

**SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS: PROPOSED PLACE OF PUBLIC WORSHIP, COMMUNITY PURPOSES AND CONSULTING ROOMS – No.987 (Lot 166)
South Coast Highway, Denmark (2018/205; A2361)**

Submission Number	Name & Address	Verbatim Submission	Planning Services Comment
S1	Details omitted as per Council Policy.	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed development at Lot 166, comprising a Place of Public Worship, Consulting Rooms, and Community Purposes. I am against the proposed development for the following reasons.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="562 331 1568 852"> <p>1. The scale of the development is excessive for Denmark. The land is (to my knowledge) owned by the Baptist Church in Denmark and has been a proposed site for a new church for many years. That was a simple purpose and, had it been restricted to that purpose only, no objection would have been tenable as the scale of the development would have been small, there being only several dozen members of the Baptist faith in and around Denmark. However, the scale of the proposed development including a building of 560m² is much greater and in my opinion exceeds any proportion that is commensurate with current or likely Denmark community needs. Rather, it is of a scale suitable for a large town or city. Not only has there been no opinion expressed from within the community that any need exists for development of this scale, the recent rebuilding of the Bowling Club and its availability to community organisations, along with other sources such as Shire buildings and commercial enterprises such as local wineries, means that community needs for meetings and events are currently satisfied. Additional development is not required.</p> <li data-bbox="562 852 1568 1222"> <p>2. The applicants or funders of the development are not disclosed in the documents received. The development application ostensibly or implicitly emanates from the Baptist Church (the title is “Baptist Community Centre”), but your papers sent do not identify the “applicant”. I believe that is Shire policy. I have been advised that the application is allegedly supported by a well-known WA family resident in Perth, but the extent of that support and whether their name is attached to the application are unknown. Of course, any Australian entity has a right to apply for development consent anywhere, but the absence of full disclosure for a development of this scale carries a serious risk that the external interests do not have the welfare of Denmark as their primary concern and that local residents or the Shire may gain an inaccurate view as to the purposes of the development.</p> 	<p>The proposed building addresses setback, plot ratio and other development standards from the <i>Shire of Denmark Town Planning Scheme No. 3 (TPS3)</i>.</p> <p>The applicant advises ‘Consistent with the trend of new church buildings in other areas, the proposed Denmark Baptist Church community centre building will provide many more facilities to the community than simply a place of worship.’</p> <p>Subject to addressing planning standards, the size of the building is a decision for the Baptist Church. The determination of need for community purposes is also considered to be a decision for the Baptist Church.</p> <p>The applicant/designer is Martin H Beeck for the Baptist Union of Western Australia Inc (owner) and Denmark Baptist Community Inc.</p>

		<p>3. Public safety will be adversely affected. The development faces the South Coast Highway and the entrance crosses the pedestrian pathway used by school pupils daily on their way to and from Denmark High School. Eastbound traffic will be required to make a right turn across opposing traffic and this requirement will cause a safety hazard and interruption of traffic flow on the Highway, which a single lane in each direction. The development therefore carries a risk to public safety in several respects.</p>	<p>South Coast Highway is the responsibility of Main Roads Western Australia (MRWA). MRWA are satisfied with the proposed access and raise no objections to the safety of road users on South Coast Highway.</p> <p>The adjoining road system has sufficient capacity to handle traffic generation associated with the proposed development.</p> <p>The proposed vehicular access:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • has appropriate sight distances on South Coast Highway in both directions; • there is appropriate visibility in both directions to see pedestrians on the duel use path; • enables vehicles to enter and leave the site in a forward gear; and • will be a sealed crossover which allows for two-way traffic.
		<p>4. Neighbouring properties will be adversely affected. The number of seats shown in the plans for main building far exceeds the number of car parks to be made available. This implies increased traffic on Morgan St, Flay St and Beveridge Rd as visitors seek alternative parking. The High School and TAFE grounds are also likely to be targeted for unauthorized parking. Noise during functions affecting neighbouring properties is also of potential concern. This may be mitigated by adequate vegetation barriers around the development but the screening plants are not specified.</p>	<p>Appendix XI – Parking Standards of TPS3 requires 1 parking space per 4 persons for places of public assembly and entertainment. Based on the assembly hall providing the potential for a maximum seating of 180 people, this equates to a standard of 45 parking spaces. The application, as outlined in Attachment 8.1.1e, provides 46 parking spaces. It is expected the car park will rarely be full.</p> <p>The development conditions address noise and landscaping.</p>

