connected to existing activities. Rural zoned land will continue to allow for rural activities, and is generally well serviced along the entirety of the Brand Highway.  Commentary regarding other economic activities has been included in the final DSP in Section 4.2.1, 4.2.6 and 4.2.7.
24	Landowners of Lots 10, 15, 16 and 17 Brand Highway	Strongly supports the DSP as it applies to the subject site.	Noted. No changes proposed.
25	Robyn Watts	Contends there should be a timeframe for the proposed expansion of the residential areas.	Noted. It is not appropriate to provide definitive timeframes as development will occur in line with local demand and supply mechanisms. Flexibility is required to ensure decision makers can

#	Submitter	Issue raised / modification requested	Response
			respond to local needs. No changes proposed.
		Opposes increased residential density at the Racecourse Estate Precinct.	Noted. Limited density increase is proposed over time. Detailed local structure planning is required before densities would be specifically amended and the submitter will have to opportunity to be engaged during further planning work which affects them. No changes proposed.
		DSP suggests low density character of Dongara and Port Denison urban areas will be retained, however seeks to include substantial areas of higher density development.	Noted. In line with appropriate state planning principles, this DSP seeks to appropriately manage growth over the long term. It is common to see areas of increased density in townsites in areas where services and facilities can be most effectively utilised by existing and future populations. No changes proposed.
		Estimation of additional required land does not appear to consider undeveloped land which is currently zoned residential.	Noted. It is acknowledged that substantial existing undeveloped land is available. The DSP seeks to provide a variety of realistic options for growth and also seeks to provide guidance regarding staging. No changes proposed.
		Queries accuracy of traffic data and trip rates used.	Noted. Traffic analysis is based on standardised and consistent transport analyses methodologies which are supported by state and local agencies. Trip rates used are in line with current methodologies and reflect housing occupancy, vehicle ownership and research data. No changes proposed.
		Integrator A road adjacent to a school does not seem safe.	Detailed design will determine the relevant and appropriate type of road and/or school in various locations and the safety of school children will be a consideration in future detailed road and development planning. No changes proposed.
		Environmental aspects (including engineering) associated with providing a pedestrian link across the river do not appear to have been considered.	Conceptually, a pedestrian connection over the river has been proposed. The DSP does not purport to provide detailed design or investigations. This is subject to further detailed design, costing and implementation.  It should be noted that the Shire of Irwin takes its environmental

#	Submitter	Issue raised / modification requested	Response
			stewardship very seriously and in line with numerous existing and proposed strategies would ensure that environmental aspects of any proposal are professionally and appropriately considered. No changes proposed.
		No reference in DSP to community comments made at the public workshops.	Appendix A to the DSP provides a summary of community consultation outcomes. No changes proposed.
26	Betty Cockman	Prioritise a tree planting policy for greening of Irwin Shire.	In line with current initiatives of the Shire in their preparation of a Green Infrastructure Strategy, a recommendation has been included in the DSP to consider ongoing vegetation improvements throughout the DSP area (and the rest of the Shire).
		Can power poles be removed and power lines relocated underground in foreshore areas.	A comment regarding undergrounding power has been included in the DSP although this may be considered a long term opportunity based on various development timing, staging and cost issues.

**Table 2: Summary of key issues raised**

Issue raised / modification requested	Number of submissions raising issue
<b>Government / Agency Submission</b>	
Requesting minor changes to DSP documentation	6
South Port Denison Precinct	2
Environmental	1
Tourism	1
Aboriginal and Historic cultural heritage	1
Water Scheme	1
Bushfire Protection	1
Flora and Fauna	1
<b>Private / Landowner Submission</b>	
Zone change	3
Subdivision	1
Conservation and public purposes land	2
Rural Living Zone	1
Urban Density (decrease)	1
Urban Density (increase)	2
Timeframe	1
Beach Amenities	1
Environment	2