		<p>5. The stated purposes of the development are inconsistent in Shire documents. In addition to the three purposes mentioned above (a quotation from your letter), the Shire website also mentions "...a crèche, storage areas, kitchen, rooms to accommodate office/counselling space and a range of community based uses such as small receptions/functions and group activities". The nature of the "Consulting room" function is unspecified. These functions imply daily traffic, not occasional traffic when one-off events are being held.</p>	<p>The consulting rooms are a minor/incidental component of the facility and are likely to generate limited traffic and impacts.</p>
		<p>Other points of concern Sixty percent of the beautiful mature Karri and Red Gums will be sacrificed under the proposed. This is highly regrettable.</p>	<p>Noted. The application proposes the removal of 8 Karri trees and 7 Marri (Red Gum) trees. There is an expectation that some trees can be removed to facilitate development, address bushfire requirements and minimise the risk of falling tree limbs.</p>
		<p>The nature of the screening vegetation is unspecified. Any feedback from you in relation to these objections will be appreciated.</p>	<p>This is required to be addressed as a development condition.</p>
<p>S2</p>	<p>Details omitted as per Council Policy.</p>	<p>I OBJECT to the proposed place of worship that is intended on South-coast Highway. As someone who values peace and quiet, and has specifically chosen my property for that very reason and locale, I believe that creating such a structure and allowing for the proposed population to utilise the building and grounds will destroy the natural birdlife, tree-life and general peace and quiet of the locale.</p>	<p>The proposed development will change the character of the site which is currently vacant. It is noted that potential noise associated with the activities may at times be insignificant compared to the noise generated by traffic on South Coast Highway. Noise management and mitigation are required to be addressed as development conditions. It is also noted that the level of noise emanating from the premises shall not exceed that prescribed in the <i>Environmental Protection Act 1986</i>, and the <i>Environmental Protection (Noise) Regulations 1997</i>.</p>
		<p>By allowing for such a population to gather, traffic will be affected and the overflow for events, worship and just general day to day is something that will negatively impact the very serene atmosphere that is found within the area.</p>	<p>MRWA raise no objection.</p>
		<p>As well, once such a building is constructed, the hours and potential disturbances emanating from such a site, will have serious negative ramifications. Please confirm that you have received this email and make note of this objection.</p>	<p>This is required to be addressed as a development condition.</p>

S3	Details omitted as per Council Policy.	We are writing to advise we object to the above proposal. From the site plan provided the proposal requires extensive clearing of the land. We believe the current trees on the land provide a majestic entry statement to the Denmark Township and should be retained.	The area's character includes the tree-lined entry/gateway into Denmark. There are several trees within the road reserve on the southern side. These trees will be retained.
		On current estimation there are four places of worship and up to thirteen public meeting facilities available for hire to community groups. The need for another purpose built worship and meeting facility appears to be a duplication. We believe the addition of another worship and community space is not required and will not enhance the town.	The determination of need for community purposes is considered to be a decision for the Baptist Church.
S4	Details omitted as per Council Policy.	As a landowner in the proximity to the proposed development I wish to lodge my objection for the following reasons.	
		1. Amenity. This area is a quiet residential community and such a development would be completely out of character for the area.	The development complies with TPS3 standards. It is noted that potential noise associated with the activities may at times be insignificant compared to the noise generated by traffic on South Coast Highway.
		2. The residents would have to put up with an increase in traffic noise and movement. There would also be a risk for traffic turning onto South Coast Highway and into the High School zone.	MRWA raise no objection.
		3. The removal of 15 mature Karri and Red Gum trees would be environmentally detrimental and directly affect the vegetation preservation of the locality.	The site contains limited environmental assets given it is largely cleared. There is an expectation that some trees can be removed to facilitate development, address bushfire requirements and minimise the risk of falling tree limbs.
		4. The current zoning is residential and a Place of Worship approval would not conform with the objectives of a residential area. Please give my submission careful consideration and reject this proposal.	The Place of Public Worship is consistent with TPS3 objectives and is a use envisaged for the Residential Zone as evidenced by TPS3 permissibility and provisions.
S5	Details omitted as per Council Policy.	As a landowner in the proximity to the proposed development I wish to lodge my objection for a number of reasons.	
		1. Amenity . This area is a quiet residential community and such a development would be completely out of character for the area. The residents would have to put up with an increase in traffic noise both day and night.	The development complies with TPS3 standards. It is noted that potential noise associated with the activities may at times be insignificant compared to the noise generated by traffic on South Coast Highway.
		2. Environmental . The loss of 15 mature trees and removal of vegetation would result in the loss of vital habitat for native birds and animals.	Noted. The application proposes the removal of 8 Karri trees and 7 Marri (Red Gum) trees. There is an expectation that some trees can be

			removed to facilitate development, address bushfire requirements and minimise the risk of falling tree limbs.
		3. Zoning. I believe the current zoning is residential as are the surrounding properties so am curious as to why the Shire would even consider changing this. The shire has a new industrial area which would be much more suitable for a large scale development such as this.	A place of public worship is an 'X' use (not permitted) in the General Industry zone in TPS3.
		4. I am told there is about 30 Baptists in the Denmark community, which begs the question as to why the need for such a large development.	Subject to addressing planning standards, the size of the building is a decision for the Baptist Church.
		Finally I don't believe this proposed development conforms with the objectives of a residential area and should be rejected by the Shire.	The Place of Public Worship is consistent with TPS3 objectives and is a use envisaged for the Residential Zone as evidenced by TPS3 permissibility and provisions.
S6	Details omitted as per Council Policy.	I am writing to vehemently oppose the proposed Baptist Community Centre for the following reasons.	
		The size and scale of the development is at odds with the number of people who identify as Baptist within our community. The most recent census (2016) lists 35 people identifying as Baptist in Denmark (town) out of a total population of 2637, just over 1% of the population. In the greater 6333 area the number rises to 68 from 5845, still just 1% of the population. The proposal is for a 180 seat auditorium; quite clearly, this is not a building intended for the local congregation who could easily be building something on a far more modest scale to accommodate their needs. It is clear that this is a building which is entirely unsuited to the needs of the intended congregants.	The proposed building addresses setback, plot ratio and other development standards from TPS3. Subject to addressing planning standards, the size of the building is a decision for the Baptist Church.
		Part of the rationale for a building of this scale and size is that Denmark has need of such a facility. But does it? Within 500metres or so there is the Riverside Club; in the town centre, just over a kilometre away there is the Civic Centre and less than a kilometre to the East there is the Country Club, all venues capable of holding similar or larger numbers of people. If the Angling Club and Surf Lifesaving Club are added to this, it is clear that Denmark is well served by community venues and most certainly does not need a further venue situated in a zoned residential area.	The determination of need for community purposes is considered to be a decision for the Baptist Church.
		The proposal, in its current form, will have a significant negative impact on the amenity of the area. At present, it is a quiet, suburban locale. A 180 seat auditorium operating regularly throughout the week with the attendant increase in traffic, late night noise and so on will irrevocably change this for the worse. Let us consider traffic. The auditorium seats 180 people, there is parking for 45 cars. Rudimentary arithmetic suggests that there will be an overflow and Flay and Morgan Streets will bear the brunt of this. This means that the residents adjacent, especially those of us to the West are going to get noise and disruption from both the venue and the clientele, before and after events. There will be significantly increased traffic flows	Although there are various activities proposed from the site throughout the week, the highest vehicle numbers are expected from the church service on Sundays between 8.30am and 12.00pm. It is estimated that around 40 people will attend the service/s which can be accommodated on-site. It is expected the car park will rarely be full.

		through Morgan and Flay Streets, which is a highly undesirable outcome. Residents, including us, have bought there for precisely the opposite reason, that it is quiet, little traffic, little disruption. This proposal has the potential to fundamentally upend the existing amenity and living conditions.	
		The proposed building is extraordinarily large and dominates a large proportion of the block. What remains will largely be covered in asphalt, a far cry from the treed landscape that currently exists and what forms part of the visual amenity of the area. These trees form a spectacular backdrop to the surrounding properties, and while I acknowledge that a smaller, more appropriate building would require some tree removal, the current plan effectively razes the block, destroying the visual amenity that I and the surrounding property owners enjoy.	The proposed building addresses setback, plot ratio and other development standards from TPS3.
		At present, little to no information has been provided about the operating conditions of a venue of this magnitude. How many days and/or nights of operation would be permitted? What would be the noise conditions? What would be the hours of operation? So in addition to the ruining of the visual amenity of the locale, the proposal will destroy the peaceful and quiet nature of this area of Denmark.	This is required to be addressed as a development condition.
		Some further questions. Sewerage – what is the plan for dealing with the waste of a full auditorium? A couple of septic tanks clearly won't do the job. Stormwater? Yes, the plan says all storm water to be retained on site, but how? With the amount of paved surface replacing the existing soil and a very large roof area, a few soak-wells are not going to cope. The provisions as indicated on the plan would appear to be completely inadequate.	The Shire is satisfied with the geotechnical report and technical memorandum prepared by the consulting engineer. The Shire considers that on-site effluent disposal and managing stormwater can be effectively addressed. This is addressed in the development conditions.
		Lastly, the ethics of those behind the proposal. Denmark prides itself on being a town that is diverse, inclusive and accepting. While acknowledging the right to religious freedom, it would seem incongruous to allow a group, whose intolerance towards certain groups within society is on the public record, to build what purports to be a community centre and then have them censor or regulate what occurs within that space. The Baptist Minister made it very clear in a meeting with a community group that this is exactly what would happen. It would be a community centre in name only. Thus, the proposal, far from being a way of bringing the community together, has the potential to promote divisiveness and intolerance.	Ethic and 'moral' considerations are not a planning consideration as set out in the <i>Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015</i> . Accordingly, this does not represent a valid ground for refusal.
		To summarise; the proposal for 987 South Coast Highway Denmark should not be allowed to proceed because of the excessive size and height of the building, the overwhelming footprint of the carpark, the very large number of people that the building is capable of holding and the ensuing noise and disruption likely to be generated, the negative effect it would have upon the value of our property, and the fact that it overwhelmingly does not belong in a residential area.	No evidence has been provided to verify this statement regarding property values and it is not a matter addressed by the Regulations.
S7	Details omitted as per Council Policy.	I am writing to strongly oppose the proposed Baptist Place of Worship and Consulting Rooms for the following reasons.	

		<p>The proposal is of an overwhelming size with the possibility of the building holding way in excess of 180 people. The auditorium is planned to seat 180 people and there are four consulting rooms which could hold a great more number of people at the same time. The entrance hall and kitchen could also hold extra people at this time. This building abuts residential homes and so for a public building on our fence to have the capacity to hold so many people is extremely unsettling to me. A sign erected on the property has advertised a future church building. The proposal being mooted is not the advertised church but an excessive and ridiculously large assembly hall with “consulting” rooms.</p>	<p>The proposed building addresses setback, plot ratio and other development standards from TPS3. Subject to addressing planning standards, the size of the building is a decision for the Baptist Church.</p>
		<p>In addition to an oversized building of 560msq, 50 car bays and a large driveway is planned. This would result in the vast majority of the block being taken up by building and bitumen. The vast majority of trees are planned to be removed which currently provide a wonderful background to our homes. I realise that the tree removal company considers all of these trees to be dangerous but I presume they will only be removed if the proposed building is erected. I consider this proposal to be removing the amenities that add to the peaceful surrounds of our immediate neighbourhood and so reject the proposal on these grounds.</p>	<p>Noted. The application proposes the removal of 8 Karri trees and 7 Marri (Red Gum) trees. There is an expectation that some trees can be removed to facilitate development, address bushfire requirements and minimise the risk of falling tree limbs.</p>
		<p>I am also concerned about the proposed development from an ethical point of view. The Baptist Church has issues with inclusivity which precludes homosexuality. The building is being promoted as a community centre but I can not understand how it can be such if certain groups of our community would not be welcome to perform in the building. At a meeting with representatives at Denmark High School the Baptist Minister made it clear that although they wanted support from the school community they were not supportive of gay people.</p>	<p>Ethic and ‘moral’ considerations are not a planning consideration as set out in the <i>Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015</i>. Accordingly, this does not represent a valid ground for refusal.</p>
		<p>Will this be solely a Baptist Centre? There were only 35 Recorded Baptists in Denmark at the most recent census, so why is such an enormous centre required? My suspicion is that large workshops of people will be coming from without Denmark to use the facility under the guise of Margaret Court Ministries supporters. The centre, in the middle of surrounding homes, could therefore be very busy at all times.</p>	<p>Subject to addressing planning standards, the size of the building is a decision for the Baptist Church.</p> <p>The applicant/designer is Martin H Beeck for the Baptist Union of Western Australia Inc (owner) and Denmark Baptist Community Inc.</p>
		<p>A building of this size is detrimental to the value of our property which is on a quiet cul-de-sac. I believe that it would negatively affect the financial value of our home. Traffic will increase in and out of the site and affect access on the footpaths along the boundary as well as adding greatly to general noise pollution in our vicinity. Our privacy will also be adversely affected.</p>	<p>No evidence has been provided to verify this statement regarding property values and it is not a matter addressed by the Regulations.</p> <p>MRWA raise no objection.</p>

		<p>The building is being promoted as a community centre. I believe that we have sufficient buildings available in Denmark for this purpose. The Denmark Riverside Club is only a few hundred meters down the road and is capable of holding large groups of people for community activities. The Denmark Golf and Tennis Club which is also close by is available for large groups of people to hold events. The Denmark Civic Centre is also available for concerts and performances and includes a proscenium stage and professional lighting box and acoustic design. I therefore consider that the argument presented by the Baptists that their centre is necessary for the general community is invalid.</p>	The determination of need for community purposes is considered to be a decision for the Baptist Church.
		To summarise; I am against the proposal for 987 South Coast Highway Denmark because of the excessive size and height of the building, the overwhelming footprint of the carpark, the very large number of people that the building is capable of holding and the ensuing noise generated, the negative effect it would have upon the value of our property, and the fact that it overwhelming does not belong in a residential area. I reject the proposal in the strongest terms.	The proposed building addresses setback, plot ratio and other development standards from TPS3. Various matters can be addressed through development conditions.
S8	Details omitted as per Council Policy.	<p>While I have no objection to a place of worship being developed on the above block, I consider the proposed building far excessive for the needs of the congregation it will serve. As far as the other proposed uses of this building I fail to see the need for this in our town. We already have more than ample room to accommodate all these activities in buildings around the town. i.e.. Riverside Club, yacht club, the new surf club, Denmark Recreation Centre, Civic Centre and the newly renovated RSL Hall to mention a few.</p> <p>The schools all have their own assembly halls.</p> <p>So why do we need to build another huge centre, with all the necessary parking needed in a quiet residential area.</p> <p>This is why I object to this proposal.</p>	Subject to addressing planning standards, the size of the building is a decision for the Baptist Church. The determination of need for community purposes is also considered to be a decision for the Baptist Church.
S9	Details omitted as per Council Policy.	We, the owners of [REDACTED], Denmark wish to advise that we have no objection to the proposed place of worship, consulting rooms and community purposes at No.987 (Lot 166) South Coast Highway, Denmark.	Noted
S10	Details omitted as per Council Policy.	I have no objection to a church being built on the land adjacent to my property.	Noted
GS1	Main Roads Western Australia	<p>Main Roads has previously provided the proponent its requirements relating to the proposed crossover onto South Coast Highway. Main roads requirements are referred to in the documentation provided to the Shire by the proponent.</p> <p>It would be appreciated if the Shire of Denmark can make it a condition of development that the proponent design and construct the crossover to Main Roads requirements.</p>	Noted and addressed in a recommended development condition.